

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



HTY

FILE: [Redacted] Office: CIUDAD JUAREZ, MEXICO

Date: **AUG 29 2007**

IN RE: [Redacted]

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

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Officer-in-Charge (OIC), Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

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 record reflects that the OIC sent the decision on September 27, 2005 to the applicant at her address of record. On appeal, the applicant states that she did not receive the decision until October 10, 2005. The applicant filed the appeal with improper fee on November 2, 2005, and the appeal was rejected as improperly filed. USCIS did not receive the properly filed appeal until December 28, 2005, 127 days after the decision was issued and 79 days after the applicant claimed it was received. Therefore, the appeal was untimely filed.

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 OIC at the American Consulate in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The OIC declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO. On appeal, the applicant states merely that she will submit evidence if given more time, but she submits no new evidence and cites not pertinent precedent decision to establish that the OIC's decision was based on an incorrect application of law or policy. The applicant requested 30 days to present a brief and/or evidence, but the record shows that no additional information has been submitted to date.

As the applicant presents no new facts to be considered, or any precedent decisions to establish that the OIC's denial was based on an incorrect application of law or USCIS policy, the appeal will not be treated as a motion to reopen or reconsider and will, therefore, be rejected.

As always, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The applicant has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.