

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

L1

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:

MSC-04-315-10234

Office: NEW YORK

Date: JAN 15 2008

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:



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 or rejected, 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, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident Under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet, on August 10, 2004. The director denied the application on August 3, 2006, after determining that the applicant had failed to meet his burden of proof, by a preponderance of the evidence, of his unlawful residence in the United States during the statutory period. The director noted that the applicant had submitted two boilerplate affidavits that were not credible or amenable to verification, although attempts were made to contact the affiants. The director further noted that the applicant had failed to provide evidence such as school records, medical records, dental records, birth certificates, etc. as proof of his presence in the United States.

On appeal, the applicant states that he submitted two credible affidavits that support his contention that he was present in the United States during the requisite period. He further states that it is unfair to request that he submit documentary evidence of his residence in the United States during the request period because he was a child during that time.

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 director's decision reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. In this case, the applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he has resided in the United States for the requisite period, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. On appeal, the applicant has not presented any evidence to overcome the director's decision. Nor has he specifically 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.