

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

M

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER DATE: **JUN 30 2008**
[EAC 02 282 51311]
[EAC 08 085 51257, Motion]

INRE: 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:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiem Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Director, Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

The applicant claims to be a citizen of El Salvador 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 because the applicant failed to establish that she: 1) had continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001; 2) had been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001.

The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on November 30, 2005, after the Director (now Chief) of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish her eligibility for TPS. On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserts her claim of eligibility for TPS.

A motion to reopen or reconsider must be filed within thirty days of the underlying decision, except that failure to file during this period may be excused at the Service's discretion when the applicant has demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Whenever a person has the right or is required to do some act within a prescribed period after the service of a notice upon him and the notice is served by mail, three days shall be added to the prescribed period. Service by mail is complete upon mailing. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The previous decision from the AAO was dated November 30, 2005. Any motion to reopen must have been filed within thirty days after service of the decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i). Coupled with three days for mailing, the motion, in this case, should have been filed on or before December 03, 2006. The motion to reopen was received on January 30, 2008. The applicant claims ineffective assistance of counsel as the reason for her delay in filing this motion. The applicant however, fails to provide any evidence to substantiate her claim. The delay of almost two years on filing this motion is not considered reasonable.

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 motion to reopen was not filed within the allotted time period. 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 November 30, 2005, is affirmed.