



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

MI

FILE:

[WAC 05 074 75729]
[EAC 07 128 50102 MOTION]

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER DATE: JAN 16 2008

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.


Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the application. The Chief, Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), dismissed a subsequent appeal. 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 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 re-registration application because the applicant's initial TPS application had been denied and the applicant was not eligible to apply for re-registration for TPS. Additionally, the applicant also failed to establish that he was eligible for late registration.

A subsequent appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on March 6, 2007, after the Chief of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that he was eligible for re-registration or late registration.

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 residence since December 30, 1998, and 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 establish his eligibility for re-registration. The motion does not address applicant's eligibility for re-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 dated March 6, 2006, 2007, is affirmed.