(b)(6)

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
*Office of Administrative Appeals*
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

**U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services**

DATE: JUL 24 2013 OFFICE: PHOENIX, AZ FILE:
(Consolidated therein:

IN RE:

APPLICATION: Application for Certificate of Citizenship under former Section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1401

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Form N-600, Application for Certificate of Citizenship (Form N-600) was denied by the Field Office Director (director), Phoenix, Arizona, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that an affected party must file a complete appeal within 30 days after service of an unfavorable decision. If the decision is mailed, the 30-day period for submitting an appeal begins three days after it is mailed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(b). The date of filing is the date of actual receipt of the appeal, not the date of mailing. 8 C.F.R. §103.2(a)(7)(i).

The director sent the decision to the applicant at his address of record on September 13, 2011. The director stated that the applicant had 30 (33) days to file an appeal. A Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) was received by the Service on October 12, 2011; however, the Form I-290B was rejected due to improper filing. A properly filed appeal was received by the Service on November 9, 2011, fifty-seven days after the director's decision was issued. Therefore, the appeal was untimely filed and must be rejected.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the time limit for filing an appeal. However, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(*2*) provides that if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen as described in 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) or a motion to reconsider as described in 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3), 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: (1) 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 USCIS policy; and (2) 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).

The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the field office director of the Phoenix, Arizona field office. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The director determined that the appeal does not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or motion to reconsider.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

**ORDER**: The appeal is rejected.