




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

MI



FILE:




Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **AUG 27 2007**

[WAC 05 210 95978]

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Temporary Protected Status under Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1254

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 was denied by the Director, California Service Center. A motion to reopen, filed by the applicant, was denied by the director. The director subsequently reopened the case and she again denied the application. It is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The applicant is a native and citizen of El Salvador who is seeking Temporary Protected Status (TPS) under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1254.

The director determined that the applicant failed to establish that he was eligible for filing his TPS application after the initial registration period from March 9, 2001 through September 9, 2002. The director, therefore, denied the application.

An appeal that is not filed within the time allowed must be rejected as improperly filed. In such a case, any filing fee accepted will not be refunded. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1).

Whenever a person has the right or is required to do some act within a prescribed period after the service of a notice upon him and the notice is served by mail, three days shall be added to the prescribed period. Service by mail is complete upon mailing. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The director's decision of denial, dated January 17, 2007, clearly advised the applicant that any appeal must be properly filed within thirty days after service of the decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i). Coupled with three days for mailing, the appeal, in this case, should have been filed on or before February 19, 2007. The appeal, was initially sent to and received at AAO on February 16, 2007. The applicant must file his or her appeal with the director who issued the denial; in this case, the Director, California Service Center, not the AAO. The appeal was not properly filed, and was not received at the California Service Center until February 26, 2007.

Neither 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).

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.