



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



LI

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-335-10640

Office: NEW YORK

Date: **MAY 01 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.

for Michael T. Kelly
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 District. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 31, 2005 (together, the I-687 Application). The director determined that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period, specifically noting that “the information and documentation [that the applicant] submitted are insufficient to overcome the grounds for denial.” In addition, the director noted that during the April 3, 2006 interview, the applicant stated that he first entered the United States in March 1983. The director also stated that the applicant provided an address in Port Au Prince, Haiti from 1961 to 1983 on a Form G-325A dated September 12, 1986 and on another Form G-325A signed on June 9, 1986. Furthermore, the director noted that on November 10, 1989, Northern Boulevard Dodge Inc. made its initial filing with the New York Department of State and that the applicant “could not have been working [for] them from 1983 to 1990 as claimed.” The director denied the application as the applicant had not met his burden of proof and was, therefore, not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, the applicant submits a timely Form I-694 Notice of Appeal of Decision Under Section 210 or 245A and states that a written brief or statement is attached. The record of proceeding contains no brief or written statement from the applicant, other than his statement on the Form I-694 itself. On the Form I-694, the applicant states that his application was “filed by a third party that failed to submit the proofs” required and that the applicant is now in a “position to demonstrate that [he] lived in the United States for more than 24 years.” The applicant does not submit any additional evidence on appeal. As of this date, the AAO has not received any additional evidence from the applicant. Therefore, the record is complete.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed.

A review of the decision reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not presented additional evidence. The applicant fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the application. Nor has he specifically addressed the basis for denial. As the applicant presents no additional evidence on appeal to overcome the decision of the director, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv).

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.