

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

LI

FILE:

MSC 06 026 11693

Office: MILWAUKEE

Date:

NOV 07 2007

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. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter 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, Chicago, Illinois, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. This matter will be rejected.

The district director concluded that the applicant had not established that he was eligible for class membership pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. The district director further determined that the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through the date that he attempted to file a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident, with the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services or CIS) in the original legalization application period between May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. Therefore, the director concluded that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and denied the application.

The regulation at 8 C.F. R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii) states, in pertinent part:

(B) Meaning of affected party. For purposes of this section and §§ 103.4 and 103.5 of this part, *affected party* (in addition to the Service) means the person or entity with legal standing in a proceeding. It does not include the beneficiary of a visa petition.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v) states:

Improperly filed appeal – (A) Appeal filed by person or entity not entitled to file it – (1) Rejection without refund of filing fee. An appeal filed by a person or entity not entitled to file it must be rejected as improperly filed. In such a case, any filing fee the Service has accepted will not be refunded.

Only an affected party, a person or entity with legal standing, may file an appeal of an unfavorable decision. [REDACTED], who identified himself as the applicant's father, signed the Form I-694, Notice of Appeal of Decision under Section 210 or 245A. The record does not contain a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, authorizing [REDACTED] to act on behalf of the applicant, and [REDACTED] is not recognized as an authorized or accredited representative pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 292.1(a). The appeal has not been filed by the applicant, or by any entity with legal standing in the proceeding. Therefore, the appeal has not been properly filed and must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.