

Identifying information collected to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

H2

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:



Office: NEWARK, NJ

Date: **SEP 28 2006**

IN RE:



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:

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. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The district director denied the waiver application and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1) as untimely filed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of El Salvador who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to § 212(a)(9), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i).

An affected party has 30 days from the date of an adverse decision to file an appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i). If the adverse decision was served by mail, an additional three-day period is added to the 30-day period. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The record reflects that the director mailed the decision on February 15, 2005. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) received the appeal 66 days later on April 22, 2005. Therefore, the appeal was untimely filed.

An appeal that is not filed within the time allowed must be rejected as improperly filed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1). If, however, an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2). 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: (1) 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 CIS policy; and (2) 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).

The official that has jurisdiction over a motion to reopen or reconsider 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.

The burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected as untimely filed.