

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

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

MI



FILE: [REDACTED]
[SRC 02 034 53466]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: **JAN 26 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 by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

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 because the applicant failed to establish that he had: 1) continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001; and 2) been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001.

On appeal, the applicant asserts his claim of eligibility for TPS.

Section 244(c) of the Act, and the related regulations in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2, provide that an applicant who is a national of a foreign state is eligible for TPS only if such alien establishes that he or she:

- (a) Is a national of a state designated under section 244(b) of the Act;
- (b) Has been continuously physically present in the United States since the effective date of the most recent designation of that foreign state;
- (c) Has continuously resided in the United States since such date as the Attorney General may designate;
- (d) Is admissible as an immigrant except as provided under section 244.3;
- (e) Is not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. § 244.4; and
- (f)
 - (1) Registers for Temporary Protected Status during the initial registration period announced by public notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or
 - (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.

The phrase continuously physically present, as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 244.1, means actual physical presence in the United States for the entire period specified in the regulations. An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States by virtue of brief, casual, and innocent absences as defined within this section.

The phrase continuously resided, as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 244.1, means residing in the United States for the entire period specified in the regulations. An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous residence in the United States by reason of a brief, casual and innocent absence as defined within this section or due merely to a brief temporary trip abroad required by emergency or extenuating circumstances outside the control of the alien.

Persons applying for TPS offered to El Salvadorans must demonstrate continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001. An extension of the TPS designation has been granted with validity until September 9, 2006, upon the applicant's re-registration during the requisite time period.

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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 initially submitted the following documentation along with his TPS application:

1. An affidavit from [REDACTED] in which he stated that the applicant has lived with him at [REDACTED] Texas since November of 2000;
2. An affidavit from [REDACTED] in which he stated that he has known the applicant for over twenty years and that the applicant is a good and outstanding person; and,
3. Copies of money orders dated October 20, 2001 and bearing the applicant's name as purchaser.

On April 26, 2004, the applicant was requested to submit evidence establishing his continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001. The record of proceedings does not contain any evidence submitted by the applicant in response to the director's request for evidence.

The director determined that the applicant had failed to submit sufficient evidence to establish his eligibility for TPS and denied the application on July 29, 2004.

On appeal, the applicant reasserts his claim of eligibility for TPS and submits the following documentation:

4. A letter from the Virginia Workers' Compensation Commission to the applicant dated November 27, 2002, in reference to the applicant's accident on October 25, 2002; and,
5. A memo from doctor [REDACTED] of Vienna, Virginia, to the applicant in which he states that the applicant has been under his professional medical care since July 15, 2003.

The applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence to establish his qualifying continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001. There has been no corroborative evidence submitted to support the statements made by the affiants in numbers 1 and 2 above regarding the applicant's claimed presence in the United States since 2000. It is reasonable to expect that the applicant would have some type of contemporaneous evidence to support these assertions; however, insufficient evidence has been provided. Without corroborative evidence, affidavits from acquaintances do not substantiate clear and convincing evidence of the applicant's continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States. Moreover, affidavits are only specifically listed as acceptable evidence for proof of employment, and attestations by churches, unions, or other organizations of the applicant's residence as described in 8 C.F.R. §244.9(a)(2)(i) and (v). In addition, it is noted that Santos Turcios does not specify how many years he has known the applicant in the United States.

The money order receipts (No. 3 above) are dated subsequent to the requisite time period and therefore, cannot be used to establish the applicant's eligibility for TPS. While the medical documents submitted by the applicant on appeal demonstrate his work related injury and treatment therefore, they do not refer to dates in 2001 and therefore do not provide 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.

The applicant has failed to establish that he has met the continuous residence and continuous physical presence criteria described in 8 C.F.R. §§ 244.2(b) and (c). Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application for TPS will be affirmed.

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

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.