

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

M,

PUBLIC Copy



FILE:

[WAC 05 228 91998]

[EAC 08 025 51821, *motion*]

OFFICE: Vermont Service Center

DATE:

MAR 21 2008

INRE:

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 that originally decided your case. 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, California Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Chief, Administrative Appeals Office. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (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 20, 2005, under CIS receipt number WAC 05 228 91998, after the initial registration period for Hondurans had ended. The director denied that application on April 25, 2006 because the applicant had failed to provide evidence establishing his continuous residence and his continuous physical presence in the United States during the requisite periods. The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on March 1, 2007 by the Chief of the AAO. The applicant submitted a motion to reopen which was dismissed by the AAO on October 3, 2007, because the applicant failed to articulate any basis of eligibility or address the reasons for the dismissal of the application.

On 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 his continuous residence and his 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 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 this 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 file his Application for Temporary Protected Status within the initial registration period or to establish his eligibility for late registration. 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 dated October 3, 2007, is affirmed.