



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

LI

PUBLIC COPY
identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] MSC-05-155-11463

Office: NEW YORK

Date: DEC 26 2007

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, you no longer have a case pending before this office, and you are not entitled to file a motion to reopen or reconsider your case.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for Temporary Resident Status pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreements reached in *Catholic Social Services, Inc., et al., v. Ridge, et al.*, CIV. NO. S-86-1343-LKK (E.D. Cal) January 23, 2004, and *Felicity Mary Newman, et al., v. United States Immigration and Citizenship Services, et al.*, CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK (C.D. Cal) February 17, 2004 (CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements), was denied by the District Director, New York. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because she found the evidence submitted with the application was insufficient to establish eligibility for Temporary Resident Status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. Specifically, in her Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), the director stated that the applicant failed to provide evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and then resided continuously in the United States since that time and for the duration of the requisite period, that he was physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date he attempted to file for legalization, and that he was admissible as an immigrant. The director granted the applicant thirty (30) days within which to submit additional evidence in support of his application. Though the director noted that her office did receive additional evidence from the applicant in support of his application in response to her NOID, she found this evidence was not sufficient to overcome her reasons for denial. Therefore, the director denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant states that he has resided in the United States since 1981. He states that he has previously submitted documents in support of his application. He requests that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) reconsider its decision regarding his application. The applicant provided no additional evidence or explanation to overcome the reasons for denial of his application.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal which is filed that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed.

A review of the decision reveals the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not presented additional evidence. Nor has he addressed the grounds stated for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.