

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

M,

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [REDACTED] OFFICE: California Service Center DATE:  
[WAC 05 085 83072]  
[EAC 07 186 50993, motion]

MAR 21 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 California Service Center. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

for Robert P. Wieman, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Director, California Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Chief, 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 is a native and 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 record reveals that the applicant filed a Form 1-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, after the initial registration period under Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) receipt number SRC 03 024 55166. The director denied that application on April 21, 2003 because the applicant had failed to establish she was eligible for late initial registration. A subsequent appeal from the director's decision was dismissed by the Director, now Chief, of the AAO who also determined the applicant was not eligible for late initial registration. The applicant then filed two motions to reopen that were also dismissed by the Chief of the AAO.

The applicant filed the current Form 1-821 on December 24, 2004, under CIS receipt number WAC 05 085 83072, and indicated that she was re-registering for TPS. The director denied the re-registration application because the applicant's initial TPS application had been denied and the applicant was not eligible to reapply for re-registration for TPS. A subsequent **appeal** from the director's decision was dismissed by the Chief of the AAO on May 26, 2006. The applicant filed a motion to reopen that was also dismissed by the Chief of the AAO on May 14, 2007.

On motion to reopen, 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 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 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 this 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 failure to file her Application for Temporary Protected Status within the initial registration period or to establish her eligibility for late registration. 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.