

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 20529-2090
MAIL STOP 2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L2

FILE:

MSC-03-100-60325

Office: NEW YORK

Date: NOV 07 2008

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:

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

The director denied the application because she found the evidence submitted with the application was insufficient to establish eligibility for Permanent Resident Status 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). Specifically, the director noted that the applicant indicated that he entered the United States for the first time on March 15, 1981 via the Canadian border. The director noted that the applicant claims that he has resided continuously in the United States since that time; however, he submitted very little evidence in support of his eligibility. The director further noted that the applicant submitted several affidavits from individuals attesting to the applicant's continuous residency, but that the affidavits did not include sufficient detail, they were not dated or notarized, and contained inconsistent information. Noting that the applicant failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he met the eligibility requirements, the director denied the application on July 20, 2005.

On appeal, the applicant does not provide any additional evidence or explanation to overcome the reasons for denial of his application. He states, "The affidavits and the supporting documents that I provided to your office are the true and original documents. I am unable to submit any detailed affidavits at this time as I am trying to contact those people who provided me affidavits, but I am unable to contact them at this time . . . I can only provide the affidavits and these are true affidavits. Please reconsider my case and grant my appeal."

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 addressed the grounds stated for denial, nor has he submitted additional relevant evidence. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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