

Identifying data 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



MI

FILE: [REDACTED]  
[EAC 02 186 50537]


Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: 00 8 1 2015

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:



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.

*Cecilia 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 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 because the applicant failed to appear for fingerprinting.

8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(13) states, in pertinent part, that:

If an individual requested to appear for fingerprinting or for an interview does not appear, the Service does not receive his or her request for rescheduling by the date of the fingerprinting appointment or interview, or the applicant or petitioner has not withdrawn the application or petition, the application or petition shall be considered abandon and, accordingly shall be denied.

The record reveals that the applicant filed his initial TPS application on May 8, 2002. On September 22, 2002, the applicant was requested to appear at a specified Application Support Center (ASC) on November 2, 2002, to be fingerprinted in accordance with 8 C.F.R. 103.2(a) and (b)(9). The applicant failed to appear. The director concluded that the applicant had abandoned his application. Consequently, the director denied the application on June 27, 2003, and advised the applicant that there is no appeal from this decision.

Counsel for the applicant filed a motion to reopen on July 19, 2003. In support of the motion, counsel states that it is "alleged" that on November 2, 2002, the applicant was sent a letter requesting him to appear at a specified Application Support Center to be fingerprinted. Counsel contends that the applicant never received a letter requesting he be fingerprinted. Counsel also stated that the applicant believes that if such a request was made, "it was either addressed to the wrong address by BCIS, or delivered to the wrong address by USPS." It is noted that the address shown on Form I-797C, Fingerprint Notification, dated September 22, 2002, is the same as the address listed in the director's denial dated June 27, 2003, and on counsel's Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, dated July 11, 2003.

The director erroneously accepted the applicant's response as an appeal instead of a motion to reopen and forwarded the file to the AAO. However, 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.

It is noted that the record does not contain sufficient evidence of the applicant's continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and his continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001.



Page 3

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.