

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



M1

FILE:



OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: MAR 12 2007

[EAC 04 102 50967 motion to reopen]

[EAC 01 195 52859 I-821]

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 Vermont 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, Vermont Service Center. The case is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal and 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.

On July 1, 2003, the director denied the application after determining that the applicant had abandoned his application by failing to respond to a request for evidence. The director informed the applicant that there is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment, but that he could file a motion to reopen the case within 33 days of the date of issuance of the Notice of Decision.

On February 17, 2004, the applicant filed a motion to reopen the case. The applicant stated that he never abandoned his TPS application.

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.