



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

MI

PUBLIC COPY
identifying data deleted to
prevent clear and warranted
invasion of personal privacy



FILE: [REDACTED]
[SRC 01 201 56574]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 06 2006

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 California Service Center. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Cindy M. Gomez for
Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center (TSC), and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The case will be remanded to the California Service Center (CSC) for further consideration and action.

The applicant claims to be 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 TPS application on May 7, 2001, during the initial registration period. On January 24, 2003, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing his continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and his continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001. 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 April 3, 2003.

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.

It is noted that the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) fingerprint results report indicates that the applicant was arrested by the Houston, Texas, Police Department on April 4, 2004, for "Theft > \$50 < \$500." The applicant has not yet provided the final court disposition for this arrest.

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.