

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



MI

FILE:



[EAC 01 193 54556]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: NOV 03 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 N. Gomez*

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The director subsequently dismissed a motion to reopen the case. The case is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The case will be remanded for further consideration and action.

The applicant is a 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.

It is noted that the record contains several completed Forms G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance of Attorney or Representative, filed on the applicant's behalf by [REDACTED]. However, it does not appear that Ms. [REDACTED] is authorized under 8 C.F.R. § 292.1 or 292.2 to represent the applicant. Therefore, the applicant shall be considered as self-represented and the decision will be furnished only to the applicant.

On June 17, 2003, the director denied the application due to abandonment because the applicant failed to respond to a request for evidence in support of his application. The director informed the applicant that there is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment, but that he could file a motion to reopen the case within 33 days of the date of issuance of the decision.

On September 22, 2003, the applicant filed a motion to reopen the case.

On April 6, 2004, the director reopened the matter and reaffirmed his previous decision. The director erroneously advised the applicant that he could file an appeal of that decision.

The applicant filed the instant appeal on May 7, 2004.

There is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(15).  
A field office decision made as a result of a motion may be appealed to the AAO only if the original decision was appealable to the AAO. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(6).

In this case, the director denied the original application due to abandonment. Since the original decision was not appealable to the AAO, the AAO has no jurisdiction to consider the current appeal from the director's dismissal of the subsequent motion to reopen. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the applicant's appeal 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 consideration and action consistent with the above.