



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

*E3*

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Date: **MAR 15 2007**

IN RE: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Replacement Naturalization/Citizenship Document under Section 338  
of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1149.

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the District Director, Los Angeles, California. 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 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 record indicates that the District Director issued the decision on May 11, 2005. It is noted that the District Director properly gave notice to the petitioner that she had 30 days to file the appeal. Although the appeal was initially received by the District Office on June 14, 2005, it was rejected due to the submission of an incorrect fee. The appeal was subsequently received by the District Office on June 20, 2005, or 40 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 District Director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The District Director declined to treat the late appeal as 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.