


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

HL

**PUBLIC COPY**



FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

MAY 19 2006

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after  
Deportation or Removal under section 212(a)(9)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and  
Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(iii)

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 for Permission to Reapply for Admission into the United States after Deportation or Removal (Form I-212) was denied by the Director, California Service Center, 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 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 record indicates that the Director issued the decision on March 25, 2005. It is noted that the Director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file the appeal. The Notice of Appeal to the AAO (Form I-290B) was received by the California Service Center on April 28, 2005, 34 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

The AAO notes that a previously submitted Form I-212 was denied on March 21, 2002, by the Officer in Charge, Manila, Philippines, and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the AAO on April 25, 2003.

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. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the Director, California Service Center. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The Director declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.