

PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

M 1

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 04 2005

[LIN 04 011 50155]

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:

[REDACTED]

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, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal 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 determined that the applicant failed to establish he: 1) had continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001; 2) had been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001; and 3) was eligible for late registration. The director, therefore, denied the application.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant states that the applicant entered the United States on November 8, 2000 and has been a resident since that date.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 244.1, "register" means "to properly file, with the director, a completed application, with proper fee, for Temporary Protected Status during the registration period designated under section 244(b) of the Act."

The record reveals that the applicant did file an initial application for TPS during the initial registration period on August 23, 2001. That application was denied on March 7, 2002, for failure to respond to a request for evidence to establish his eligibility for TPS. Since the application was denied due to abandonment there was no appeal available; however, the applicant could have filed a request for a motion to reopen within 30 days from the date of the denial. The applicant did not file a motion to reopen during the requisite timeframe.

The applicant filed a subsequent Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, on November 1, 2002. The director denied this application on June 2, 2003 because it was filed outside of the initial registration period and because the applicant had failed to establish his eligibility for filing under the provisions of late registration. The applicant also determined that the applicant failed to establish continuous residence since February 13, 2001 and continuous physical presence since March 9, 2001. Since the applicant did properly file an application during the initial registration period, the director erred in his explanation of the basis for denial. The applicant filed a motion to reopen. The director found that the applicant neither provided new evidence, precedent decisions, nor established that the decision was incorrect, and dismissed the motion.

The applicant filed a subsequent Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, on October 10, 2003. The director denied this application on February 17, 2004 because it was filed outside of the initial registration period and because the applicant had failed to establish his eligibility for filing under the provisions of late registration. The applicant also determined that the applicant failed to establish continuous residence and continuous physical presence. Since the applicant did properly file an application during the initial registration period, the director erred in his explanation of the basis for denial. While the director found the applicant ineligible for TPS because he had failed to establish eligibility for late registration, the director's decision did not sufficiently explain the entire basis for denial.

The applicant's initial Form I-821 was properly filed on August 23, 2001. That initial application was denied by the director on March 7, 2002. Any Form I-821 application subsequently submitted by the same applicant after

an initial application is filed and a decision rendered, must be considered as either a request for annual registration or as a new filing for TPS benefits.

If the applicant is filing an application as a re-registration, a previous grant of TPS must have been afforded the applicant, as only those individuals who are granted TPS must register annually. In addition, the applicant must continue to maintain the conditions of eligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 244.17.

The applicant filed subsequent Forms I-821 on November 1, 2002 and October 10, 2003. Since the initial application was denied on March 7, 2002, the subsequent application cannot be considered as a re-registration. Therefore, this application can only be considered as a late registration.

Section 244(c) of the Act, and the related regulations in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2, provide that an applicant who is a national of a foreign state as designated by the Attorney General is eligible for temporary protected status only if such alien establishes that he or she:

- (a) Is a national, as defined in section 101(a)(21) of the Act, of a foreign state designated under section 244(b) of the Act;
- (b) Has been continuously physically present in the United States since the effective date of the most recent designation of that foreign state;
- (c) Has continuously resided in the United States since such date as the Attorney General may designate;
- (d) Is admissible as an immigrant except as provided under section 244.3;
- (e) Is not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. § 244.4; and
- (f)
 - (1) Registers for TPS during the initial registration period announced by public notice in the *Federal Register*, or
 - (2) During any subsequent extension of such designation if at the time of the initial registration period:
 - (i) The applicant is a nonimmigrant or has been granted voluntary departure status or any relief from removal;
 - (ii) The applicant has an application for change of status, adjustment of status, asylum, voluntary departure, or any relief from removal which is pending or subject to further review or appeal;
 - (iii) The applicant is a parolee or has a pending request for reparole; or
 - (iv) The applicant is a spouse or child of an alien currently eligible to be a TPS registrant.

- (g) Has filed an application for late registration with the appropriate Service director within a 60-day period immediately following the expiration or termination of conditions described in paragraph (f)(2) of this section.

Continuously physically present, as defined in 8 C.F.R. §244.1, means actual physical presence in the United States for the entire period specified in the regulations. An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States by virtue of brief, casual, and innocent absences as defined within this section.

Continuously resided, as defined in 8 C.F.R. §244.1, means residing in the United States for the entire period specified in the regulations. An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous residence in the United States by reason of a brief, casual, and innocent absence as defined within this section or due merely to a brief temporary trip abroad required by emergency or extenuating circumstances outside the control of the alien.

Persons applying for TPS offered to El Salvadorans must demonstrate entry on or prior to February 13, 2001, that they have continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001, and that they have been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001. On July 9, 2002, the Attorney General announced an extension of the TPS designation until September 9, 2003. Subsequent extensions of the TPS designation have been granted by the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, with the latest extension granted until September 9, 2006, upon the applicant's re-registration during the requisite time period.

The initial registration period for El Salvadorans was from March 9, 2001 through September 9, 2002. The record shows that the applicant filed this application on October 11, 2003.

The burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he or she meets the above requirements. Applicants shall submit all documentation as required in the instructions or requested by Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS). 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(a). The sufficiency of all evidence will be judged according to its relevancy, consistency, credibility, and probative value. To meet his or her burden of proof, the applicant must provide supporting documentary evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own statements. 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(b).

The first issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant is eligible for late registration.

The record of proceeding confirms that the applicant filed his application after the initial registration period had closed. To qualify for late registration, the applicant must provide evidence that during the initial registration period from March 9, 2001 through September 9, 2002, he fell within the provisions described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2) (listed above). If the qualifying condition or application has expired or been terminated, the individual must file within a 60-day period immediately following the expiration or termination of the qualifying condition in order to be considered for the late initial registration. 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(g).

On November 6, 2003, the applicant was provided the opportunity to submit evidence establishing his eligibility for late registration as set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2). The applicant was also requested to submit evidence establishing his date of entry and continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and his continuous physical presence in the United States from March 9, 2001, to the filing date of the application. The applicant was also requested to submit photo identification. The applicant, in response, provided evidence in an attempt to establish continuous residence and continuous physical presence during the qualifying period. He did not present evidence of his eligibility for late registration. Therefore, the director denied the application.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant states that the applicant first entered the United States on November 8, 2000 and has resided in this country since then. The applicant also resubmits evidence in an attempt to establish his continuous residence and physical presence in the United States during the qualifying period. However, this does not mitigate the applicant's failure to file his TPS application within the initial registration period. The applicant has not submitted any evidence to establish that he has met any of the criteria for late registration described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2). Consequently, the director's conclusion that the applicant failed to establish his eligibility for late registration will be affirmed.

The second and third issues in this proceeding are whether the applicant has established his continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and his continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001.

As stated above, the applicant was requested on November 6, 2003 to submit evidence establishing his qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States. In response, the applicant submitted a statement [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The applicant also resubmitted evidence previously provided.

The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish his qualifying residence and physical presence in the United States during the requisite periods and denied the application. On appeal, the applicant submits a statement from James C. Pickett, and Suzanne E. Harper. The applicant also resubmits evidence previously provided.

Mr. and Ms. Gray, Managers of Town and Country Apartment, Seattle, Washington, state that the applicant began working at their apartment on October 16, 2001. Mr. Pickett states that he has known the applicant since February 2001 when he moved to Town and Country Apartment. Ms. Harper states that she has known the applicant since early in 2001. However, these statements are not supported by any corroborative evidence. It is reasonable to expect that the applicant would have some type of contemporaneous evidence to support these assertions; however, no such evidence has been provided. Affidavits are not, by themselves, persuasive evidence of residence or physical presence. Furthermore, Mr. and Ms. Gray state that the applicant began working at Town and County on October 16, 2001, and Mr. Pickett states that he met the applicant in February 2001 when he moved to the apartment. These statements offer conflicting information. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

The applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence to establish his qualifying residence since February 13, 2001, and his continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001. He has, therefore, failed to establish that he has met the criteria described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(b) and (c). Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application for temporary protected status on these grounds will also be affirmed.

Beyond the director's decision, it is noted that a Federal Bureau of Investigation Fingerprint Report indicates that on January 17, 1990, the applicant was arrested by the Ventura, California Sheriff's Office for Robbery.

An alien applying for temporary protected status has the burden of proving that he or she meets the requirements enumerated above and is otherwise eligible under the provisions of section 244 of the Act. The applicant has failed to meet this burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.