

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

tl



FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
(PANAMA CITY, PANAMA)

Date: OCT 29 2007

(GYQ 2003 566 2013)


IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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 District Director, Mexico City, Mexico (Panama City, Panama). 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 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 the decision on May 12, 2006 and properly notified the applicant that he had 33 days to file an appeal. The record reflects that the appeal was received at the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) office in Panama on June 15, 2006 – 34 days after the denial decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. The officer in charge 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).

Here, 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.