


**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

PUBLIC Copy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



FILE: [REDACTED]
[WAC 05 136 70453]

OFFICE: California Service Center

DATE: **APR 02 2008**

INRE: 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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, California Service Center. A subsequent appeal and a motion to reopen were dismissed by the Director, Administrative Appeals Office. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on a motion to reopen. The previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed and the motion to reopen will be dismissed.

The applicant claims to be 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.

The director denied the initial application because the applicant failed to establish she was eligible for late registration.

A subsequent appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on February 1, 2005, after the Director of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that she was eligible for late registration.

The applicant filed another **re-registration** application, which was denied. The appeal and subsequent motion to reopen for that re-registration were also denied as the AAO also concluded that the applicant was not eligible to re-register.

On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserts her claim of eligibility for TPS.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding, and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2).

A motion to reconsider must state the reason for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy ... [and] must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3).

A motion that does not meet applicable requirements *shall* be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

The applicant's motion to reopen consists of documentation relating to her claim of residence since December 30, 1998, and physical presence since January 5, 1999, in the United States. However, the primary basis for the denial of the application and the appeal was not a failure to establish qualifying residence and physical presence. Rather, the primary basis for these decisions was the applicant's ineligibility to re-register. The motion does not address applicant's eligibility for re-registration. As such, the issue on which the underlying decisions were based has not been addressed or overcome on motion.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. That burden has not been met since the applicant has not provided any new facts or additional evidence to overcome the previous decision of the AAO. Accordingly, the motion to reopen will be dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated March 5, 2007, and November 14, 2007, are affirmed.