


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



L2

FILE: MSC-02-002-64127 Office: ATLANTA Date: FEB 05 2006

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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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. 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, Atlanta. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant had failed to establish that he satisfied the "basic citizenship skills" requirement under section 1104(c)(2)(E) of the LIFE Act. He was provided two opportunities to pass the English literacy and/or the United States history and government tests, but failed to pass the tests or submit relevant evidence as described in the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17.

On appeal, the applicant stated that he was unable to respond to the director's letters because he was out of town, and he asked for another chance to demonstrate basic citizen skills. The applicant did not allege any legal or factual error in the director's decision.

Any appeal that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv). 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 and has not addressed the basis for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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