

identifying information deleted to prevent unwarranted invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Er

PUBLIC COPY




FILE:

Office: NEW YORK, NY

Date: NOV 30 2007

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Certificate of Citizenship pursuant to Section 320 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1431.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 F. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The District Director, New York, New York, denied the application. 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 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. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The district director issued a decision on December 10, 2004. The district director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file an appeal. The record indicates that the Notice of Appeal was sent to the Vermont Service Center in error on January 22, 2005, 43 days after the issuance of the applicant's denial decision. An appeal is not properly filed until the proper office, in this case the New York, New York U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) district office, receives it. The appeal was received by the New York district office on March 18, 2005 - 98 days after the district director's decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. The district director erroneously annotated the appeal as timely and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. 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 applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

In the present matter, 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.