




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: **OCT 11 2007**

[SRC 03 111 53348]

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 California Service Center. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The initial application for Temporary Protected Status was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center. A subsequent application for re-registration was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is currently before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed. The AAO will return the matter to the director for consideration as a motion to reconsider.

The applicant is stated to be 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 record reveals that the applicant filed an initial TPS application on March 22, 2001, under CIS receipt number SRC 01 149 61474. The Texas Service Center Director denied that application due to abandonment, on July 27, 2002, because the applicant failed to respond, within 30 days, to a June 27, 2002 notice of intent to deny requesting that she submit a photo identification, and evidence to establish her continuous physical presence in the United States from March 9, 2001 to the date of filing. A denial due to abandonment may not be appealed; however, an applicant may file a motion to reopen under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 within 30 days of the denial decision. The record does not reflect that the applicant filed a motion to reopen.

The applicant filed the current Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, on September 19, 2002, under CIS receipt number SRC 03 111 53348, and indicated that she was re-registering for TPS. The director denied the re-registration application on January 29, 2003, because the applicant's initial TPS application had been denied and the applicant was not eligible to re-register for TPS.

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 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 director issued the decision on January 29, 2003. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the applicant that she had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal was received by the California Service Center on March 10, 2003. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. The director erroneously annotated the appeal as timely and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected. Nevertheless, 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 meets the requirements of a motion to reconsider as the applicant has submitted new evidence. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the service center director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). Therefore, the director must consider the untimely appeal as a motion to reconsider and render a new decision accordingly.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the director for consideration as a motion to reconsider.