





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services


(b)(6)



DATE: **SEP 19 2013**

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 


IN RE: Applicant: 

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case. This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The re-registration 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.

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 denied the re-registration application because the applicant's initial TPS application () had been denied on May 13, 2010,¹ and the applicant was not eligible to apply for re-registration for TPS.

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 submit the complete appeal within 30 days after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(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 April 23, 2013, and it was mailed to the applicant at her address of record. The envelope containing the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, was postmarked May 28, 2013, and it was received at the California Service Center on May 29, 2013, 36 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. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the Director, California Service Center. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The director determined that the late appeal did not meet the requirements of a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

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

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.

¹The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the application because the applicant had previously filed a frivolous asylum application and, therefore, she was permanently ineligible for any benefit under section 244 of the Act. The appeal and motion to reconsider were dismissed by the AAO on September 20, 2010 and March 1, 2011, respectively.