


**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



41

FILE: [Redacted]
MSC-06-047-21516

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **JUN 12 2008**

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 applicant submitted insufficient evidence to establish eligibility for Temporary Resident Status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman settlement agreements. Specifically, the applicant stated in her interview with a Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) officer that she first entered the United States on April 3, 1986 legally through New York. She stayed for three weeks. She indicated that she returned to the United States in September 1987 on an F-1 student visa and attended Bunker Hill Community College in Massachusetts from September 1987 until September 1989. The applicant provided no evidence of residence in the United States prior to 1987.

On appeal, the applicant confirmed that she first entered the United States in 1986 for three weeks and that she did not reside in the United States until 1987. Her statements on appeal are consistent with her initial testimony. The applicant provided no additional evidence or explanation to overcome the reasons for denial of her application. The director noted in her decision that an applicant for temporary resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). The applicant must also establish that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States since November 6, 1986. Section 245A(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(3). The regulations clarify that the applicant must be physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b).

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the term "until the date of filing" in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b) means until the date the applicant attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to timely file during the original legalization application period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. CSS Settlement Agreement, paragraph 11 at page 6; Newman Settlement Agreement, paragraph 11 at page 10.

Since the applicant, by her own repeated admission, has failed to meet the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence that she resided continuously in the United States for the requisite period, the appeal will be dismissed.

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 she 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.