



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

MI

[REDACTED]

FILE [REDACTED]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 06 2007

[EAC 07 017 51427, motion]

[EAC 01 187 51391]

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.


Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Vermont 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 and the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed.

The applicant is 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.

The director denied the application after determining that the applicant failed to establish he: 1) had continuously resided in the United States since March 9, 2001; 2) had been continuously physically present in the United States since January 5, 1999; and 3) was a national of El Salvador.

Upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO concurred with the director's conclusion that the applicant had not established continuous residence and continuous physical presence, but determined that the applicant had established his nationality, and dismissed the appeal on September 1, 2006.

On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserted his claim of eligibility for TPS but failed to submit any probative evidence in an attempt to establish his qualifying 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 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 a statement from the applicant and resubmission of evidence previously provided. 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 1, 2006, is affirmed.