

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



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:

Office: TAMPA

Date: JUN 25 2009

MSC-05-281-11244

IN RE:

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, or *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 of the Tampa office, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status because the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite time period.

In addition, the director determined that the applicant failed to establish that he is eligible for class membership pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman settlement agreements.¹ Nonetheless, by adjudicating the application on the merits, the director treated the applicant as a class member.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the evidence previously submitted by the applicant establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite time period. Counsel asserts that he will submit a brief as well as additional evidence after the FOIA request is received.

The record reflects that the FOIA request was completed on May 18, 2009. No brief or additional evidence has been submitted.

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 decision reveals the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not addressed the grounds stated for denial, nor has he presented additional evidence relevant to the grounds for denial or the stated reason for appeal. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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

¹ The director noted the inconsistency between the applicant's answer at the time of his interview that he was front-desked on two previous attempts to apply for legalization, for reasons unrelated to travel, and his answer in the instant Form I-687 application, at number 14, where the applicant stated that he had not previously applied for temporary residence as a legalization applicant.