

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

L2

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 02 044 62333

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: APR 27 2007

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. All documents have been returned
to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

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, Los Angeles, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act; 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b). The director found that the applicant had entered the United States pursuant to a valid passport and visa prior to January 1, 1982 and failed to establish that her period of authorized stay as a nonimmigrant expired before such date through the passage of time or that the alien's unlawful status was known to the Government as of such date. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). The director further determined that the applicant had exceeded the forty-five (45) day limit for a single absence from the United States during this period, as set forth in the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(c)(1), and that the applicant failed to establish that her three months absence from the United States, from July to October 1986, was due to emergent reasons.

On appeal, the applicant states that she submitted all of the required evidence prior to the interview. The applicant submitted no further documentation on appeal, and did not address any of the director's grounds for denial of the application.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, 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.

The applicant has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding; therefore, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

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