

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly 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

PUBLIC COPY

74



FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY, MX
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: OCT 29 2007

CDJ 2005 713 241

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility.

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. Wieman, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City (Ciudad Juarez), Mexico. The matter is now before the AAO on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed. The matter will be returned to the district director for consideration as a motion to reopen and for issuance of a new decision.

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. 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 record reflects that the district director issued the denial decision on September 14, 2006. The district director properly gave notice to the applicant that she had 33 days to file an appeal. The record indicates that the applicant's appeal was received on December 13, 2006 – 90 days after the district director's decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

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 applicant's untimely appeal contains new evidence, including a hardship letter from the applicant's husband, copies of the applicant's U.S. citizen children's birth certificates, school identification indicating that one of the applicant's children continues to go to school in the United States, and court documentation relating to the applicant's criminal record.¹ The untimely appeal thus meets the requirements for consideration as 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 district director. 8 C.F.R.

¹ The untimely appeal also contains untranslated documents written in Spanish. The regulation provides at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3) that:

Any document containing foreign language submitted to the Service [now U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, CIS] shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English.

Because the untranslated documents fail to comply with the requirements set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3), they serve no evidentiary purpose.

§ 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 and for issuance of a new decision.