

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



LI

FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC-05-336-11399

Office: NEW YORK

Date: OCT 31 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "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, New York. The decision 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.

In summarizing the reasons for his appeal, the applicant stated, "as will be fully briefed I did not engage in any fraud as alleged by the officers. The document[s] I produced [were] genuine and not made up. Just because the office is paranoid with the issue of fraud, does not mean that I have committed any." The applicant did not specify any legal or factual error in the director's decision and did not provide any documentation in support of his claim. He asked for an additional 30 days to submit a brief in support of his application. However, the Notice of Appeal was filed on September 8, 2007 and, as of the date of this decision, no additional evidence or brief has been received by the AAO.

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 and has not 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.