


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



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

PUBLIC COPY

M
1



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **JUL 28 2008**
[WAC 06 007 70280]
[EAC 08 089 51318 – MOTION]


IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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 application was denied by the Director, California Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Director, Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The applicant filed a motion to reopen that was subsequently dismissed by the AAO. The matter is again before the AAO on a second motion to reopen. The previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed, and the motion 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 director determined that the applicant failed to establish that he was eligible for filing his TPS application after the initial registration period from January 5, 1999 to August 20, 1999. The director, therefore, denied the application.

Upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO concurred with the director's conclusion and dismissed the appeal on May 7, 2007. The director also determined that the applicant had failed to establish his continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States during the requisite period.

On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserted his claim of eligibility for TPS but failed to submit any probative evidence in an attempt to establish his qualifying residence in the United States or his eligibility for late registration.

The AAO dismissed the motion on January 3, 2008.

In the present motion, the applicant states that he 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 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 a statement from the applicant and submission of non-probative evidence previously provided. As such, the issues on which the underlying decisions were based have 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 is affirmed.