

identifying data deleted to  
prevent identity information  
in violation of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

H2

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: MIAMI (JACKSONVILLE), FL

Date: SEP 28 2005

IN RE:

[Redacted]

APPLICATION:

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[Redacted]

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, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The District Director, Miami (Jacksonville), Florida denied the Form I-601 Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility. 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 March 26, 2002. The appeal was received by CIS on May 31, 2002, or 66 days after the decision was issued. Counsel states that more than 30 days were required to file the appeal as the decision was mailed to an old office address and was not immediately forwarded to the new office. *Letter from Elizabeth Ricci*, dated May 28, 2002. However, no proof was submitted to verify this allegation or that CIS was notified of the new address. In addition, the decision was sent to the applicant at the stated address. Therefore, it was properly served. 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, Miami, Florida. *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.