

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

MI




FILE: [REDACTED]
[SRC 04 107 54458]

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 25 2006

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 California Service Center. 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, Texas Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Director (now Chief), Administrative Appeals Office. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on a motion to reopen. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Nicaragua 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 his eligibility for late initial registration. The initial registration period for Nicaraguans was from January 5, 1999, through August 20, 1999. The record reveals that the applicant filed his initial TPS application with Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), on March 3, 2004. The director also determined that the applicant had failed to submit evidence of his continuous physical presence in the United States since January 5, 1999, and had not submitted a copy of his current driver's license.

The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on June 6, 2005, after the Director of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish his eligibility for TPS.

On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserts his claim of eligibility for TPS. He states that he has lived in the United States since 1997, and would like to remain here legally in order to support his family. In support of the appeal, the applicant submits: money order receipts dated in 2004 and 2005; and a receipt dated in 1999.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding, and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2).

A motion to reconsider must state the reason for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy ... [and] must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3).

A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

The applicant's motion to reopen consists of documentation relating to his claim of continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States. The documentation is dated in 2004 and 2005 and does not establish his eligibility during the initial portions of the requisite periods. It is noted that some of the previously submitted documentation has been altered. 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 applicant has not established that he has met the criteria described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(b) and (c).

In addition, the TPS application was denied due to the applicant's failure to file his Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, within the initial registration period or to establish his eligibility for late registration as set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2) and (g). The motion does not address applicant's eligibility for late

registration. As such, the issue on which the underlying decisions were based has not been overcome on motion.

The applicant has not provided any new facts or additional evidence to overcome the previous decision of the AAO. Accordingly, the motion to reopen will be dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO will not be disturbed.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated June 6, 2005, is affirmed.