

(b)(6)



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

DATE: **MAR 22 2013** 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.


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

The record indicates that the applicant filed a Form I-687 Application for Temporary Resident Status on January 4, 2006. On September 14, 2006, the director denied the application noting that the applicant failed to appear for fingerprinting. Thus, the director indicated that the application was abandoned.

USCIS subsequently informed the applicant that, pursuant to a recent court order, applications for temporary resident status may not be denied based on abandonment. He was informed that he was entitled to file an appeal with AAO which must be adjudicated on the merits.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). Following *de novo* review, the AAO found that that the director's basis for denial of the Form I-687 was in error. However, the AAO identified alternative grounds for denial of the application. Specifically, the AAO noted that the applicant failed to submit sufficient credible evidence of his continuous residence during the relevant period.

On November 29, 2012, the AAO issued a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) informing the applicant of the deficiencies in the record and providing him with an opportunity to respond. Counsel for the applicant requested a 21 day extension to respond to the NOID. More than three months have lapsed and nothing more has been submitted for the record. On appeal the applicant requested a copy of the record of proceedings. The request was processed on January 17, 2013 (NRC2012113798).

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 substantively respond to the NOID, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

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