




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

41



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER Date: **MAY 30 2008**
MAC 06 101 23544

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. 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
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 Director, National Benefits Center. That decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant did not establish that he continuously resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that his application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker had been denied. That decision was rendered in 1993. The applicant states that he does not agree with that decision as he had worked in agriculture for more than 90 days. The agricultural worker decision referenced by the applicant is unrelated to the present proceeding. The applicant then states that he disagrees with the director's decision in this proceeding as "the LULAC program" gives "a second chance to people with cases like mine to have a green card." The director's decision denied the applicant's Form I-687 because the applicant did not establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he resided in a continuous unlawful status, except for brief absences, from before January 1982 until the date the applicant was turned away by service officials when he tried to apply for legalization, and, because the applicant did not establish that he was continuously present in the United States, except for brief, casual and innocent departures, from November 6, 1986 until the date he was turned away by the service when he tried to apply for legalization. The applicant does not address the basis of the director's denial nor offer any new evidence in that regard. 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 new evidence. 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.