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

[redacted]

M1

FILE: [redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 12 2006
[SRC 02 207 54651]

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.

for Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant claims to be a native and 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 director denied the application for TPS because the applicant failed to establish she was eligible for late registration.

The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed after the Director of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish her eligibility for TPS. On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserts her claim of eligibility for TPS.

On motion, the applicant restates the arguments that she provided with her earlier appeal. Further, she did not address the grounds of denial. Therefore, the record is complete.

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

Inasmuch as the applicant has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal shall be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO dated December 26, 2002, dismissing the appeal is affirmed.