

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

#13

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

Date:

OCT 09 2007

CDJ 2004 751 308

IN RE:

[REDACTED]

PETITION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B) of the  
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[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. Wemmann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The District Director, Mexico City, Mexico 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 July 7, 2006. It is noted that the District Director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file the appeal and that the appeal was not to be sent directly to the AAO. Although counsel dated the appeal August 8, 2006, it was received by the District Director on August 10, 2006, 34 days after the 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 meets the requirements of a motion to reopen, as the applicant has submitted new evidence documenting that his spouse is pregnant. 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.