

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

E 2

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date: OCT 08 2008

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Certificate of Citizenship under Section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1401

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 P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Field Office Director, San Francisco, California. 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 field office 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 field office director issued the decision on February 12, 2008. It is noted that the field office director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal in this case was dated March 11, 2008, postmarked April 4, 2008, and received by USCIS on April 8, 2008, more than 33 days after the issuance of the field office director's decision.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. The AAO is therefore without jurisdiction to consider the appeal, and the appeal must be rejected.

The AAO notes that 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).

The appeal in this case is accompanied by DNA evidence purporting to establish the identity of the applicant's natural father. Here, the untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the field office director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). Therefore, the field office 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 field office director for consideration as a motion to reopen.