

identifying data released to
prevent clearly warranted
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

L1

FILE:

[REDACTED]
MSC 05 278 10684

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

AUG 15 2008

IN RE:

Applicant: [REDACTED]

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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, Los Angeles, California. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

On August 16, 2006, the director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met her burden of proof. The director specifically noted inconsistencies between the applicant's August 1, 2006 testimony, her Form I-687, and affidavits submitted by third parties. The director also observed that photocopies of some of the receipts submitted bore evidence of altered dates. The director concluded that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Agreements.

On appeal, the applicant claims that she entered into the United States in 1971 and that she has sent the most papers she can. The applicant asserts that the application was denied not because she lacked proof of her claim but because she answered questions inappropriately at her August 1, 2006 interview. The applicant states that she misspoke when stating that she applied for late amnesty in 1986 and she meant to say that she applied for late amnesty in 1987 when she returned from Mexico. The applicant does not submit any new documentation. The applicant's statement on appeal does not specifically address the director's analysis of the evidence including all the inconsistencies in the record regarding her continuous residence in the United States for the requisite time period on appeal. The applicant fails to identify a basis for the appeal.

As stated 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 reveals that the director set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not presented new additional evidence associated with this matter. Nor has she specifically addressed the inconsistencies in the record that are the basis for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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