

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

[REDACTED]

M1

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 07 2010

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:

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 office that originally decided your case 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. A motion to reopen, filed by the applicant, was granted by the director and he again denied the application. The matter 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 she: 1) had continuously resided in the United States since February 13, 2001; 2) 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, counsel for the applicant states that the director erroneously denied the application.

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 TPS 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.

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.

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 March 9, 2012, 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 July 31, 2006.

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 first issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant is eligible for late registration.

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 May 4, 2007, 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). The applicant was also requested to submit evidence establishing that she and [REDACTED] are the same person and to submit evidence of her continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and her continuous physical presence in the United States from March 9, 2001, to the filing date of the application. The applicant, in response, provided evidence in an attempt to establish continuous residence and continuous physical presence during the qualifying period. She did not present evidence of her eligibility for late registration. Therefore, the director denied the application.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant is eligible for late initial registration because she had an asylum application pending during the initial registration period. It is noted, however that this asylum application is in the name of [REDACTED], and the applicant has failed to establish that she and [REDACTED] are one and the same. Therefore, the applicant has not established that she had a pending asylum application during the initial registration period. Counsel states that the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that she and [REDACTED] are the same person. However, the record does not reflect this. Consequently, the director's conclusion that the applicant failed to establish her eligibility for late registration will be affirmed.

The second and third issues in this proceeding are whether the applicant has established her continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001 and her continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001.

As stated above, the applicant was requested on May 4, 2007, to submit evidence establishing her qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States. In response, the applicant submitted a statement indicating that she and [REDACTED] are the same person. The applicant also submitted copies of EAD's and driver's licenses, a copy of a passport and copies of a birth certificate for [REDACTED] that appears to have been issued on August 3, 1999 and a birth certificate for [REDACTED] that appears to have been issued on October 6, 1992 which indicated the applicant as the mother.

As pointed out by the director, there are several discrepancies that have not been addressed. Specifically, the birth certificates for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] list the applicant as the mother, but the asylum application in the name of [REDACTED] indicates there are no children. In addition, a rent agreement dated March 1, 1998 was submitted in the applicant's name. However, the copyright date at the bottom of the agreement pages indicates it was copyrighted in May 2004, six years after the agreement was allegedly signed. Furthermore, it is noted that the applicant indicates two separate home addresses in her documentation, [REDACTED], and [REDACTED].

██████████ for the same time periods. Additionally, the applicant indicates on her 2001 through 2005 tax documents that ██████████ and ██████████ are foster children, not her birth children. These discrepancies have not been satisfactorily explained. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

On appeal, counsel states that the director erroneously denied the application because she has provided sufficient evidence to establish that she and ██████████ are the same person. Counsel further states that USCIS is in the best position to determine whether the applicant and ██████████ are the same person. The applicant has the burden of proof to establish his or her identity and to argue that USCIS is in the best position to make this determination is specious at best. Counsel also contends that the discrepancies can be fully explained, but fails to offer any evidence or documentation to address them.

The applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence to establish her qualifying residence since February 13, 2001, and her continuous physical presence in the United States from March 9, 2001 to the date the application was filed. She has, therefore, failed to establish that she has met the criteria described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(b) and (c). Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application for TPS on these grounds will also be affirmed.

The application will be denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for denial. 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.