

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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

**PUBLIC COPY**



D 8

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

SEP 14 2010

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

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

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 \$585. 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, Vermont Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will reject the appeal as untimely filed.

The petitioner filed this petition seeking to classify himself as an O-1 nonimmigrant pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(O)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), as an alien of extraordinary ability in the arts. The petitioner seeks to work in the United States as a disc jockey for a period of three years.

The director denied the petition on November 24, 2009, determining that the petition was not filed by a United States employer, a United States agent, or a foreign employer through a United States agent, pursuant to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(o)(2)(i), which further provides that an O alien may not petition for himself or herself.

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. In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i), an application received in a USCIS office shall be stamped to show the time and date of actual receipt, if it is properly signed, executed, and accompanied by the correct fee. For calculating the date of filing, the appeal shall be regarded as properly filed on the date that it is so stamped by the service center or district office.

The record indicates that the director's decision was mailed to the petitioner on November 24, 2009. The AAO notes that, based on the date of service, the petitioner was required to file the appeal on or before Monday, December 28, 2009. The appeal was accepted and stamped as properly filed on January 5, 2010, 42 days after the director issued the adverse decision. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Moreover, the AAO notes that the petitioner filed the appeal with the wrong USCIS office. The director's notice of decision properly advised the petitioner that the appeal must be mailed to the Vermont Service Center. The petitioner mailed the appeal to a USCIS address in Chicago, Illinois that is designated solely for applicants filing Form I-290B under the Northwestern Immigrants Rights Project (NWIRP) settlement. The appeal should not have been accepted at that USCIS office, but instead should have been returned to the petitioner for re-filing with the Vermont Service Center. Nevertheless, the AAO notes that this error is harmless as the appeal was already untimely when it was received at the Chicago, Illinois address.

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).

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 as described in 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) or a motion to reconsider as described in 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. 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).

It is noted that the appeal does not meet the applicable requirements of a motion to reopen or reconsider. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a). 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 Service 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 petitioner offers no "new" evidence, which could not have been presented in the initial proceeding. Likewise, the petitioner fails to cite to any pertinent precedent decisions establishing that the director's decision was based on an incorrect application of law or USCIS policy. The petitioner does not address the grounds for denial, specifically, the requirement that a United States employer or qualifying agent file the O-1 petition.

The untimely appeal does not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider. Therefore, there is no requirement to treat the appeal as a motion under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2).

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.