

ident...  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



MU

FILE: [REDACTED]  
[SRC 02 075 54595]

Office: Texas Service Center Date: NOV 02 2011

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:

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. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Director, Administrative Appeals Office. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on a motion to reopen. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

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 because the applicant failed to establish she had continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001, and had been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001.

The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on April 25, 2003, after the Director of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish her eligibility for TPS.

On motion to reopen, the applicant states that she has been married to a TPS recipient for almost nine years. The applicant further states that she knows of several cases where the children and spouses of TPS recipients have received their TPS, "even though they have not been here on the time of February 2001."

A motion to reopen or reconsider must be filed within thirty days of the underlying decision, except that failure to file during this period may be excused at the Service's discretion when the applicant has demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Whenever a person has the right or is required to do some act within a prescribed period after the service of a notice upon him and the notice is served by mail, three days shall be added to the prescribed period. Service by mail is complete upon mailing. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The previous decision from the AAO, dated April 25, 2003, clearly advised the applicant that any motion to reopen must be filed within thirty days. Coupled with three days for mailing, the motion, in this case, should have been filed on or before May 28, 2003. The motion to reopen was received on June 27, 2003.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. That burden has not been met since the motion to reopen was not filed within the allotted time period. Accordingly, the motion to reopen will be dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO will not be disturbed.

**ORDER:** The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated April 25, 2003, is affirmed.