



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



*ML*

FILE: [REDACTED]  
[EAC 01 231 61023]

OFFICE: California Service Center

DATE: JUL 06 2007

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.

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

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Director, California 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 motion to reopen will be dismissed.

The applicant claims to be a 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.

The director denied the application because the applicant had failed to establish that she had resided and been continuously present in the United States during the require period.

The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on February 7, 2005, after the Director of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish her eligibility for TPS. A subsequent motion to reopen was also denied on May 2, 2006. On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserts her claim of eligibility for TPS.

A motion to reopen or reconsider must be filed within thirty days of the underlying decision, except that failure to file during this period may be excused at the Service's discretion when the applicant has demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Whenever a person has the right or is required to do some act within a prescribed period after the service of a notice upon him and the notice is served by mail, three days shall be added to the prescribed period. Service by mail is complete upon mailing. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The previous decision from the AAO was dated May 2, 2006. Any motion to reopen must have been filed within thirty days after service of the decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i). Coupled with three days for mailing, the motion, in this case, should have been filed on or before June 5, 2006. The motion to reopen was received on July 31, 2006. The applicant states that an immigration consultant took her money and was in control of her case, causing her to miss the filing deadline for this motion. However, the AAO would note that there is no evidence of any immigration consultant's involvement, and all correspondence has been mailed directly to the applicant since the initial filing. The applicant's motion to reopen is not timely and will be dismissed.

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 motion to reopen was not filed within the allotted time period. 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 May 2, 2006, is affirmed.