

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H2

MAR 16 2007

FILE:

Office: PHOENIX, AZ

Date:

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:

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 District Director, Phoenix, Arizona denied the waiver application and 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. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The record indicates that the district director issued the decision on October 26, 2004. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the petitioner that he had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal was received by the district office on December 24, 2004, or 59 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

The AAO notes that the appeal was initially sent directly to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). The AAO also notes that the director's decision clearly states on its cover page that the appeal in this case was to be made to the AAO, not the BIA and that the applicant was not to send the appeal directly to the AAO, but should send the appeal to the district office within 33 calendar days. The AAO finds that the appeal is not properly filed until it is received by the proper office.

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. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The 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.