identifying data deleted to prevent cl[illegible] warranted invasion of [illegible] 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

L1

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: MIAMI Date: JAN 27 2010
MSC 06 097 12454

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, Miami. That decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

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. Specifically, the director noted that the applicant was notified of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) intent to deny his application on August 17, 2007. The director noted that the applicant responded to the NOID but that the evidence submitted was insufficient to overcome the grounds set forth for denial in the Notice Of Intent To Deny (NOID). The application was, accordingly, denied.

On appeal, counsel states that the director incorrectly applied the provisions of Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a, and the provisions of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. Counsel states that a brief will be filed supporting the appeal within 30 days of the filing of the appeal. To date, no brief or additional evidence has been received and the record is deemed complete.

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. The applicant did not specifically address the basis of the director's denial nor did he present additional evidence in support of the appeal. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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