




**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



He

DATE: **DEC 08 2012** Office: MEXICO CITY (ANAHEIM, CA) FILE: 

IN RE: 

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City (Anaheim, California), and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected. The AAO will return the matter to the director for consideration as a motion to reopen and reconsider.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that an affected party must file a complete appeal within 30 days after service of an unfavorable decision. If the decision is mailed, the 30-day period for submitting an appeal begins 3 days after it is mailed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(b). The date of filing is the date of actual receipt of the appeal, not the date of mailing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record reflects that on July 20, 2011, the District Director sent the decision to the applicant at the applicant's address of record. It is noted that the Director stated that the applicant had 33 days to file an appeal. The appeal, therefore, was due on August 22, 2011, a Monday. The applicant dated the appeal on August 23, 2011, the appeal was mailed on August 24, 2011, and it was received on August 26, 2011, 37 days after the Director's decision was sent. Therefore, we conclude that the appeal was untimely filed and must be rejected.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the time limit for filing an appeal. However, 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).

Here, as additional evidence was submitted after the appeal was filed, it is apparent that the director did not have an opportunity to fully review the late appeal to determine whether it meets the requirements of either a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider. Therefore, the matter will be returned to the director. If the director determines that the late appeal meets the requirements of a motion, the motion shall be granted and a new decision will be issued.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.