

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**

H3

[REDACTED]

FILE:

Office: NEW DELHI, INDIA

Date: **JAN 14 2008**

IN RE:

[REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(a)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)

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 waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, New Delhi, India, and 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 field office director for treatment as a motion to reopen and issuance of a new decision on the merits of the case.

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 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 field office director issued the decision on April 19, 2007. The applicant first submitted the appeal directly to the AAO on June 7, 2007, 49 days after the field office director issued the decision. However, an appeal is not properly filed until the office that issued the decision, in this case the Citizenship and Immigration Services office in New Delhi, receives it. The appeal was not received by the field office director until July 6, 2007, 78 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the Immigration and Nationality Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO 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).

The appeal includes counsel's brief, the applicant's spouse's hospital discharge plans and instructions, a letter from the applicant's spouse's psychotherapist and psychiatrist, and country conditions information on India.

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 field office director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). Therefore, the field office 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 the field office director for treatment as a motion to reopen and issuance of a new decision on the merits of the case.