

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:



OFFICES: Texas Service Center

DATE:

JUL 22 2008

[SRC 02 139 56100]

[EAC 08 088 52238, *motion*]

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 office Texas Service Center. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center (TSC). A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Director, now Chief, Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). 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 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 record reveals that the applicant filed an initial TPS application on April 1, 2002, under receipt number SRC 02 139 56100. The TSC director denied that application on May 7, 2004, because the applicant failed to establish that she was eligible for late registration. A subsequent appeal from the director's decision was dismissed by the Chief of the AAO on August 5, 2005, after he concluded that the applicant had failed to establish her eligibility for TPS. On September 16, 2005, the applicant submitted a motion to reopen which was dismissed by the Chief of the AAO on July 3, 2006. The applicant submitted a second motion to reopen on August 4, 2006, and that motion was dismissed by the AAO on May 2, 2007. On June 5, 2007, the applicant submitted a third motion to reopen which was dismissed by the AAO on January 3, 2008. The applicant has now submitted a fourth motion to reopen.

On motion, the applicant asks CIS to reopen and reconsider her TPS application and grant her the opportunity to work legally in the United States. She further states that she has been in the United States since 1998 and that she has provided all of the requested evidence. The applicant submits additional documentations in support of her claim.

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 copies of the same documentation previously submitted relating to her claim of residence since December 30, 1998, and physical presence since January 5, 1999, in the United States. However, 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.