

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

H3



FILE:



Office: FRANKFURT, GERMANY

Date: **MAY 13 2008**

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v),
of the Immigration and Nationality 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 Officer-in-Charge, Frankfurt, Germany, and 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. *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 Officer-in-Charge issued the decision on March 31, 2006. It is noted that the Officer-in-Charge properly gave notice to the applicant that she had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal was received by the Officer-in-Charge on May 22, 2006, which is 52 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act (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).

In the letter dated April 24, 2006 the applicant's husband asserts that his one-year separation from his wife and children constitutes hardship. However, the applicant's husband fails to support his assertion by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the Officer-in-Charge's decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy. The applicant's husband does not indicate that new facts will be proven and will be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence, as required in a motion to reopen. Thus, 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.