

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

MI

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

[WAC 10 900 20312]

SEP 21 2010

IN RE:

Applicant:

[REDACTED]

APPLICATION:

Application for Temporary Protected Status under Section 244 of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1254

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 California Service Center. 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 California Service Center by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must 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 application was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and 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 director for consideration as a motion to reconsider.

The applicant claims to be a citizen of Haiti who is seeking Temporary Protected Status (TPS) under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1254.

The director determined that the applicant was permanently ineligible for any benefit under section 244 of the Act for previously filing a frivolous asylum application. The director therefore denied the application.

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 date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The record indicates that the director issued the Notice of Decision on March 10, 2010, and it was mailed to the applicant at her address of record. The Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal, is very clear in indicating that the appeal is not to be sent directly to the AAO. Likewise, the Notice of Decision indicates that the appeal “may not be filed directly with the AAO. The appeal must be filed at the address at the top of this page.” The applicant, nevertheless, sent her appeal to the AAO. The appeal is not considered properly received until it is received by the Service Center, which rendered the unfavorable decision. The appeal was received at the California Service Center on June 17, 2010, 38 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. 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 to reconsider must 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 Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also 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). A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

The applicant indicates that the Board of Immigration Appeal (BIA) withdrew the frivolous claim cited in the Order of the Immigration Judge. The applicant quoted, verbatim, from the BIA's decision and indicated that the copy of the decision was attached. A review of the record, however, failed to include the decision. The AAO has reviewed the BIA's decision of May 26, 2005, and included a copy, which supports the applicant's claim, into the record.

Here, the untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reconsider. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the Service Center Director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). Therefore, the director must consider the untimely appeal as a motion to reconsider and render a new decision accordingly.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected. The matter is returned to the director for consideration as a motion to reconsider