

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

M1

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: Vermont Service Center Date: FEB 27 2006
[EAC 02 149 52572]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

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.

On May 9, 2003, the director denied the application after determining that the applicant had abandoned her application by failing to respond to a request for evidence. The director informed the applicant that there is no appeal from a denial due to abandonment, but that she could file a motion to reopen the case within 33 days of the date of issuance of the Notice of Decision.

On June 4, 2003, the applicant filed a motion to reopen the case and submitted some evidence in an attempt to establish her eligibility for TPS. The director determined that the applicant failed to establish her qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States, and therefore, denied the application on March 21, 2005.

The applicant filed an appeal which is now before the AAO. The applicant also submits some additional evidence in an attempt to establish her eligibility for 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. 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.