






U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)



DATE: **SEP 05 2013** Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER FILE: 

IN RE: Applicant: 

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Permanent Resident Pursuant to Section 13 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1957, Pub. L. No. 85-316, 71 Stat. 642, as amended.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case. This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron M. Rosenberg".

Ron M. Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director (director), National Benefits Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The applicant is a citizen of Pakistan who is seeking to adjust his status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 13 of the Act of 1957 ("Section 13"), Pub. L. No. 85-316, 71 Stat. 642, as amended, 95 Stat. 1611, 8 U.S.C. § 1255b, as a derivative dependent child of an alien who performed diplomatic or semi-diplomatic duties under section 101(a)(15)(A)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(A)(ii).

The director denied the Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status after determining that the applicant's father had failed to establish that compelling reasons prevent his return to Pakistan and that his adjustment status is in the national interest of the United States. The director also noted that the U.S. Department of State issued its opinion on November 23, 2012 recommending that the applicant's father's request for adjustment of status in the United States be denied because the applicant's father presented no compelling reasons why he is unable to return to Pakistan. The director denied the applicant's adjustment of status application on the basis of his father's ineligibility for benefits under Section 13. *Decision of the Director*, dated January 7, 2013.

On February 20, 2013, the applicant submitted a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B), indicating at Part 2 that he is filing an appeal of the Form I-485, which was denied on January 7, 2013.¹ The AAO, upon a *de novo* review of the evidence,² will reject this appeal on the basis that the appeal was 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 or the attorney or representative of record 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. § 103.8(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).

In this case, the record reflects that the director issued the decision denying the Form I-485 on January 7, 2013. The applicant filed a Form I-290B, with the appropriate agency on February 20, 2013, Forty-Five (45) days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

If an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2). The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the director, National Benefits Center. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). As required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(ii)-(iv), the director reviewed the appeal

¹ The record reflects that on January 7, 2013, the director also denied the application of the applicant's father, [REDACTED] and two other dependents [REDACTED]. The applicant and the other two dependents have not submitted an appeal to the AAO. The applicant is the only one that has filed an appeal with the AAO.

² The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

prior to forwarding it to the AAO, and did not conclude that it met the requirements of a motion or otherwise warrant favorable action. Therefore, the untimely appeal must be rejected pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(I).

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.