

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**

M, /



FILE: [REDACTED]  
[WAC 05 133 71864]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: NOV 05 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 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, California Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Chief, Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed and the motion to reopen will be dismissed.

The applicant claims to be 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 denied the application because the applicant failed to establish he was eligible for late initial registration.

A subsequent appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on May 21, 2007, after the AAO Chief affirmed that the applicant was not eligible for late initial registration. The AAO Chief also found that the applicant had not established that he had continuously resided in the United States since December 30, 1998 or that he had been continuously physically present in this country since January 5, 1999. On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserts his claim of eligibility for TPS.

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 to reconsider must state the reason for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy ... [and] must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3). 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 documentation relating to his claim of continuous residence since December 30, 1998, and continuous physical presence since January 5, 1999, in the United States. However, the primary basis for the denial of the application and the appeal was not a failure to establish qualifying residence and physical presence. Rather, the primary basis for these decisions was the applicant's failure to file his Application for Temporary Protected Status within the initial registration period or to establish his eligibility for late registration. The motion does not address the applicant's eligibility for late registration. As such, the threshold issue on which the underlying decisions were based has not been overcome on motion.

It is noted the applicant has provided no further evidence to establish that he is a national or citizen of Honduras. The record does not contain any photo identification such as a passport or national identity document to establish his nationality. 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(a) and § 244.9(a)(1).

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.



Page 3

**ORDER:** The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated May 21, 2007 dismissing the appeal is affirmed.