

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20539



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L1




FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-018-11013

Office: NEW YORK Date: SEP 02 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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, all documents have been returned to the National Benefits Center. 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. If your appeal was sustained or remanded for further action, you will be contacted.

foi *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. 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 October 18, 2004 (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 applicant did not submit any new evidence in response to the director's notice of intent to deny issued on January 27, 2006. 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 a written statement. On the Form I-694, the applicant states that he believes that his application was "unfairly denied" and that he should have been granted temporary resident status based on the documents previously submitted. On appeal, the applicant also states that he was unable to submit better documentation of his unlawful residence during the requisite period due to the passage of time. Finally, the applicant asks that his application be reconsidered on humanitarian grounds. As of this date, the AAO has not received any additional evidence from counsel or 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 any new evidence. The applicant suggests that the director's adjudication of the application was unfair. The petitioner has not demonstrated any error by the director in conducting her review of the application. Nor has the petitioner demonstrated any resultant prejudice such as would constitute a due process violation. *See Vides-Vides v. INS*, 783 F.2d 1463, 1469-70 (9th Cir. 1986); *Nicholas v. INS*, 590 F.2d 802, 809-10 (9th Cir. 1979); *Martin-Mendoza v. INS*, 499 F.2d 918, 922 (9th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 419 U.S. 1113 (1975). 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.