

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

M1

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]  
[EAC 08 100 70232]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 01 2009

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:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the Vermont Service Center. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant claims to be 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.

The director determined that the applicant failed to establish he: 1) had continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001; 2) had been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001; and 3) was eligible for late registration. The director, therefore, denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant's mother requests an oral argument before the AAO because her children can not go back to El Salvador. The regulations provide that the requesting party must explain in writing why oral argument is necessary. Furthermore, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has the sole authority to grant or deny a request for oral argument and will grant argument only in cases involving unique factors or issues of law that cannot be adequately addressed in writing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(b). In this instance, the applicant's mother identified no unique factors or issues of law to be resolved. In fact, she set forth no specific reasons why oral argument should be held. Moreover, the written record of proceedings fully represents the facts and issues in this case. Consequently, the request for oral argument is denied. The applicant fails to make any other statement or claim or provide any additional evidence.

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

Inasmuch as the applicant has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

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 appeal is dismissed.