

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

tl3



FILE:



Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

Date:

OCT 30 2007

SDO 2003836015 (RELATES)

IN RE:



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

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, Mexico (Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic Sub-Office). 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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that an affected party must file an 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 district director sent the decision on June 22, 2006 to the applicant at the applicant's address of record. It is noted that the district director stated that the applicant had 30 days from the date listed on the decision to file an appeal. Counsel¹ dated the appeal, and it was received on, August 23, 2006, 62 days after the decision was issued. It is claimed on the Form I-290B that the decision was not received until July 26, 2006, but no additional evidence supporting this claim has been submitted and no explanation has been given as to why the applicant delayed filing the appeal until August 23, 2006. Therefore, the appeal was untimely filed and must be rejected.

Neither the Immigration and Nationality 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 district director of the Mexico City, Mexico District Office (Santo Domingo, Dominican

¹ It is noted that the appeal was prepared by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] asserts she is a lawyer but has failed to demonstrate that she is licensed to practice law and is in good standing in a court of general jurisdiction of the country in which she resides as required by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3). She also does not indicate she is a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States or of the highest court in any State, territory, insular possession, or the District of Columbia. See 8 C.F.R. § 292.1. Although the petition is accompanied by a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance by an Attorney or Representative, [REDACTED] has not established that she is a licensed attorney or an accredited representative authorized to undertake representations on the petitioner's behalf. Accordingly, the assertions of [REDACTED] will not be considered in this proceeding.

Republic Sub-Office). *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The district director declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

Here, the applicant has submitted sufficient new evidence—including medical, financial and tax records—to meet the requirements for a motion to reopen.

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 treatment as a motion and issuance of a new decision.