

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

62



FILE:



Office: NEW YORK

Date:

OCT 03

MSC-06-091-11162

IN RE:


Applicant:



APPLICATION:


Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 245A of the  
Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



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 temporary resident status pursuant to 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), was denied by the District Director, New York. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

In the Notice of Denial, dated December 13, 2006, the director noted that the affidavits submitted by the applicant lack sufficient detail and credibility. She also noted several inconsistencies in the record which cast doubt on the reliability of the evidence submitted by the applicant.

On the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the AAO, filed on January 17, 2007, counsel for the applicant simply asserts the following, "I have applied for benefits under the LIFE act and I have been instructed of the deficiencies in a previous notice of intent to deny my LIFE application. This deficiencies are the same for the present case I-687 and I am sending you my proposal and formal response."

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(r) state, 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.

A review of the decision reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. In as much as counsel and the applicant have failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

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