



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

L2

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted]
MSC 02 107 61191

Office: NEW YORK

Date: FEB 26 2007

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Permanent Resident pursuant to Section 1104 of the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act of 2000, Pub. L. 106-553, 114 Stat. 2762 (2000), *amended by* Life Act Amendments, Pub. L. 106-554, 114 Stat. 2763 (2000)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[Redacted]

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. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the District Director, New York, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act; 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b). Citing *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988), the director determined that the affidavits submitted by the applicant were insufficient to explain an entry in his passport showing that he was in Cote d'Ivoire in January 1988 when he alleged that his first trip outside of the United States was from July to September 1988.

On appeal, the applicant states that the stamps on his passport were for the purpose of convincing the U.S. Consulate to grant him a visa. The applicant's statement, without more, does not constitute the competent objective evidence necessary to resolve the inconsistency of his evidence.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

The applicant has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding; therefore, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.