




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



MI

FILE: A95 085 923
[SRC 04 214 53214]

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 08 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.

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

The applicant is 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 because the applicant failed to establish he was eligible for late initial registration. The director also found that the applicant had not established that he had entered the United States on or before December 30, 1998, had been continuously physically present in the United States since January 5, 1999 and that he had continuously resided in this country since December 30, 1998. The director also found that the applicant had failed to submit a photocopy of his birth certificate with an English translation or a current driver's license or any national identity document from his country of origin bearing photo and/or fingerprint as requested.

A subsequent appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on September 30, 2005, after the Director of the AAO found that although applicant had submitted sufficient evidence in the form of his passport to establish his identity and nationality, he had failed to establish his eligibility for late initial registration. Additionally, the AAO director found that he had not established his eligibility for continuous residence or continuous physical presence during the qualifying period. On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserts his claim of eligibility for TPS and submits evidence in an attempt to establish his continuous residence in the United States.

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 residence since December 30, 1998, and physical presence since January 5, 1999, in the United States. However, the primary basis for the denial of the application and the appeal was not a failure to establish qualifying residence and physical presence. Rather, the primary basis for these decisions was the applicant's failure to file his Application for Temporary Protected Status within the initial registration period or to establish his eligibility for late registration. The motion does not address the applicant's eligibility for late registration. As such, the issue on which the underlying decisions were based has not been overcome on motion.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. That burden has not been met since 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.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated September 30, 2005 dismissing the appeal is affirmed.