




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services


(b)(6)



DATE: FEB 21 2013

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE: Petitioner:   
Beneficiary: 

PETITION: Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) Pursuant to § 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K)


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.

Thank you,



Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party or the attorney or representative of record must file the complete appeal within 30 days of service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(b). The date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record indicates that the service center director issued the decision on February 27, 2012. The service center director gave notice to the petitioner that he had 30 days to file the appeal with the California Service Center, although the petitioner actually had 33 days because the decision was served by mail. Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend this time limit.

The petitioner initially submitted the appeal to the Administrative Appeals Office. The appeal was rejected as improperly filed and the petitioner was instructed to file the appeal with the California Service Center. The petitioner did not file the appeal with the California Service Center until April 23, 2012, or 56 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

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. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the Director of the California Service Center. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The director determined that the late appeal did not meet the requirements of a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

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

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.