

identifying [redacted] related to  
prevent [redacted] unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave. NW, Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

H2

**PUBLIC COPY**

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: LOS ANGELES, CA Date: OCT 09 2007

IN RE: [redacted]


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

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.

  
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The District Director, Los Angeles, California denied the waiver application. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed. The AAO will return the matter to the District Director for consideration as a motion to reopen.

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 District Director issued the decision on August 23, 2005. It is noted that the District Director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file the appeal. On September 26, 2005 the appeal was delivered to the Los Angeles District Office but returned to the applicant for submission to an alternate address. The applicant's refiling of the appeal was submitted to Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on October 6, 2005 but rejected for lack of a valid signature. Accordingly, the appeal was not actually received by CIS until October 27, 2005, 65 days after the decision was issued. Therefore, 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. 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 untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen, as the applicant has submitted copies of money orders made out to the Court Trustee as proof of his child support payments. 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). Therefore, the District Director must consider the untimely appeal as a motion to reopen and render a new decision accordingly.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the District Director for consideration as a motion to reopen.