


(b)(6)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services




DATE: Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER FILE:

**SEP 05 2013**



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 native and 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 February 2, 2013 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 February 19, 2013.

In a separate decision, the AAO, upon a *de novo* review of the evidence,<sup>1</sup> rejected the appeal of the applicant's father on the basis that the appeal was untimely filed. In the same token, the applicant's appeal will be rejected because 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 February 19, 2013. The applicant filed a Form I-290B, with the appropriate agency on April 17, 2013, Fifty-Eight (58) 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 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)(1).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

(b)(6)

*NON-PRECEDENT DECISION*

Page 3

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.