



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



ML

FILE: 
[SRC 02 197 55443]

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAY 02 2007**

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 office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


for 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 applicant filed a motion to reopen that was subsequently dismissed by the AAO. The matter is again before the AAO on a second motion to reopen. The previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed, and the motion 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 determined that the applicant failed to establish that she was eligible for filing her TPS application after the initial registration period from January 5, 1999 to August 20, 1999. The director, therefore, denied the application.

Upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO concurred with the director's conclusion and dismissed the appeal on February 28, 2003.

On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserted her claim of eligibility for TPS but failed to submit any evidence in an attempt to establish her eligibility for late registration. The Director, AAO dismissed the motion and affirmed the February 28, 2003 decision on July 5, 2006.

On the present motion to reopen the applicant reasserts her claim of eligibility for TPS but failed to submit any evidence in an attempt to establish her eligibility for late registration.

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 submission of non-probative evidence. 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 decisions of the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated February 28, 2003 and July 5, 2006, is affirmed.