



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

L1

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: MSC-05-250-15230

Office: SEATTLE

Date: MAY 29 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, Seattle District Office, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because he found the evidence submitted with the application was insufficient to establish eligibility for Temporary Resident Status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman settlement agreements. Specifically, the applicant submitted three affidavits in support of her claims of eligibility. These affidavits, from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] lacked any statements or evidence that the applicant entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 or that she resided continuously in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. None of the affiants indicated that they had specific knowledge that the applicant resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period, provided any indication of how they date their initial acquaintance with the applicant, or provided any details of their relationship with the applicant that would lend credence to her claims of eligibility.

The director further noted that on August 29, 2006 the Service received an additional affidavit from [REDACTED] in which he stated that he has served as the priest of the Guru Ravi Dass Temple in Tukwila, Washington. He indicated that the applicant has been a member of his temple since 1993. This letter concerns the time period after the statutory period and therefore, does not provide evidence of eligibility for the benefit sought.

The only other evidence submitted was a letter from Dr. [REDACTED] in which he states that the applicant was a patient of the Tukwila Dental Center since October 2000. Like the affidavit referenced above, this letter concerns the time period after the statutory period and therefore, does not provide evidence of eligibility for the benefit sought.

On appeal, the applicant stated that she does not have any additional evidence that would support her claims of eligibility. The applicant provided no additional documentation to support her claim or to overcome the reasons for denial of this application.

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.