

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

HL5

FILE:

Office: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO
(CIUDAD JUAREZ)

Date: FEB 08 2011

IN RE:

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:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. 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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez. 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 Acting Field Office Director for consideration as a motion to reopen.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico. The applicant was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i) for having attempted to enter the United States using false documents. She is the wife of a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The applicant is seeking a waiver under section 212(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i) in order to reside in the United States.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that the bar to her admission would impose extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, her lawful permanent resident spouse, and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) on December 23, 2008.

A properly filed Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Office was not received by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) until February 3, 2009, 42 days after the decision was issued. The Form I-290B appeal is dated January 29, 2009, 37 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the 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 that does not meet the applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4). The Field Office Director declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

On appeal the applicant submits additional evidence and clarifies facts discussed by the Field Office Director.

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.