



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

(b)(6)

[Redacted]

DATE: **SEP 13 2013** Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER FILE: [Redacted]

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Permanent Resident Pursuant to Section 13 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1957, Pub. L. No. 85-316, 71 Stat. 642, as amended.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[Redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

Ron M. Rosenberg  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Director (director), National Benefits Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Kenya who is seeking to adjust his status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 13 of the Act of 1957 (“Section 13”), Pub. L. No. 85-316, 71 Stat. 642, as amended, 95 Stat. 1611, 8 U.S.C. § 1255b, as the derivative dependent child of an alien who performed diplomatic or semi-diplomatic duties under section 101(a)(15)(G)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(G)(i).

The director denied the Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status after determining that the applicant’s father had failed to demonstrate that he performed diplomatic or semi-diplomatic duties and that compelling reasons prevent his and his family’s return to Kenya. The director also noted that the U.S. Department of State issued its opinion on January 16, 2013, recommending that the applicant’s father’s adjustment of status be denied because he had no qualifying position and he has failed to provide compelling reasons why he cannot return to Kenya. The director denied the applicant’s adjustment of status application on the basis of his father’s ineligibility for benefits under Section 13. *Decision of the Director*, dated February 6, 2013.

In a separate decision, the AAO upon a *de novo* review of the record dismissed the appeal of the applicant’s father on the grounds that he failed to establish that he performed diplomatic or semi-diplomatic duties.<sup>1</sup> The AAO did not make a determination as to the compelling reasons that prevent the applicant’s father from going back to Kenya. As the applicant’s eligibility for adjustment under Section 13 derives from the eligibility of his father, and the applicant has not provided new facts or evidence separate from those claimed by his father, the AAO finds that the applicant is also ineligible for adjustment of status under Section 13.

For the reasons discussed above, the AAO finds that the applicant is not eligible for adjustment under Section 13. Pursuant to section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361, the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he is eligible for adjustment of status. The applicant has failed to meet that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO’s *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).