



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

JUL 30 2007

FILE:

MSC-05-133-11409

Office: LOS ANGELES, CA

Date:

IN RE:

Applicant:

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, Los Angeles, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 repeated his statements in response to the director's notice of intent to deny, assuring the director that he lived in the United States since 1981; stating that he has no receipts for the relevant time period; stating that he misunderstood the application form (I-687) and did not report his absences correctly; and stating that he worked in landscaping and construction as noted in his application. The applicant did not address the specific basis for denial, and did not provide additional evidence.

Simply stating that there was error on his application and asserting that he resided in the United States during the statutory period is not sufficient basis for appeal. 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.