




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC Copy

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

MI



FILE:

[EAC 07291 70741]

OFFICE: Vermont Service Center DATE: APR 24 2008

INRE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Employment Authorization under 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(19)

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.

for Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

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 after detennining that the applicant had abandoned her application by failing to respond to a request for evidence.

If all requested initial evidence and requested additional evidence is not submitted by the required date, the application or petition shall be considered abandoned and, accordingly, shall be denied. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13). A denial due to abandonment may not be appealed, but an applicant or petitioner may file a motion to reopen. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(15).

The record reveals that the applicant filed her application on July 5, 2007. On September 27, 2007, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing her eligibility for late registration for TPS and her continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States during the requisite periods. The record does not contain a response from the applicant; therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had abandoned her application and denied the application on November 30, 2007. The director advised the applicant that, while the decision could not be appealed, the applicant could file a motion to reopen within 30 days.

The applicant filed a motion to reopen and reconsider a decision on December 17, 2007, and submitted additional evidence.

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.

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 action consistent with the above and entry of a decision.