

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

41



FILE:



MSC 06 068 11398

Office: SAN DIEGO

Date:

JUL 01 2009

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. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, 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.

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

The director denied the application on May 22, 2007, because the applicant did not establish that he continuously resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

The applicant filed an appeal from the director's decision on June 10, 2007. On appeal, the applicant provides a brief statement requesting that his case be reconsidered for humanitarian reasons. On appeal, the applicant failed to specifically address the director's analysis of his evidence, and did not furnish any additional evidence.

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. On appeal, the applicant has not presented additional evidence. Nor has he specifically addressed the basis for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

As always in these proceedings, the burden of proof rests solely with the applicant. Section 245a.2(d)(5) of the Act.

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