

identifying data deleted to
prevent clear inwarranted
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

H2

PUBLIC COPY




FILE: [Redacted] Office: CHICAGO, IL Date: DEC 26 2006

IN RE: [Redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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, Chicago, IL denied the waiver application 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 record indicates that the director issued the decision on July 30, 2004. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the petitioner that he had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal was received by the district office on September 30, 2004, or 62 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.¹

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 District Director. *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.

¹ The AAO notes that counsel stated on appeal that the decision was not mailed until September 3, 2004 and received on September 7, 2004. Counsel did not submit any documentation to support this assertion, nor is there anything in the record to indicate a date other than July 30, 2004.