

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L1



FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC-06-098-27579

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: SEP 25 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. 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 District Director, Los Angeles. The decision 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, noting that the evidence submitted lacked sufficient detail to establish that the applicant entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and resided continuously in the United States throughout the relevant period.

Specifically, the director noted that the applicant submitted affidavits from individuals who were either not present in the United States during the relevant period, or who indicate only that the applicant visited them in the United States, not that the applicant resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. Additionally, the director noted that that the applicant submitted photographs which were not dated, and multiple receipts which do not list a name.

On appeal, the applicant stated that "I did arrive in the U.S. in 1981, during my interview I unfortunately I might have not specified accurately the address and information that I was being asked." He further states "I offer my apologies for all the confusion in regards to my dates, I am truly sorry for all the misunderstandings these dates have caused. Please note that I did arrive to the United States in a young age, I did not attend school due to my mother being told I would be deported. Although I was very young, my parents approved on my stay in the U.S. due to the terrorism that was going on during that time in my country."

The applicant provided no additional evidence or explanation to overcome the reasons for denial of his 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 he 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.