

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W.; Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L8



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-279-10777

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: DEC 11 2007

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. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, 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.


Robert P. Wiemann, 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 District Director, Los Angeles. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because she found the evidence submitted with the application was insufficient to establish eligibility for Temporary Resident Status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman settlement agreements. Specifically, the director noted that testimony the applicant provided at the time of her interview with a Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) officer regarding when she first met [REDACTED] an affiant from whom she submitted an affidavit, was not consistent with what was shown in his affidavit. The director went on to say that other affidavits in the record did not establish that the affiants from whom they were submitted had known the applicant for the duration of the requisite period. Therefore, the director found that the applicant failed to meet her burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence that she resided continuously in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant submits a Form I-694 Notice of Appeal of Decision on which she states that she was wrongly denied. She asserts that her application was supported by affidavits. She indicates that she will submit a brief to CIS within thirty (30) days. It is noted that CIS received the applicant's Form I-694 on August 8, 2006. As of December 5, 2007, CIS has not received a brief from the applicant. Further, the applicant provided no additional evidence or explanation to overcome the reasons for denial of her application.

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 the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not presented additional evidence. Nor has she addressed the grounds stated for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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