

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

Er



FILE:



Office: HARLINGEN, TEXAS

Date: **MAR 29 2011**

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Certificate of Citizenship pursuant to § 301(a)(7) of the former Immigration and Nationality Act; 8 U.S.C. § 1401(a)(7).

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the District Director, Harlingen, Texas, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The record reflects that the applicant was born on August 27, 1967 in Mexico. The applicant's father was born in Mexico, but he derived U.S. citizenship at birth. The applicant's mother, who is now deceased, was not a U.S. citizen. The applicant's parents were married to each other. The applicant seeks a certificate of citizenship pursuant to § 301(a)(7) of the former Immigration and Nationality Act (the former Act); 8 U.S.C. § 1401(a)(7), based on the claim that he acquired U.S. citizenship at birth through his father.

The district director found that the record contained insufficient evidence to establish that the applicant's father had resided in the United States for ten years prior to the applicant's birth, at least five years of which occurred after his father turned fourteen, as required by § 301(a)(7) of the former Act. The application was denied accordingly.

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 March 29, 2005 and gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file the appeal. CIS received the appeal on May 26, 2005, or 58 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

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 district 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.