

identifying data deleted
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

L1

FILE:



Office: LAS VEGAS

Date:

FEB 12 2009

MSC 04 267 10078

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:

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, Las Vegas. 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 he continuously resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. Specifically, the director noted that the applicant was served with a Notice Of Intent To Deny (NOID). The applicant submitted no additional evidence in response to the NOID and asked that the evidence already submitted be reviewed. The director reviewed the evidence with no new finding of eligibility. The director stated that the applicant failed to provide any documentary evidence for the requisite period and that the affidavits filed by the applicant did not corroborate the applicant's testimony.

On appeal, the applicant states, in part, that his response to the NOID was a request that his evidence be reconsidered. The applicant states that he hopes this will be taken into consideration and his application approved.

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 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.