


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



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

PUBLJCCOPY



M 1

FILE: [REDACTED] OFFICE: Texas Service Center DATE: **APR 222008**

[SRC 03 19655642]
[EAC 07 13550778, motion]

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 Texas Service Center. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


for Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Texas Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Chief, Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the 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 is stated to be a native and citizen of Nicaragua 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, Texas Service Center, denied the application for TPS because the applicant failed to establish she was eligible for late registration. The appeal from the director's decision was dismissed on September 17, 2004, after the Director, now Chief, of the AAO also concluded that the applicant had failed to establish her eligibility for TPS. Additionally, the Chief of the AAO found the applicant failed to establish her qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States during the requisite periods. On October 25, 2004, the applicant filed a motion to reopen that was dismissed by the Chief of the AAO on October 18, 2005. The applicant filed a second motion to reopen that was dismissed by the AAO on April 2, 2007. The applicant has now submitted another motion to reopen.

On the current motion, the applicant asks CIS to reopen her case and give her the opportunity to be legal in the United States. She also states that she has been in the United States since 1998 and has provided all of the requested evidence. The applicant also submits evidence in an attempt to establish her continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States during the qualifying period.

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 copies of the same documentation relating to her claim of residence since December 30, 1998, and physical presence since January 5, 1999, in the United States. However, the motion does not address the applicant's eligibility for late 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 is affirmed.