

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals, MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



Dg

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

DEC 06 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(P)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(i)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed. The AAO will return the matter to the director for consideration as a motion to reopen and reconsider.

The petitioner filed the nonimmigrant petition seeking to classify the beneficiary under section 101(a)(15)(P)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(P)(i). The petitioner, a professional soccer club, seeks to employ the beneficiary as a professional soccer player for a period of approximately four months.

The director denied the petition, concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary qualifies for classification as an internationally recognized athlete. Specifically, the director found that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary meets at least two of the seven evidentiary criteria for internationally recognized athletes or athletic teams pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(p)(4)(ii)(B)(2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2) requires an affected party to file the complete appeal within 30 days after service of the decision, or, in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b), within 33 days if the decision was served by mail.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i) provides:

An application received in a USCIS office shall be stamped to show the time and date of actual receipt and, unless otherwise specified in part 204 or part 245a of this chapter shall be regarded as properly filed when so stamped, if it is signed and executed and the required filing fee or a waiver of the filing fee is granted. An application or petition which is not properly signed or is submitted with the wrong filing fee shall be rejected as improperly filed. Rejected applications and petitions, and ones in which the check or other financial instrument used to pay the filing fee is subsequently returned as non-payable will not retain a filing date.

The record indicates that the director's decision was issued to the petitioner on May 5, 2010. The AAO notes that, based on the date of service, the petitioner was required to file the appeal on or before Monday, June 7, 2010. The record shows that the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, was initially stamped by the service center as received on June 10, 2010. However, this filing date was cancelled because the petitioner failed to sign the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. The service center rejected and returned the petitioner's appeal. The petitioner resubmitted the properly signed Form I-290B on April 21, 2010, and the appeal is considered properly filed as of that date, 47 days after the director's decision was issued.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. Thus, the appeal was not timely filed and must be rejected on these grounds pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1).

Nevertheless, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2) states that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or USCIS policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

Here, the untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the service center director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). Therefore, the director must consider the untimely appeal as a motion to reopen and render a new decision accordingly.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the director for consideration as a motion to reopen/reconsider and the issuance of a new decision.