

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

E3

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: NOV 10 2010

IN RE: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Replacement Naturalization/Citizenship Document under Section 343
of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1454.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 office that originally decided your case. 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. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. 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, Texas Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native of Jamaica and claims to be a citizen of the United States. She seeks to have a replacement document issued to her, pursuant to section 343 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1454. Based on the negative results of a records check by the Chief of the Record Operations Branch in the Office of Records at Central Office Washington, the director determined that the applicant had failed to establish that she was previously issued a Certificate of Citizenship or Certificate of Naturalization. The director denied the application accordingly.

On the Notice of Appeal or Motion received on May 12, 2010, the applicant states, in part, that her application was denied due to the bureaucratic deficiencies of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). The applicant also states that she has filed a Form G-639, Freedom of Information/Privacy Act (FOIA) Request, which is still pending. As supporting documentation, the applicant submits: a personal statement; excerpts from a report from the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General entitled *USCIS Faces Challenges in Modernizing Information Technology*; documents related to her FOIA request; copies of immigration-related newspaper articles; and copies of previously submitted documentation.

On appeal, the applicant indicates that the director's decision is erroneous, as another government agency "confirmed [her] permanent residency and citizenship in the application process in 1993." While the applicant disagrees with the director's decision, she has provided insufficient information regarding how her statement submitted on appeal addresses the director's reason for denying the petition, namely that she has provided no evidence that she was previously issued a Certificate of Citizenship or Certificate of Naturalization.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Inasmuch as the applicant has failed to specifically identify any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.