


**PUBLIC COPY**



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

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

**M1**



FILE:



Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **DEC 29 2006**

[SRC 03 022 54100]

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

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center (TSC), reopened, and denied again by the Director, Vermont Service Center (VSC). The matter 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.

On May 14, 2003, the director denied the application due to abandonment. On March 11, 2005, the director reopened the proceeding and, on February 16, 2006, reaffirmed his decision to deny the application. The applicant filed an appeal from that decision on March 20, 2006.

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).

The director accepted the applicant's response to the director's latest decision as an appeal and forwarded the file to the AAO. However, 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 denial of the subsequent motion to reopen. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the applicant's response 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.