

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

[REDACTED]

MI

FILE: [REDACTED]
[WAC 05 089 78493]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 29 2007

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, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a 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.

Although a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, has been submitted, the individual named is not authorized under 8 C.F.R. § 292.1 or 292.2 to represent the applicant. Therefore, the applicant shall be considered as self-represented and the decision will be furnished only to the applicant.

The record reveals that the applicant filed his initial TPS application on June 30, 1999, under CIS receipt number SRC 99 213 52281. The Director, Miami District Office, denied that application on November 15, 2001, because the applicant was not eligible for TPS due to his past convictions.

The applicant filed the current Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, on January 12, 2005, and indicated that he was re-registering for TPS.

The director denied the re-registration application because the applicant's initial TPS application had been denied and the applicant was not eligible to apply for re-registration for TPS.

If the applicant is filing an application as a re-registration, a previous grant of TPS must have been afforded the applicant, as only those individuals who are granted TPS must register annually. In addition, the applicant must continue to maintain the conditions of eligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 244.17.

In this case, the applicant has not previously been granted TPS. Therefore, he is not eligible to re-register for TPS. Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application will be affirmed.

It is noted that the director's decision does not explore the possibility that the applicant was attempting to file a late initial application for TPS instead of an annual re-registration.

Section 244(c) of the Act, and the related regulations in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2, provide that an applicant may apply for TPS during the initial registration period, or:

- (f) (2) During any subsequent extension of such designation if at the time of the initial registration period:
 - (i) The applicant is a nonimmigrant or has been granted voluntary departure status or any relief from removal;
 - (ii) The applicant has an application for change of status, adjustment of status, asylum, voluntary departure, or any relief from removal which is pending or subject to further review or appeal;

- (iii) The applicant is a parolee or has a pending request for reparole; or
 - (iv) The applicant is a spouse or child of an alien currently eligible to be a TPS registrant.
- (g) Has filed an application for late registration with the appropriate Service director within a 60-day period immediately following the expiration or termination of conditions described in paragraph (f)(2) of this section.

The initial registration period for Hondurans was from January 5, 1999, through August 20, 1999. The record reveals that the applicant filed the instant application with Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on January 12, 2005.

To qualify for late registration, the applicant must provide evidence that during the initial registration period he fell within at least one of the provisions described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2) above.

The burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he or she meets the above requirements. Applicants shall submit all documentation as required in the instructions or requested by CIS. 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(a). The sufficiency of all evidence will be judged according to its relevancy, consistency, credibility, and probative value. To meet his or her burden of proof, the applicant must provide supporting documentary evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own statements. 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(b).

On appeal, the applicant submits copies of his birth and marriage certificates along with English translations indicating that he was married in 1988. However, a review of the record of proceedings reveals that the applicant had claimed he was not married (i.e., "single") on his previously filed applications for TPS and employment authorizations. Furthermore, it appears that the copy of the applicant's birth certificate is illegible and the English translation of his "marriage certificate" is not a complete translation of the original language document. The applicant has failed to establish that this application should be accepted as a late initial registration under 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2). Therefore, the application also must be denied for this reason.

Persons applying for TPS offered to Hondurans must demonstrate that they have continuously resided in the United States since December 30, 1998, and that they have been continuously physically present since January 5, 1999. Subsequent extensions of the TPS designation have been granted, with the latest extension valid until July 5, 2007, upon the applicant's re-registration during the requisite time period.

Beyond the decision of the director, it also is noted that the applicant has provided insufficient evidence to establish his qualifying continuous physical presence and continuous residence during the requisite time periods. 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(b) and (c). Therefore, the application will also be denied for these reasons.

Although not addressed by the director, the record of proceedings contains the Federal Bureau of Investigation report reflecting the following offenses in Florida:

- (1) On November 13, 1992, the applicant was arrested by the Metro-Dade Police Department and charged with "Marijuana Possession";
- (2) On March 31, 1995, the applicant was arrested by the Metro-Dade Police Department and charged with "Making False Report";
- (3) On April 20, 1995, the applicant was arrested by the Metro-Dade Police Department and charged with "Prob Violation";
- (4) On December 6, 1996, the applicant was arrested by the Metro-Dade Police Department and charged with "Petty Larceny";
- (5) On November 3, 2000, the applicant was arrested by the Metro-Dade Police Department and charged with "Nonmoving Traffic Violation";
- (6) On August 31, 2002, the applicant was arrested by the Hialeah Police Department and charged with "Nonmoving Traffic Violation - BW Driving While License Suspended";
- (7) On April 5, 2004, the applicant was arrested by the Miami Police Department and charged with "Nonmoving Traffic Violation - BW Driving While License Suspended";
- (8) On January 26, 2006, the applicant was arrested by the Miami Police Department and charged with "Conservation-Environment-Florida Litter Law".

CIS must address this arrests and convictions in any future decisions or proceedings.

It is also noted that the applicant was ordered removed from the United States by an immigration judge in Harlingen, Texas on November 1, 1991.

The application will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. An alien applying for temporary protected status has the burden of proving that he or she meets the requirements enumerated above and is otherwise eligible under the provisions of section 244 of the Act. The applicant has failed to meet this burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.