

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

W

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-236-13060

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: JUL 30 2007

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Temporary Resident Status under 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. All documents have 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, Los Angeles, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant did not provide credible evidence of continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant claimed that the officer who interviewed him regarding his claim did not tell the truth and he requested that he be interviewed again by a different officer. He claimed that the officer who interviewed him before mistakenly reported that the applicant told him he had tried to apply for legalization in 1987 but was informed by a security guard that the program was over. The applicant claimed that "that statement is not true [and] I never told that to the officer."

On appeal, the applicant also indicated that he would submit a brief and/or additional evidence within 30 days of filing the appeal. More than one year has lapsed and nothing more has been submitted.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed. The basis for the denial in this case is the lack of credible evidence of continuous residence in the United States and is not related to the alleged misunderstanding during the interview.

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 basis for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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