

Identifying data used to  
prevent clearly 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**



MI

FILE:



Office: Texas Service Center Date:

FEB 02 2005

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 M. Gomez*  
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 initial application on August 8, 2001. On January 22, 2003, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing his qualifying physical presence in the United States from March 9, 2001, evidence that he arrived in the United States prior to February 13, 2001, and photo identification. 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 September 11, 2003.

The applicant responded to the Notice of Decision on October 21, 2003. The applicant's mother (the applicant was born in 1997), states that they never received the notice to provide additional evidence. The applicant also provides additional documentation in support of his claim. **It is noted that the applicant's response to the Notice of Decision was received more than 30 days after the issuance of the director's decision.**

The director advised the applicant that, while the decision could not be appealed, the applicant could file a motion to reopen within 30 days. The applicant responded to the director's decision; however, the director erroneously accepted the applicant's response as an appeal instead of a motion to reopen and forwarded the file to the AAO. As the director's decision was based on abandonment, the AAO has no jurisdiction over this case. 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.