

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

FILE:

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 24 2010

IN RE:

Applicant:

APPLICATION:

Application for Temporary Protected Status under Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1254

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

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DISCUSSION: The applicant's Temporary Protected Status (TPS) was withdrawn by the Director, Vermont Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reconsider. The motion will be dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed.

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 director withdrew TPS because the applicant had been convicted of two misdemeanors.

Upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO concurred with the director's conclusion and dismissed the appeal on March 29, 2010.

On motion, the applicant reasserts his claim of eligibility for TPS and states that the two offenses were in fact part of a single scheme of criminal misconduct and therefore should be deemed one misdemeanor.

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).

The applicant's motion to reconsider consists of a statement from counsel contending that the applicant was only convicted of one misdemeanor since the offenses arose out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct. The fact that the offenses arose from a common scheme does not preclude them from being counted as separate offenses. However, while the determination of whether the applicant's crimes arose "out of a single scheme of criminal misconduct" may be relevant to an individual's removability under section 237 of the Act, this determination has no bearing on the applicant's eligibility for TPS. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 353 (7th Ed., 1999) defines the term "count" to mean a separate and distinct claim in a complaint or similar pleading. It also indicates that the term "count" is used to signify the part of an indictment charging a distinct offense. According to the court disposition, the applicant was charged with two separate violations to which he pled guilty to two separate crimes and the court ordered two separate punishments. Therefore, the applicant has been convicted of two separate and distinct misdemeanor offenses. As such, the issue on which the underlying decisions were based has not been 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 pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy or establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. Accordingly, the motion will be dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion to reconsider is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO is affirmed.