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

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

M1

[redacted]

MAR 22 2006

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:
[WAC 05 084 75253]

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:

[redacted]

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, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a citizen of Honduras 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 February 22, 1999 under CIS receipt number [EAC 99 157 51470]. The director sent a Notice of Action to the applicant requesting additional evidence from him on September 29, 1999, October 20, 2000, and again on November 29, 2000. The director also sent the applicant a notice to appear for fingerprinting dated May 3, 2000. The director denied the application on May 10, 2001 due to abandonment because the applicant had failed respond to the notices.

The applicant filed a Motion to Reopen on May 29, 2001 in which he stated that he never received the notices sent by the Service Center. The director dismissed the Motion to Reopen on August 23, 2001, determining that the applicant had failed to meet any of the criteria for which an abandoned petition could be reopened.

The applicant filed the current Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, on December 23, 2004, and indicated that he was re-registering for TPS.

The director denied the re-registration application on July 23, 2005, because the applicant's initial TPS application had been denied and the applicant was not eligible to apply for re-registration for TPS.

On appeal, counsel asserts, "The director factually and legally erred in denying the applicant's request for temporary protected status." Counsel continues by asserting that the applicant has been present in the United States since 1998; and therefore, is "prima facie" eligible for the TPS benefits sought.

Despite counsel's assertions, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to establish his eligibility for re-registration. 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. Although counsel claims that the applicant has resided in the United States since 1998, the issue of continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States is separate and distinct from the issue of re-registration.

In this case, the applicant has not previously been granted TPS. Therefore, he is not eligible to re-register for TPS. Consequently, the director's decision to deny the current 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 Hondurans was from January 5, 1999 to August 20, 1999. The record reveals that the applicant filed the current application with Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on December 23, 2004.

To qualify for late registration, the applicant must provide evidence that during the initial registration period he 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.

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.