

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

L1



FILE:



MSC-06-070-10940

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

OCT 30 2008

IN RE:

Applicant:



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:



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, New York and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The applicant must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States since such date through the date the application is considered filed pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2).

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Act, and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet, on December 9, 2005. The director denied the application on March 7, 2007, after determining that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided or had been continuously physically present in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. The director noted the multiple inconsistencies with regard to the applicant's claimed entry into and his absences from the United States during the requisite period. The director also noted the inconsistencies in the applicant's evidence submitted with regard to his claimed residence in Los Angeles, California while simultaneously working in New York. The director further noted the contradiction in statements made by the applicant concerning his father's physical demeanor and the date photographs were allegedly taken of him in New York. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met his burden of proof and was, therefore, not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the evidence submitted and statements made by the applicant are credible. Counsel further asserts that the director incorrectly took into consideration all documents contained in the applicant's file, and that the entry date that appears on the applicant's Form G-325 was a result of a clerical error and should have read 1981 rather than 1991. Counsel asserts that the applicant has met all statutory requirements and that he has established his eligibility for temporary resident status. The applicant does not submit any evidence on appeal. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

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

A review of the director's decision reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not presented any evidence to overcome the director's decision. Nor has he specifically 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.