

Identifying data deleted to
protect clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

M1



FILE:




Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: NOV 28 2008

[EAC 02 259 52009]

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:

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.

Cindy N. Gomez for

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The case will be remanded.

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.

When an officer denies an application, "the officer shall explain in writing the specific reasons for denial." 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The director denied the application on August 20, 2003; however, the director's decision does not clearly indicate the specific basis for the denial. Therefore, the case will be remanded for the issuance of a new decision that sets forth the specific reasons for the denial.

It is noted that the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) fingerprint results report indicates that the applicant was apprehended by the U.S. Border Patrol at Del Rio, Texas on July 4, 2001, and placed under removal proceedings under the alias of [REDACTED] (A file [REDACTED]). The applicant must furnish national identity documents and an explanation of these discrepancies. It is also noted that the applicant changed the date of his entry from 2001 to 2000 in subsequent applications, under penalty of perjury. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

It is also noted that the record contains an unexecuted Form I-205, Warrant of Removal and Deportation issued at San Antonio, Texas, on June 8, 2002.

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

ORDER: The case is remanded to the director.