U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3100
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

H2

OCT 0 2 2007

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(h).

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 waiver application was denied by the Director, California Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that an affected party must file a complete appeal within 30 days after service of an unfavorable decision. If the decision is mailed, the 30-day period for submitting an appeal begins 3 days after it is mailed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The date of filing is the date of actual receipt of the appeal, not the date of mailing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record reflects that the director issued the decision on July 6, 2006 to the applicant at the applicant's address of record. It is noted that the director stated that the applicant had 33 days to file an appeal with that office. However, the applicant filed the appeal directly with the AAO on August 9, 2006, 34 days after the decision was issued. It was rejected the same day and the applicant was instructed to file the appeal with the office where he originally filed his waiver application. The applicant re-filed the appeal with the California Service Center on August 22, 2006, 47 days after the decision was issued. Therefore, the appeal was untimely filed and must be rejected.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the time limit for filing an appeal. However, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(*2*) provides that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen as described in 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) or a motion to reconsider as described in 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), 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: (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 USCIS 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 having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the director of the California Service Center. *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.

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 and does not qualify as a motion, the appeal must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.