

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

MI

FILE:

[WAC 05 147 79539]

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 03 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 office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
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 case will be remanded for further consideration and action.

The applicant claims to be 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.

Although a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, has been submitted, the individual named is not authorized under 8 C.F.R. § 292.1 or 292.2 to represent the applicant. Therefore, the applicant shall be considered as self-represented and the decision will be furnished only to the applicant.

The director denied the re-registration application after determining that the applicant had abandoned his application by failing to report for fingerprinting as scheduled.

If all requested initial evidence and requested additional evidence is not submitted by the required date, the application or petition shall be considered abandoned and, accordingly, shall be denied. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13). A denial due to abandonment may not be appealed, but an applicant or petitioner may file a motion to reopen. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(15).

The record reveals that the applicant filed his TPS re-registration application on February 24, 2005. The applicant was requested to report for fingerprinting on May 26, 2005. The record does not show that the applicant appeared for fingerprinting as requested; therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had abandoned his application and denied the application on September 6, 2005.

The applicant responded to the director's decision on September 26, 2005. The applicant requested that his TPS application be reopened and stated that in May of 2005 he received a letter from INS that was addressed to a [REDACTED]. He further stated that he gave the letter back to the postman because that was not his name; and, has heard nothing else from INS until he received his denial notice.

The director erroneously accepted the applicant's response as an appeal instead of a motion to reopen and forwarded the file to the AAO. However, as the director's decision was based on abandonment, the AAO has no jurisdiction over this case. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the applicant's response as a motion to reopen.

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

**ORDER:** The case is remanded to the director for further action consistent with the above and entry of a decision.