


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



112

OCT 29 2007

FILE: [Redacted]

Office: ROME, ITALY

Date:

IN RE: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

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 cursive script, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The District Director, Rome, Italy denied the waiver application. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed. The AAO will return the matter to the district director for consideration as a motion to reopen.

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 district director issued the decision on February 22, 2006. It is noted that the district director properly gave notice to the applicant that he had 33 days to file the appeal with the Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) office in Rome, Italy. While the applicant's spouse contends that she did not receive the decision until March 7, 2006, there is no evidence in the record to establish that there was a delay in issuance of the decision. CIS received the appeal on April 26, 2006, or 63 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. The AAO notes that, had the decision been issued on March 7, 2006, the appeal would still have been untimely filed as it was not received until 50 days after that date.

Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO or the district director 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 reopen. 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). Therefore, the district director must consider the untimely appeal as a motion to reopen and render a new decision accordingly.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to district director for treatment as a motion and issuance of a new decision.