

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
Citizenship and Immigration Services

MI

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20536



File:




Office: Vermont Service Center

Date:

**DEC 31 2003**

IN RE: Applicant:



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

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

*Cindy M. Gomez for*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The case will be remanded for further consideration and action.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Honduras who indicated on her application that she entered the United States on April 6, 1998, without a lawful admission or parole. The director denied the application for Temporary Protected Status (TPS) under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1254, for lack of prosecution (abandonment) because the applicant failed to respond to a request for evidence to establish her eligibility for TPS.

If all requested initial evidence and requested additional evidence is not submitted by the required date, the application or petition shall be considered abandoned and, accordingly, shall be denied. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13). A denial due to abandonment may not be appealed, but an applicant or petitioner may file a motion to reopen. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(15).

The record reveals that the applicant filed her application on August 3, 2001. On April 24, 2002, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing her qualifying residence and physical presence in the United States. The record does not contain a response from the applicant; therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had abandoned her application and issued a Notice of Denial on March 14, 2003. On motion, the applicant stated that she had never received a request for information. According to the applicant, she has maintained the same residence, but she admits that sometimes her mail is "misdelivered."

The director accepted the motion as an appeal and forwarded the file to AAO in error. However, the applicant has, in fact, submitted a motion to reopen that must be addressed by the director.

As the director's decision was based on lack of prosecution, the AAO has no jurisdiction on this case, and it may not be appealed to the AAO. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the motion.

As always in these proceedings, the burden of proof rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

**ORDER:** The case is remanded to the director for further action consistent with the above and entry of a decision.