

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

L1

Date: NOV 18 2011

Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER

FILE

[REDACTED]

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 of the National Benefits Center. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director erroneously denied the I-687 application, finding that the applicant abandoned the application, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13), by failing to respond to a notice of intent to deny (NOID) the application.<sup>1</sup> Because the director erred in denying the application based on abandonment, on October 12, 2010, the director issued a notice advising the applicant of the right to appeal to the AAO. On September 26, 2011, the AAO withdrew the director's decision. The matter is now before the AAO on appeal.<sup>2</sup>

On September 26, 2011, the AAO issued a NOID regarding the I-687 application, informing the applicant of the deficiencies in the record and providing her with an opportunity to respond.<sup>3</sup> Specifically, the AAO requested that the applicant provide evidence that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since such date for the duration of the requisite period. In addition, the NOID noted that the applicant was born on December 15, 1979, and was, therefore, very young during the requisite statutory period. The NOID requested that the applicant produce evidence of school attendance and vaccinations in the United States, as well as evidence of being cared for by an adult during this period. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence in response to the AAO's request.

---

<sup>1</sup> On December 14, 2009, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ruled that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may not apply its abandonment regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13), in adjudicating legalization applications filed by CSS class members. See, *CSS v. Michael Chertoff*, Case 2:86-cv-01343-LKK-JFM.

<sup>2</sup> On appeal, counsel states that he will submit a brief within 30 days. Counsel has not submitted a brief. Also on appeal, the applicant asserts that her failure to timely file a rebuttal to the NOID is the fault of prior counsel, on whom she relied to her detriment. It is noted that any appeal based upon a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel requires: (1) that the claim be supported by an affidavit of the allegedly aggrieved respondent setting forth in detail the agreement that was entered into with counsel with respect to the actions to be taken and what representations counsel did or did not make to the respondent in this regard, (2) that counsel whose integrity or competence is being impugned be informed of the allegations leveled against him and be given an opportunity to respond, and (3) that the appeal or motion reflect whether a complaint has been filed with appropriate disciplinary authorities with respect to any violation of counsel's ethical or legal responsibilities, and if not, why not. *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), *aff'd*, 857 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1988). The applicant has not submitted any of the required documentation to support an appeal based on ineffective assistance of counsel. Therefore, the applicant is found not to have established a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel.

<sup>3</sup> The NOID noted that at the time of completing the instant I-687 application, the applicant listed a residence for her father in [REDACTED] from 1980 through the end of the requisite period. She did not list any absences from the United States during the requisite period. The NOID noted that the applicant has not submitted any evidence to establish her entry into the United States and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

As stated previously, to meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony, and the sufficiency of all the evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). Here, the applicant has failed to provide probative and credible evidence of her continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

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. Given the paucity of credible evidence contained in the record and the applicant's failure to respond to the NOID, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

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