

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

PUBLIC COPY

4



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 05 216 12693

Office: KANSAS CITY

Date: **AUG 03 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:

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.

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, Kansas City. 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 July 30, 2007, and that the applicant did not overcome the reasons set forth for denial.

On appeal, the applicant submits a brief stating that she made a good faith effort to establish her eligibility for benefits, and that the denial of her application is a denial of due process.¹

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 nor did she 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.

¹ 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(3) specifies that a petitioner may be represented "by an attorney in the United States, as defined in § 1.1(f) of this chapter, by an attorney outside the United States as defined in § 292.1(a)(6) of this chapter, or by an accredited representative as defined in § 292.1(a)(4) of this chapter." The appeal in this instance was filed by [REDACTED] (an immigration consulting service). Mr. [REDACTED] submitted a G-28, which was executed by the applicant, authorizing [REDACTED] to represent her in these proceedings. [REDACTED], however, is not an accredited representative as defined in the above cited regulation, and he may not represent the applicant. The applicant is, therefore, deemed to be self-represented.