M1

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: Texas Service Center Date: FEB 26 2004

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

PETITION: Application for Temporary Protected Status under Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1254

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER: Self-represented

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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.

Cindy M. Gomez for
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The case will be remanded for further consideration and action.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Nicaragua 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 respond to a request for evidence to establish her eligibility for TPS. The director, therefore, denied the application.

If all requested initial evidence and requested additional evidence is not submitted by the required date, the application or petition shall be considered abandoned and, accordingly, shall be denied. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13). A denial due to abandonment may not be appealed, but an applicant or petitioner may file a motion to reopen. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(15).

The record reveals that the applicant filed her application on June 12, 2002. On January 2, 2003, the applicant was requested to submit additional evidence establishing her qualifying residence in the United States. The record does not contain a response from the applicant; therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had abandoned her application and issued a Notice of Denial on March 25, 2003.

In compliance with the director's instructions, the applicant submitted a motion to reopen her case. According to the applicant, she never received the January 23, 2003 notice. The record shows that the notice was sent to the applicant's address of record. The applicant also provides additional documentation.

The director accepted the motion as an appeal and forwarded the file to AAO in error. However, the applicant has, in fact, submitted a motion to reopen that must be addressed by the director.

As the director's decision was based on lack of prosecution, the AAO has no jurisdiction on this case, and it may not be appealed to the AAO. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the motion.

It is noted that the applicant had an adjustment of status application pending as indicated in a receipt notice dated January 25, 1999; this would indicate eligibility for late registration, if it is otherwise determined that the applicant meets all other criteria necessary to be eligible for late registration.

As always in these proceedings, the burden of proof rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

ORDER: The case is remanded to the director for further action consistent with the above and entry of a decision.