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

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

[redacted]

MAY 0 4 2006

FILE: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:
[WAC 05 098 71167]

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, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 her initial TPS application on July 7, 2003 under CIS receipt number LIN 03 221 51061. The director denied that application on August 25, 2003, because the applicant failed to establish her qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States during the requisite periods and her eligibility to file for late initial registration. On September 23, 2003, the applicant filed an appeal from the denial decision. That appeal was dismissed by the AAO on July 1, 2004.

The applicant filed the current Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, on January 6, 2005 and indicated that she was re-registering for TPS.

The director denied the re-registration application 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, the applicant states that she has lived in Chicago since January 1997 and that she has submitted sufficient evidence of her residence.

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.

In this case, the applicant has not previously been granted TPS. Therefore, she is not eligible to re-register for TPS. Consequently, the director's decision to deny the 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 January 6, 2005.

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

On appeal, the applicant states that she has lived in Chicago since January 1997 and she has submitted sufficient evidence of her residence. The applicant also requests that her file be reexamined.

The applicant, however, 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.

Beyond the director's decision, it is noted that on April 19, 2005, an immigration judge ordered the applicant removed from the United States to Honduras. A Warrant of Removal/Deportation, Form I-205, was issued on April 19, 2005. It does not appear that the warrant was executed. However, it presents the possibility that the applicant was deported and returned to the United States, without permission contrary to section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Consequently, the applicant may not have maintained continuous residence or physical presence in the United States during the qualifying period pursuant to 8 C.F.R. §§ 244.2(b) and (c).

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.