

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

M

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

NOV 07 2007
Date:

[EAC 01 193 54428]

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.

John H. Vaughan
for

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied, reopened, and denied again by the Director, Vermont Service Center (VSC). The case is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The case will be remanded for further consideration and action.

The applicant is a 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 due to abandonment because the applicant failed to respond to a Notice of Intent to Deny requesting evidence in support of his application. 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 decision.

On November 15, 2003, the applicant filed a motion to reopen.

On March 8, 2004, the director reaffirmed his decision to deny the application. The applicant filed an appeal of that decision on April 9, 2004.

There is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment. 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(15).

A field office decision made as a result of a motion may be appealed to the AAO only if the original decision was appealable to the AAO. 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(6).

The director accepted the applicant's response to the director's latest decision as an appeal and forwarded the file to the AAO. However, in this case, the director denied the original application due to abandonment; since the original decision was not appealable to the AAO, the AAO has no jurisdiction to consider the current appeal from the director's denial of the subsequent motion to reopen. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the applicant's response as a motion to reopen.

It is noted that CIS records reveal another alien registration file relating to the applicant, [REDACTED] which shows that the applicant was ordered removed from the United States to El Salvador by an Immigration Judge on May 24, 2000. That order remains outstanding.

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 consideration and action consistent with the above.