




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)



DATE: **JAN 28 2013** OFFICE: CIUDAD JUAREZ (ANAHEIM) 

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:


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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Form I-601, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility was denied by the Field Officer Director, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico (Anaheim, California). The matter 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 three 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. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record reflects that the field office director sent the decision on March 7, 2012 to the applicant at the applicant's address of record. It is noted that the field office director stated the applicant had 33 days to file an appeal. Although the applicant dated the Form I-290B appeal on April 4, 2012, the appeal was not received until April 30, 2011, fifty-five 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 office. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). In the present matter, the field office director determined that the appeal does not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or motion to reconsider.

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

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.