



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

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



MI

FILE:



Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date:

SEP 20 2007

[SRC 03 223 54509]

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 "R. Wiemann".

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. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on a motion to reopen. The motion to reopen 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 denied the application because the applicant failed to establish his eligibility for late registration.

A subsequent appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on January 26, 2005, after the Director of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that he was eligible for late registration.

On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserted his claim of eligibility for TPS.

The applicant's motion to reopen consists of documentation relating to his claim of residence and physical presence 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 applicant's eligibility for late registration. 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 decision of the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated January 26, 2005, dismissing the appeal, is affirmed.