


(b)(6)

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



Date: **APR 02 2013**

Office: ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA

FILE: 

IN RE: Applicant: 

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:

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 black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the International Adjudications Support Branch, Anaheim, California, on behalf of the Field Office Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

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. § 103.5a(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 the International Adjudications Support Branch sent the decision on August 14, 2012 to the applicant at the applicant's address of record. It is noted that the International Adjudications Support Branch stated that the applicant had 33 days to file an appeal. Although the applicant's father dated the appeal on September 11, 2012, the appeal was not received until September 17, 2012, 34 days after the decision was issued. Therefore, 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).

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 of the Ciudad Juarez, Mexico Field Office. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). In this case, the field office director determined that the late appeal did not meet the requirements of a motion, the appeal is, therefore, rejected.

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

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.