

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



M/

FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: MAR 01 2007

[WAC 02 284 50042]

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 "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The case will be remanded for further consideration and action.

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 had abandoned his application by failing to respond to a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID).

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 her application on July 25, 2002. On January 14, 2003, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing her nationality/identity. The applicant responded on January 27, 2003, submitting a copy of her El Salvadoran passport. The record also contains a copy of her birth certificate with an English translation. On February 14, 2003, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing her qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States. The record does not contain a response from the applicant; therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had abandoned her application and denied it on April 21, 2003.

On appeal, the applicant submits additional documentation for consideration.

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 matter will be remanded and the director shall consider the applicant's response as a motion to reopen. It is noted that some of the documentation submitted by the applicant appears suspect.

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.