

**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

H,



FILE:

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

OCT 31 2007

IN RE: Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Ground of Inadmissibility under Section 212 of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director of the California Service Center denied the Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a). 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. *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 director issued the decision on January 4, 2007. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal was received by the California Service Center on February 7, 2007, 35 days after the date of issuance of the decision. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected. Nevertheless, 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 applicant submits a letter in support of his appeal. The applicant does not advance any new argument, provide additional support, or submit new evidence with his appeal. The untimely appeal does not appear to meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or reconsider, and thus there is no requirement to treat the appeal as a motion under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2).

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.