



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly ~~un~~ warranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

L1



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-172-11751

Office: LOS ANGELES

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

Michael T. Kelley

for 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, Los Angeles. 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 March 21, 2005 (together, the I-687 Application). The director determined that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period, specifically noting that the applicant's "testimony, application and evidence submitted are not consistent." The director denied the application as the applicant had not met her 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 appeal, the applicant states that she has "resid[ed] in the United States since before January 1, 1982" and has "submitted all the necessary document[ation]" for approval of her application. The applicant also argues that she was the "victim of inadequate counsel." The applicant states that counsel prepared applications with incorrect information "without [the applicant's] consent" and that counsel advised the applicant that she only needed "10 years to qualify for legalization." 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 any new 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 the applicant specifically addressed the basis for denial. The applicant fails to address the inconsistencies in the application as noted by the director. The applicant states she was not effectively represented by counsel. Any appeal or motion based upon a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel requires: (1) that the claim be supported by an affidavit of the allegedly aggrieved respondent setting forth in detail the agreement that was entered into with counsel with respect to the actions to be taken and what representations counsel did or did not make to the respondent in this regard, (2) that counsel whose integrity or competence is being impugned be informed of the allegations leveled against him and be given an opportunity to respond, and (3) that the appeal or motion reflect whether a complaint has been filed with appropriate disciplinary authorities with respect to any violation of counsel's ethical or legal responsibilities, and if not, why not. *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), *aff'd*, 857 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1988). The applicant has not met these requirements. 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.