

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass Ave., N.W. Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

*hr*

[REDACTED]

FILE:

Office: CHICAGO, IL

Date: **SEP 21 2007**

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:

[REDACTED]

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The District Director, Chicago, Illinois denied the waiver application and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as 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 must file the complete appeal within 30 days of 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 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 May 28, 2004. It is noted that the district director properly gave notice to the petitioner that he had 33 days to file the appeal. The appeal was received by the district director on July 14, 2004, or 47 days after the decision was issued. The AAO notes that the applicant's appeal was received by the AAO on June 25, 2004, however, an appeal is not considered to be properly filed until it is received by the appropriate office, in this case the Chicago District Office. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed. The director erroneously forwarded the matter to the AAO.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. 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).

On appeal, counsel states his reasons for reconsideration and cites various precedent decisions to support his reasons for reconsideration. *Counsel's Brief*, dated August 1, 2004.

Here, the untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reconsider. 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 reconsider and render a new decision accordingly.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the director for consideration as a motion to reconsider.