

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

41

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-06-082-10040

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

SEP 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, Los Angeles, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The applicant must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States since such date through the date the application is considered filed pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2).

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 Class Membership Worksheet. The director denied the application after determining that 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 period. The director noted that the applicant failed to submit evidence to demonstrate how he, as an eleven year old child, was employed and was able to survive in the United States throughout the requisite period. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met his burden of proof and was, therefore, not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he entered the United States in 1981, attended school from 1981 to 1985, was supported by [REDACTED] and was employed as a farm laborer from 1986 to 2005. The applicant does not submit any new evidence on appeal. To meet his burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his own testimony. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

Although the applicant submitted a letter from the Compton Unified School District which indicated that he attended Mayo Elementary School from September 13, 1981 through June 19, 1984; and Roosevelt Jr. High from September 11, 1984 through June 21, 1987; it is not certified and is unsigned. It is noted that the letter was not delivered to the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) office in a sealed envelope, as requested by the director, and that the letter is not accompanied by any official school transcripts. It is also noted that the school letter is inconsistent with the applicant's statement on appeal, that he attended school from 1981 to 1985. The inconsistency casts doubt on the applicant's evidence and proof. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

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 director's decision reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the Form I-687 application. On appeal, the applicant has not provided any relevant evidence to overcome the director's decision. Nor has he overcome, by his assertions, the basis for the denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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