

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

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

M1

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUN 02 2010

[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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the Vermont Service Center. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the Vermont Service Center by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is 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 that she was eligible for filing her TPS application after the initial registration period from March 9, 2001 through September 9, 2002. The director, therefore, denied the application.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant claims that the director erred in finding that the 60 day period is not subject to equitable tolling, and that equitable tolling should not be applied in this case due to ineffective assistance or counsel.

Section 244(c) of the Act, and the related regulations in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2, provide that an applicant who is a national of a foreign state as designated by the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security (Secretary), is eligible for temporary protected status only if such alien establishes that he or she:

- (a) Is a national, as defined in section 101(a)(21) of the Act, of a foreign state designated under section 244(b) of the Act;
- (b) Has been continuously physically present in the United States since the effective date of the most recent designation of that foreign state;
- (c) Has continuously resided in the United States since such date as the Secretary may designate;
- (d) Is admissible as an immigrant except as provided under section 244.3;
- (e) Is not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. § 244.4; and
- (f)
 - (1) Registers for TPS during the initial registration period announced by public notice in the *Federal Register*, or
 - (2) During any subsequent extension of such designation if at the time of the initial registration period:
 - (i) The applicant is a nonimmigrant or has been granted voluntary departure status or any relief from removal;

- (ii) The applicant has an application for change of status, adjustment of status, asylum, voluntary departure, or any relief from removal which is pending or subject to further review or appeal;
 - (iii) The applicant is a parolee or has a pending request for reparole; or
 - (iv) The applicant is a spouse or child of an alien currently eligible to be a TPS registrant.
- (g) Has filed an application for late registration with the appropriate Service director within a 60-day period immediately following the expiration or termination of conditions described in paragraph (f)(2) of this section.

The term *continuously physically present*, as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 244.1, means actual physical presence in the United States for the entire period specified in the regulations. An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States by virtue of brief, casual, and innocent absences as defined within this section.

The term *continuously resided*, as defined in 8 C.F.R. §244.1, means residing in the United States for the entire period specified in the regulations. An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous residence in the United States by reason of a brief, casual, and innocent absence as defined within this section or due merely to a brief temporary trip abroad required by emergency or extenuating circumstances outside the control of the alien.

Persons applying for TPS offered to El Salvadorans must demonstrate that they have continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001, and that they have been continuously physically present in the United States since March 9, 2001. On July 9, 2002, the Attorney General announced an extension of the TPS designation until September 9, 2003. Subsequent extensions of the TPS designation have been granted, with the latest extension granted until September 9, 2010, upon the applicant's re-registration during the requisite period.

The initial registration period for El Salvadorans was from March 9, 2001 through September 9, 2002. The record shows that the applicant filed this application on August 6, 2008.

The burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he or she meets the above requirements. Applicants shall submit all documentation as required in the instructions or requested by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(a). The sufficiency of all evidence will be judged according to its relevancy, consistency, credibility, and probative value. To meet his or her burden of proof, the applicant must provide supporting documentary evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own statements. 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(b).

The record of proceeding confirms that the applicant filed her application after the initial registration period had closed. To qualify for late registration, the applicant must provide evidence that during the initial registration period from March 9, 2001 through September 9, 2002, she fell within the provisions described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2) (listed above). If the qualifying condition or application has expired or been terminated, the individual must file within a 60-day period immediately following the expiration or termination of the qualifying condition in order to be considered for the late initial registration. 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(g).

On October 22, 2008, the applicant was provided the opportunity to submit evidence establishing her eligibility for late registration as set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2). In response, the applicant stated that she did not file her TPS application within 60 days of the denial of her NACARA application because she was not made aware by her prior counsel that her NACARA application was denied. The applicant requested that the 60-day period be equitably tolled due to ineffective assistance of counsel. The director noted that there was no provision in the regulations for the tolling of the 60-day period. The director determined that the applicant did not submit her application within 60 days from the date the NACARA application was dismissed. Therefore, the director concluded that the applicant had failed to establish eligibility for late registration. Accordingly, on November 17, 2008, the director denied the application.

On appeal, counsel claims that the director erred in finding that the 60 day period is not subject to equitable tolling, and that equitable tolling should not be applied in this case due to ineffective assistance or counsel. The applicant has failed to submit the requisite affidavit in support of her claim, as discussed above. Counsel also cites *Matter of Compean*, 24 I. & N. Dec. 710 (Jan. 7, 2009) in support of his claim that the 60 day period should be tolled due to ineffective assistance of counsel. It is noted, however, that on June 3, 2009, the Attorney General vacated the decision in *Matter of Compean* regarding claims of ineffective assistance of counsel. Furthermore, any appeal or motion based upon a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel requires: (1) that the claim be supported by an affidavit of the allegedly aggrieved respondent setting forth in detail the agreement that was entered into with counsel or the authorized representative with respect to the actions taken and what representations counsel or the representative did or did not make to the respondent in this regard, (2) that the person whose integrity or competence is being impugned be informed of the allegations leveled against him and be given an opportunity to respond, and (3) that the appeal or motion reflect whether a complaint has been filed with appropriate disciplinary authorities with respect to any violation of ethical or legal responsibilities, and if not, why not. *Matter of Lozada*, 9 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), *aff'd*, 857 F. 2d 10 (1st Cir. 1988). To the extent that the applicant has failed to produce evidence sufficient to substantiate an ineffective assistance of counsel claim, the AAO will review the record applying standard statutory and regulatory eligibility requirements and burdens of proof.

The applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence to establish that she has met any of the criteria for late registration described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2). Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application for TPS will be affirmed.

The record of proceeding reflects that on May 7, 1996, an immigration judge ordered the applicant removed from the United States to El Salvador. The applicant failed to appear at the Los Angeles District Office on September 2, 1996, for her enforced departure.

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.