

PUBLIC COPY

**Ident. Application denied to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

MI



FILE:




Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:

DEC 08 2004

IN RE:


Applicant:



APPLICATION:

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

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of El Salvador 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 application after determining that the applicant had abandoned his application by failing to respond to a request for evidence.

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 his application on March 16, 2001. On July 2, 2002, and again on August 16, 2002, the applicant was requested to submit the final court disposition of his arrest on July 1, 1986, in Santa Ana, California, for "DUI Alcohol and/or drugs" and "obstructs/resists pub off." The record does not contain a response from the applicant; therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had abandoned his application and denied the application on March 7, 2003.

The director erroneously advised the applicant that he could file an appeal from this decision within 30 days. As the director's decision was based on abandonment, the AAO has no jurisdiction over this case. The director's error does not, and can not, supersede the regulations. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the applicant's response as a motion to reopen.

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.