

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

PUBLIC COPY

L1



FILE:



Office: CLEVELAND

Date:

JAN 17 2008

MSC-05-337-10818

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 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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Eric Hadda".

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, Cleveland, Ohio, 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 September 2, 2005. The director denied the application on June 16, 2006, after determining that the applicant had not submitted sufficient evidence to meet his burden of proof, and that he was therefore denying the application for the reasons stated in the NOID.

On appeal, the applicant states that his father initially brought him to the United States in August of 1981, that his amnesty application was refused by immigration officers in July of 1987, and that he returned to his country and stayed until April of 2001, when he came back to America. The applicant also stated that he did not keep his documents because he did not think that he would need them.

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. 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.