



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



LL

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-06-004-11978

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: JUN 20 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 was denied by the Director, Los Angeles District Office, and 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, the applicant stated in his interview with a Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) officer that he was not sure when he came into the United States for the first time, but he thinks maybe 1982 or 1983. The applicant provided documentation of school attendance starting in 1993 and testified that he did not attend school in the United States any earlier than 1993. The applicant provided no evidence of residence in the United States prior to 1993.

On appeal, the applicant stated that he was brought to the United States as a child. He does not have personal recollection of the exact date, but his mother has indicated that the date was prior to January 1, 1982. The applicant provided no additional documentation from his mother, or from any other person, to support this claim. The applicant also stated on appeal that he is seeking additional documentation from the schools he attended. The applicant did not explain what additional school documentation he is seeking that would be relevant to his legalization application, considering that he stated in the CIS interview that he had not attended any schools prior to 1993. 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.