U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529 - 2090

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: NEW YORK Date: SEP 24 2009

MSC-05-218-10626

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.

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, New York. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The director stated that the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to meet his burden of proof to establish his eligibility for the benefit sought. In addition, the director noted that on December 8, 2005 the applicant signed a sworn statement stating that he first arrived in the United States in 1991.

On appeal, the applicant asserts, through counsel, that he has established his continuous unlawful residence for the requisite time period. On appeal, counsel argues that affidavits submitted are sufficient evidence of the applicant's continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.[1] On appeal, counsel indicated that brief would be mailed in 30 days. As of this date, the AAO has not received a brief from counsel. Therefore, the record is 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 denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not presented any new evidence of his entry into the United States or his continuous residence during the requisite period. The applicant fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the application. Nor has he specifically addressed the basis for denial. As the applicant presents no additional evidence relevant to the grounds for denial, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv).

---

[1] The AAO has reviewed the affidavits in the record of proceeding and agrees with the director that the evidence submitted does not provide sufficient evidence to overcome the burden of proof necessary to establish his eligibility for the benefit sought. None of the witness statements provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of those associations and demonstrate that they were a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence during the time addressed in the affidavits. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that the relationship probably did exist and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

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