

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



M<sub>1</sub>

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 02 2008  
[EAC 02 056 51964]  
EAC 08 085 51968 – 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 office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

  
Robert P. Wiemann, 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. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on a motion to reopen. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and 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 he had: 1) continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001; and 2) been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001.

The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on April 6, 2005, after the Director of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish his eligibility for TPS. On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserted his 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).

The record indicates that the AAO issued its decision on April 6, 2005. Although the applicant dated the motion January 14, 2008, it was received by the director on January 22, 2008, more than two years after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the motion is untimely filed.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing a motion.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved in 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 reasons 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. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition 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).

Here, the untimely motion does not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider. Therefore, there is no requirement to treat the appeal as a motion under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2).

As the motion was untimely filed, the motion must be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The motion is dismissed.