



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

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

ML

FILE:

[WAC 06 033 70088]

OFFICE: California Service Center

DATE: APR 27 2007

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.

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

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 (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to establish that she is a national of a foreign state designated by the Attorney General and eligible for the granting of Temporary Protected Status (TPS) under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1254.

Section 244(c) of the Act, and the related regulations in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(a), provide that an applicant is eligible for TPS only if such alien establishes that he or she:

Is a national of a foreign state designated under section 244(b) of the Act;....

The applicant indicated on her application that she was born in Sudan, but was also a citizen and national of Australia. In support of her application, the applicant submitted a copy of her Australian passport which shows she was admitted into the United States as a nonimmigrant on May 23, 2002. The director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that she was a national of a foreign state designated by the Attorney General and denied the application on May 18, 2006.

The applicant asserts on appeal that she was eligible for TPS because she is a citizen of Sudan, regardless of the fact that she is also a citizen of Australia.

In *Chee Kin Jang v. Reno*, 113 F. 3d 1074 (9th Cir. 1997), the United States Court of Appeals found that the Service reasonably interpreted the term “PRC national” in the Chinese Student Protection Act (CSPA) to exclude Chinese dual nationals who did not declare citizenship of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) when they entered the United States, and that the Service’s treatment of PRC dual nationals, depending on whether they entered under a PRC passport or a passport of a different country, was reasonable. The Court states that an alien is bound by the nationality claimed or established at the time of entry for the duration of his or her stay in the United States. Thus, a dual national CSPA principal applicant must have claimed PRC nationality at the time of his or her last entry into the United States.

In *Chevron USA, Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Counsel*, 467 U.S. 837, 842-843 & n.9 (1984), the district court held that the practice of binding an alien to his claimed nationality “promotes the congressional policy of insuring that an alien will be able to return, voluntarily or otherwise, to his or her country of origin if requested to do so and provides for consistency in the enforcement of law, especially given the large numbers of nonimmigrant foreign nationals who visit the United States each year.”

Additionally, the Board of Immigration Appeals, in *Matter of Ognibene*, 18 I&N Dec. 425 (BIA 1983), concluded that although an alien may hold the phenomenon of dual nationality, an alien may only claim one citizenship at a time for purposes of immigration matters within the United States. As explained in *Ognibene*, clearly, it is not the prerogative or position of the United States to require a dual national alien nonimmigrant to elect to retain one or another of his nationalities. Equally as clear, the national sovereignty of the United States is acceptably and reasonably exercised through section 214 of the Act in holding that a dual national

alien nonimmigrant is, for the duration of his temporary stay in the United States, of the nationality which he claimed or established at the time that he entered the United States.

The Board, in *Ognibene*, further held that under appropriate circumstances in a given proceeding of law, the operative nationality of a dual national may be determined by his conduct without affording him the opportunity to elect which of his nationalities he will exercise. The General Counsel, in GENCO Op. 84-22 (July 13, 1984), reinforced this concept and states, "In interpreting a law which turns on nationality, the individual's conduct with regard to a particular nation may be examined. An individual's conduct determines his 'operative nationality.' The 'operative nationality' is determined by allowing the individual to elect which nationality to exercise. The nationality claimed or established by the nonimmigrant alien when he enters the United States must be regarded as his sole nationality for the duration of his stay in the United States." [Emphasis in original].

Additionally, the General Counsel, in GENCO Op. 92-34 (August 7, 1992), concluded that the Service may, in the exercise of discretion, deny TPS in the case of an alien who, although a national of a foreign state designated for TPS, is also a national of another foreign state that has not been designated for TPS. The General Counsel explains that "TPS is not a provision designated to create a general right to remain in the United States. Rather, the statute provides a regularized means of granting haven to aliens who, because of extraordinary and temporary circumstances, cannot return to their home country in safety. See *id.* 244A(b)(1)(A), (B), and (C), 8 U.S.C. § 1254(b)(1)(a), (b), and (c)."

The director is correct in his findings that the applicant claimed to be a national and citizen of Australia throughout these immigration proceedings. The nationality the applicant claimed and/or established at the time she first came into contact with the Service (now CIS) was that of Australian. On subsequent filings before the Service, including her TPS application, the applicant continued to present herself as an Australian. Therefore, this citizenship must be regarded as her operative nationality during these proceedings.

Australia is not a designated foreign state under Section 244 of the Act. The applicant, therefore, does not meet the eligibility requirements of being a national of a state designated under section 244(b) of the Act. As the applicant has not demonstrated that her "operative nationality" is that of a TPS-designated country, the director's decision to deny the application will be affirmed, as a matter of discretion.

An alien applying for TPS 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.

In addition, the applicant failed to demonstrate that she was eligible for late registration. As the applicant is not eligible for TPS on other grounds, this issue will not be covered here.

The burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she meets the above requirements. Counsel's statement and the evidence provided on appeal do not overcome the adverse evidence in the record. Consequently, the District Director's decision to deny the application for TPS will be affirmed.

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 TPS 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.