U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

[redacted]

M1

DEC 22 2006

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

[WAC 05 197 72011]

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 office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

for Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is stated to be 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.

The record reveals that the applicant filed a TPS application on May 17, 2001, under receipt number WAC 01 223 51974. On February 4, 2004, the applicant was requested to provide the fingerprint fee. The director denied the application on May 11, 2004, after determining that the applicant had abandoned her application by failing to respond to the request for evidence. There is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment; however, the applicant could have filed a motion to reopen within 30 days of the date of the denial notice. The record does not reflect that the applicant filed a motion within the allotted timeframe.

The applicant filed the current Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, on April 15, 2005, and indicated that she was re-registering for TPS.

The director denied the re-registration application because the applicant's initial TPS application had been denied and the applicant was not eligible to apply for re-registration for TPS.

In her appeal, the applicant states she never received any notices requesting additional evidence. It is noted that the request for evidence was sent to the applicant's last known address at that time and was not returned to Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS).

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.

In this case, the applicant has not previously been granted TPS. Therefore, she is not eligible to re-register for TPS. Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application will be affirmed.

It is noted that the director's decision does not explore the possibility that the applicant was attempting to file a late initial application for TPS instead of an annual re-registration.

Section 244(c) of the Act, and the related regulations in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2, provide that an applicant may apply for TPS during the initial registration period, or:

> (f) (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.

The initial registration period for El Salvador was from March 9, 2001 to September 9, 2002. The record reveals that the applicant filed the current application with CIS on April 15, 2005.

To qualify for late registration, the applicant must provide evidence that during the initial registration period she fell within at least one of the provisions described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2) above.

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 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 applicant has failed to provide any evidence to establish that this application should be accepted as a late initial registration under 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2). Therefore, the application also must be denied for this reason.

It is noted that in the applicant's initial TPS application, she claims she entered the United States on April 17, 1999; however, in her TPS application, filed on April 15, 2005, she claims she entered the United States on July 4, 1998. The passport stamp shows the applicant was admitted as a B-2 visitor on April 17, 1999, with authorization to stay in the United States until October 16, 1999. Additionally, the applicant's passport was issued on March 9, 1999, in El Salvador. These discrepancies cast doubt on the applicant's actual entry date into the United States. 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 lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

The application will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. 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.