

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

M₁



FILE: [REDACTED] OFFICE: Vermont Service Center DATE:

[SRC 04 253 53603]

APR 022008

[EAC 07 244 52768, motion]

INRE: 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 cursive script, 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 Chief, Administrative Appeals Office. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (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 record **reveals** that the applicant filed a late initial TPS application on September 29, 2004, under CIS receipt number SRC 04253 53603. The director denied the application on October 21, 2004, after determining that the applicant had failed to establish she was eligible for late initial registration. The director also found that the applicant had failed to establish her qualifying continuous residence and her continuous physical presence in the United States. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Chief of the AAO on July 28, 2006, after he also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish her continuous residence and continuous physical presence and her eligibility for late initial registration, and that she had failed to submit sufficient evidence of her nationality. The applicant submitted a motion to reopen which was dismissed by the AAO on July 23, 2007.

On motion to reopen, the applicant asks CIS to reopen her case and give her the opportunity to be legal in the United States. She also states that she has been in the United States since 1997 and has provided all of the requested evidence. The applicant also submits evidence in an attempt to establish continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States during the qualifying period

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 her claim of residence since December 30, 1998, and physical presence since January 5, 1999, in the United States, most of which is already in the record. Moreover, the applicant has not addressed the director's finding that she had failed to file her Application for Temporary Protected Status within the initial registration period or to establish her eligibility for late registration. The motion does not address the applicant's eligibility for late registration. As such, the issue on which the underlying decisions were based has not been addressed or 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 is affirmed.