

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

LI

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 06 068 12774

Office: NEW YORK

Date: **APR 02 2009**

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:

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.

John F. Grissom
Acting 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 Director, New York. That decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant did not establish that she continuously resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. Specifically, the director noted that the applicant was notified of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) intent to deny her application on April 23, 2007. The director noted that the applicant responded to the NOID with a letter from her attorney, which failed to address the necessary residency or continuous physical presence requirements. Accordingly, the director denied the application.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief stating simply that the applicant arrived in the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and was thereafter prevented from applying for legalization between May 5, 1987 and May 4, 1988. Counsel states that the applicant “has submitted some documents to confirm her presence during the statutory period,” but is unable to obtain evidence from earlier years to demonstrate eligibility under the current legalization process. Counsel does not discuss or identify the evidence to which he refers with reference to the reasons set forth by the director in denying the application, and asks that the appeal be granted for humanitarian reasons.

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 accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. The applicant did not specifically address the basis of the director’s denial (that the evidence submitted did not establish the applicant’s residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period) nor did he present additional evidence in support of the appeal. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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