

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

W



JUL 30 2007

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CLEVELAND (CINCINNATI) Date:  
MSC-05-167-11894

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.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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, Cleveland, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant “failed to meet the requirements for legalization under either the CSS or Newman/LULAC settlements.” The director noted that during his interview on March 24, 2006 the applicant testified under oath that he entered the United States for the first time in 1985.

On appeal, the applicant claimed that he resided in the United States for the requisite periods and that he entered the country for the first time in the eighties.

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

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.