


PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

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



MI

FILE: [REDACTED]
[EAC 01 164 53623]

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: **JAN 23 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 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, reopened, and denied again 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 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 application on March 30, 2001. On October 16, 2001, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing his qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States. The record did not contain a response from the applicant; therefore, the director denied the application on August 13, 2003, due to abandonment.

On October 27, 2003, the applicant filed a motion to reopen from the director's August 13, 2003 decision. The director denied this motion on May 5, 2004. On May 24, 2004, counsel the applicant filed a motion to reopen the director's decision.

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.

Although a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, has been submitted, the individual named is not authorized under 8 C.F.R. § 292.1 or 292.2 to represent the applicant. Therefore, the applicant shall be considered as self-represented and the decision will be furnished only to the applicant.

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