

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

Hy



FILE:



Office: EL PASO, TEXAS

Date:

JUL 24 2008

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) of the Immigration and
Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)

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 District Director, El Paso, Texas, denied the application for permission to reapply for admission after removal, and 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 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 21, 2006. It is noted that the District Director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file his appeal. On September 6, 2006, the applicant filed his appeal with Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), claiming that he received the decision on August 16, 2006. On September 6, 2006, CIS sent a letter to the applicant requesting proof that he received the decision on August 16, 2006. On November 27, 2006, 129 days after the decision was issued, the applicant resubmitted his appeal with no evidence that he received the decision on August 16, 2006. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO or the District Director the authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(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.