

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



H2

FILE:



Office: LOS ANGELES (SANTA ANA), CA

Date:

SEP 18 2007

IN RE:

Applicant:



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 application was denied by the District Director, Los Angeles, California. 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 after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record reflects that the district director issued the applicant's decision on April 19, 2006. It is noted that the district director properly gave notice to the applicant that she had 33 days to file the appeal. The Notice of Appeal was sent to the AAO in error. An appeal is not properly filed until the proper office, in this case the Santa Ana, California U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) field office, receives it. The applicant attempted to file an appeal with the Santa Ana field office on May 25, 2006 – 36 days after the issuance of her denial decision. The appeal was rejected as improperly filed due to improper fee payment. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i). An appeal with proper fee was received by the Santa Ana field office on July 9, 2006 – 81 days after the denial decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. The district director erroneously annotated the appeal as timely and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

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 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.