

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**

[REDACTED]

L2

FILE:

[REDACTED]

MSC 02 204 63022

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

OCT 31

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:

[REDACTED]

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.

for 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 director in New York City. It is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The director denied the application on the ground that the applicant failed to satisfy the “basic citizenship skills” requirement under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act. Specifically, on two separate occasions – March 15, 2004 and September 10, 2004 – the applicant failed to pass a test of her English language ability and knowledge of U.S. history and government, in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(1). Nor did the applicant satisfy her “basic citizenship skills” requirement in accordance with one of the other two options set forth in the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and (3), or qualify for an exception to the “basic citizenship skills” requirement under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal counsel asserts that the applicant “has numerous ties to the United States and a long period of attachment to American principles.” Denying the applicant permanent resident status, counsel contends, “would result in extreme hardship to herself and her husband.” Counsel supplements the appeal with additional evidence of the applicant’s residence in the United States beginning in October 1987.

As provided in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed.

A review of the decision shows that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not addressed the specific basis for denial – which was her failure to satisfy the “basic citizenship skills” requirement for legalization under the LIFE Act – and has not presented any additional evidence related thereto. In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), therefore, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

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