



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

E2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: HARLINGEN, TX

Date:

AUG 16 2007

IN RE:

[REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Certificate of Citizenship pursuant to Section 301(a)(7) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, U.S.C. § 1401(a)(7).

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The District Director, Harlingen, Texas denied the application. 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 district director for consideration as a motion to reopen.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party must file the complete appeal within 30 days of after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(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 district director issued the decision on July 19, 2006. It is noted that the district director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 30 days to file the appeal. Although the district director received a letter from the applicant on August 18, 2006 indicating his intention to file an appeal, the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Office was not received by Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) until December 14, 2006, 148 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33 day time limit for filing an appeal. As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected. 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 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 the applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

Here, the untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen. The applicant has submitted additional documentation to establish that his father's U.S. residence prior to his birth satisfies the requirements of section 301(a)(7) of the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, the applicable immigration statute in the present case. The documentation submitted by the applicant includes baptismal certificates for his father's siblings, a September 11, 2006 affidavit sworn by an individual who attests to have direct knowledge concerning the birth and residence of his father and photographs. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the district director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). Therefore, the district 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 district director for consideration as a motion to reopen.