

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

OCT 31 2009

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEW YORK  
MSC 02 239 60579

Date:

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. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter 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.

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, 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 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.

On appeal, the applicant states that the thirty (30) days he was given to provide additional evidence was insufficient for him to gather the evidence requested since he had entered the United States almost three decades ago, and had multiple relocations. The applicant also asserts that he is eligible for LIFE legalization as a matter of law. The applicant does not submit any additional evidence on appeal.

In the Notice of Decision, dated July 6, 2007, the director denied the instant application. The director noted that the applicant failed to submit additional evidence requested by the director in a May 17, 2007 notice of intent to deny (NOID). It is noted that there is no indication in the record that the applicant requested additional time to submit evidence requested in the NOID.

On appeal, the applicant does not state a reason for the appeal. The record does not reflect receipt of an appeal brief, and the applicant does not submit any additional evidence on appeal. As of the date of this decision, no additional evidence has been submitted. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

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 that 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.