

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

M1

FILE:



Office: California Service Center

Date: **AUG 02 2007**

[WAC 06 133 70054]

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: Self-Represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant claims to be a 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 denied the application because the applicant failed to establish he had: 1) 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.

On appeal, the applicant asks that CIS approve his 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 is eligible for TPS only if such alien establishes that he or she:

- (a) Is a national of a 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 Attorney General 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 Temporary Protected Status 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.

The phrase 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 phrase 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 continuous residence in the United States since February 13, 2001, and continuous physical presence in the United States since March 9, 2001. Subsequent extensions of the TPS designation have been granted, with the latest extension valid until September 9, 2007, upon the applicant's re-registration during the requisite time period.

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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS). 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 initial registration period for Salvadorans was from March 9, 2001, through September 9, 2002. The record reveals that the applicant filed his application with Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on February 10, 2006. To qualify for late registration, the applicant must provide evidence that during the initial registration period he fell within at least one of the provisions described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2) above.

On July 22, 2006, the applicant was requested to submit evidence establishing his 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 his qualifying continuous residence and continuous physical presence in the United States. The applicant, in response, provided documentation relating to his residence and physical presence in the United States.

The director determined that the applicant had failed to establish he was eligible for late registration and denied the application on September 12, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant asks that CIS approve his application.

The applicant submitted evidence in an attempt to establish his qualifying residence and physical presence in the United States. However, this evidence does not mitigate the applicant's failure to file his Application for Temporary Protected Status within the initial registration period. The applicant has not submitted any evidence to establish that he has met any of the criteria for late registration described in 8 C.F.R. § 244.2(f)(2). Consequently, the director's conclusion that the applicant had failed to establish his eligibility for late registration will be affirmed.

The second issue in this matter is whether the applicant has established that he resided and was continuously physically present during the required periods.

On July 22, 2006, the applicant was requested to submit evidence establishing his continuous residence since February 13, 2001, and continuous physical presence since March 9, 2001, in the United States. The applicant, in response, provided the following documentation:

1. Letter, dated August 8, 2006, signed by [REDACTED], stating he has known the applicant since September, 2001.
2. Letter, dated August 7, 2006, signed by [REDACTED] stating she has known the applicant since April, 2001.
3. Document, bearing a letterhead El Ojo Latino, dated, August 7, 2006, signed by [REDACTED] stating she has known the applicant since March, 2001, and that the applicant worked for five months distributing her newspaper.
4. Letter, dated August 8, 2006, signed by [REDACTED] making an unclear statement.
5. Letter, dated August 8, 2006, signed by [REDACTED] Proprietor, Eggspectation Restaurant, stating that the applicant has worked there since November of 2004.
6. Bank statements bearing the applicant's name and dated for the period October 27, 2005 to November 25, 2005.
7. Document, written in Spanish, dated in December 19, 2004.
8. Cell Phone bill, dated in 2006.

The director determined that the applicant had failed to submit sufficient evidence to establish his eligibility for TPS and denied the application on September 12, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant reasserts his claim and submits the following documentation:

9. Letter, bearing the letterhead of Congregational Holiness Church, Inc., signed by [REDACTED] stating the applicant has been a member since January 2001.

The letters at items No. 1 and 2 above are so general in nature as to provide little evidentiary weight to the applicant's assertions. They are not supported by any other corroborative evidence such as paystubs or rent payments, do not list the applicant's address or whereabouts during required period, and cannot be independently verified.

The employment affidavit from [REDACTED] has little evidentiary weight or probative value as it does not provide basic information that is expressly required by 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(a)(2)(i). Specifically, the affiant does not provide the address where the applicant resided during the period of his employment. It is further noted that the affiant did not indicate the location of her business, nor is there any corroborating evidence in the record such as pay stubs, W-2 tax forms, or yearly income statements listing the business as an employer of the applicant. The AAO has received numerous such affidavits from this individual, and have serious doubts about their authenticity and credibility. The item is rejected as authentic evidence. If CIS fails to believe that a fact stated in the petition is true, CIS may reject that fact. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b); see also *Anetekhai v. I.N.S.*, 876 F.2d 1218, 1220 (5th Cir.1989); *Lu-Ann Bakery Shop, Inc. v. Nelson*, 705 F. Supp. 7, 10 (D.D.C.1988); *Systronics Corp. v. INS*, 153 F. Supp. 2d 7, 15 (D.D.C. 2001). An agency may make reasonable empirical assumptions based on its experience and history of its regulatory management within its field. *NLRB v. Curtin Matheson Scientific, Inc.*, U.S. 775 (1990).

The letter at No. 4, above, is unclear, making the following statement "I point out that I am renting a Room in me Apartment the [REDACTED]" The letter is signed by [REDACTED] and the applicant. The AAO cannot construct an assertion or presume a fact or meaning on behalf of an applicant where the submitted evidence does not make its relevance clear. This item is of little probative value.

The AAO would note that the applicant has not submitted any contemporaneous documentation, despite the fact that the applicant claims to have been present in the United States since November 2000. The remaining documentation deals with the period of 2004 or later, leaving a substantial gap of evidence for the required period between 2001 and 2004. It is reasonable to expect that the applicant would have some other type of contemporaneous evidence to support his assertions; however, no such evidence has been provided. The sufficiency of all evidence will be judged according to its relevancy, consistency, credibility, and probative value. 8 C.F.R. § 244.9(b). It is determined that the documentation submitted by the applicant is not sufficient to establish that he satisfies the residence and physical presence requirements described in 8 C.F.R. §§ 244.2(b) and (c). Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application for temporary protected status will 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 temporary protected status 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.