



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY
identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



M1

FILE:



Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: MAR 06 2007

[EAC 02 150 51290]

IN RE:

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:



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. The director subsequently reopened and denied the application. The case is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal and will be remanded for further consideration and action.

The applicant claims to be 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.

On May 22, 2003, the director denied the application due to abandonment. The director informed the applicant that there is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment, but that he could file a motion to reopen the case within 33 days of the date of issuance of the Notice of Decision.

On January 28, 2005, the applicant filed a motion to reopen the case. The applicant asserted that he was eligible for Temporary Protected Status and submitted evidence of his presence and residence in the United States.

On October 17, 2005, 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 applicant filed an appeal on November 17, 2005. On appeal counsel for the applicant states that the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence and should be granted TPS.

There is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(15).

A field office decision made as a result of a motion may be appealed to the AAO only if the original decision was appealable to the AAO. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(6).

The director accepted the applicant's response to the director's latest decision as an appeal and forwarded the file to the AAO. However, in this case, the director denied the original application due to abandonment; since the original decision was not appealable to the AAO, the AAO has no jurisdiction to consider the current appeal from the director's denial of the subsequent Motion to Reopen. Therefore, the case will be remanded and the director shall consider the applicant's response as a Motion to Reopen.

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.