



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 27464549

Date: SEPT. 20, 2023

Appeal of Nebraska Service Center Decision

Form I-131, Application for Travel Document

The Applicant seeks a refugee travel document under section 208(c)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act). An applicant for a refugee travel document must file the application while in valid refugee status under section 207 of the Act, valid asylum status under section 208 of the Act, or must be a permanent resident who received such status as a direct result of his or her asylum or refugee status. 8 C.F.R. § 223.2(b)(2).

The Director of the Nebraska Service Center denied the Form I-131, concluding that the record showed an immigration judge had granted withholding of removal but had denied the Applicant's application for asylum. Consequently, the Director stated that the Applicant did not have valid asylum status under section 208 of the Act, citing to the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 223.2(b)(2). The matter is now before us on appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

On appeal, the Applicant does not dispute the Director's conclusion that the Applicant did not have valid asylum status in the United States when he filed the Form I-131. Instead, the Applicant claims that he was falsely accused of an offense against a child and also states that he hopes that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services will approve his application for a travel document because he wishes to visit his children in Egypt.

In this case, the Applicant did not first meet the threshold requirement that he have valid asylum status in the United States under section 208 of the Act prior to filing the Form I-131. 8 C.F.R. § 223.2(b)(2). Accordingly, the application will remain denied.¹

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

¹ The Director also stated that it was not in the agency's best interest to issue a travel document to the Applicant because the Applicant is under an order of supervision. However, we need not reach, and therefore reserve, this issue. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (stating that agencies are not required to make "purely advisory findings" on issues that are unnecessary to the ultimate decision); *see also Matter of L-A-C*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526 n.7 (BIA 2015) (declining to reach alternative issues on appeal where the applicant did not otherwise meet their burden of proof).