

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2



FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC 01 268 60390

Office: BALTIMORE

Date: **JUL 23 2008**

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:



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.

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, Baltimore, Maryland, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to demonstrate that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988. Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act; 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director's denial of the application was an abuse of discretion and contrary to the guidelines set forth in the regulations. Counsel indicated on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Office, that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted within 30 days of filing the appeal. On April 29, 2008, the AAO advised counsel that no further documentation had been received by the AAO in support of the applicant's appeal. In response, counsel stated that the applicant relies on his argument set forth on the Form I-290B. Therefore, the record will be considered complete as presently constituted.

We note that applicant had four applications before the District Director, Baltimore, which were all denied on July 27, 2005: three Forms I-485, Application to Register Permanent Resident or Adjust Status, based on an application for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act; an approved Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker; and on a pending Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative; and a Form I-601, Waiver of Grounds of Excludability. Counsel submits one Form I-290B in which he attempts to address all of the denials.<sup>1</sup> However, each of the denials is of a different application and should have been appealed separately. Counsel advances no specific argument as to the deficiencies in the director's decision regarding the applicant's LIFE Act application and does not address the grounds for the director's denial. Counsel also appears to have confused the requirements of 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) with the requirements of the regulations set forth in the LIFE Act.

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. The applicant has failed to address the reasons stated for denial of the LIFE application and has not provided any additional evidence on appeal. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> On August 29, 2005, counsel also submitted Motions to Reconsider the decisions denying the latter two Forms I-485. The record does not reflect that the director has issued decisions on the motions.