



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

41

FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC 06 101 22841

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **OCT 23 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:

[REDACTED]

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.

Perry Rhew  
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, Los Angeles. The decision 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, and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet. 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.

On appeal, counsel requests a copy of the materials contained in the administrative record related to his client's applicant plus any additional information that was used as the basis for the denial. Counsel requests that the period to file his brief and additional evidence be automatically extended until thirty days after the record is received in accordance with his request. The record shows the applicant's Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts request for the Record of Proceedings (ROP) was processed and responded to on April 8, 2009. Counsel requested an automatic extension of thirty days beyond receipt of his client's ROP and indicated he would file his brief and additional evidence to the AAO; however, he has not done so. Therefore, the record is considered complete.

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 that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for the denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not addressed the grounds stated for denial, nor has he presented additional evidence. The appeal shall therefore be summarily dismissed.

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