

identifying info deleted to  
prevent identity unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

M1



FILE:



Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: DEC 15 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:

Self-represented

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.

*Cindy N. 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 (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 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 November 8, 2002. On March 6, 2003, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing his eligibility for late registration and his qualifying residence in the United States. The record does not contain a response from the applicant; therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had abandoned his application and issued a Notice of Denial on April 25, 2003. The director advised the applicant that, while the decision could not be appealed, the applicant could file a motion to reopen.

In compliance with the director's instructions, the applicant submitted a motion to reopen his case. According to the applicant, he has lived in the United States since 1997. The applicant previously asserted that he was eligible for late registration because of his marriage. However, no evidence of his spouse's eligibility for TPS is included in the record, nor did the applicant complete all of "Part 3, Information about your spouse and children" on the application filed on November 8, 2002.

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.