

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY





OCT 19 2007

FILE: 
MSC-02-071-62365

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:


IN RE: Applicant: 

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: 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.


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, Los Angeles, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the information the applicant submitted failed to overcome the grounds for denial stated in the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID). Specifically, the director found that the documents the applicant submitted did not establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided in continuous unlawful status since that date through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant stated that the immigration officer did not specify exactly how and why the applicant's rebuttal failed to overcome the grounds for denial stated in the NOID; that the immigration officer failed to contact any of the applicant's affiants, leaving the investigation incomplete; and that, as a result, the immigration officer violated the applicant's right to due process and treated him unfairly.

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. Specifically, the applicant has not offered evidence or an explanation indicating he has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided in continuous unlawful status since that date through May 4, 1988. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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