

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

*E 2*

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [REDACTED] OFFICE: MIAMI (RIVIERA BEACH) Date: AUG 28 2006

IN RE: APPLICANT: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Certificate of Citizenship under sections 309 and 301 of the former Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1409 and 1401.

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 "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Acting District Director (“director”), Miami, FL. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant filed a Form N-600, Application for Certificate of Citizenship, on August 2, 2000. She was scheduled for an interview in connection with this application on August 9, 2001 at 10:10AM at the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)) sub-office in Riviera Beach, Florida. The applicant failed to appear for this interview, and CIS records do not reflect that she made a timely request for rescheduling prior to the interview, or that she provided an explanation of why she was unable to appear on August 9, 2001. On August 31, 2001, the director denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that her interview was scheduled for August 10, 2001, not August 9, 2001. She provides that her father called a Spanish-speaking telephone line for CIS and reported that the applicant would be unable to attend an interview on August 10, 2001 due to the fact that she had to take a college exam on the same date. The applicant contends that a CIS representative informed her father that a new interview date would be scheduled, and she would be notified by mail. The applicant requests that an interview be scheduled in order that she may proceed with her application.

Upon review, the applicant has not shown that her application was erroneously denied by the director. CIS records contain an original interview notice that reflects that the applicant’s interview was scheduled for August 9, 2001. The applicant now submits a copy of the interview notice with the appeal, yet on this copy the date of the interview has been hand-altered to reflect that the interview was scheduled for August 10, 2001. There is no evidence or indication in CIS records that this alteration was made by an officer of CIS, thus the applicant has not established that her interview was in fact scheduled for August 10, 2001.

The applicant submits documentation from Hillsborough Community College that shows that she was scheduled for two tests on August 10, 2001, at 11:00AM and 2:00PM. Yet, as the applicant’s interview date was on August 9, 2001, she has not established a reason for why she was absent. Nor has the applicant submitted contemporaneous evidence to support that her father called CIS on July 17, 2001 to change her interview date.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant has not shown that her interview was rescheduled. Nor has she established a reason for her failure to appear on August 9, 2001. Therefore, the AAO finds no cause to disturb the director’s decision and the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.