identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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

[redacted]

L1

Date: SEP 06 2011 Office: NEW YORK 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

Elizabeth M'Cormack

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, New York, New York, based on abandonment. The director subsequently reopened the proceeding.[1] 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 July 11, 2005. The director incorrectly denied the application based on abandonment pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13). The AAO conducts a *de novo* review, evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence in the record according to its probative value and credibility as required by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).[2] Following *de novo* review, the AAO found that that the director's basis for denial of the applicant's 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 to support her application. Further, the applicant did not establish that she was admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act.

On July 26, 2011, the AAO sent the applicant a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) informing the applicant of the deficiencies in her application and providing her with an opportunity to submit additional evidence to establish that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since such date for the duration of the requisite period and that she was admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act. The applicant did not respond to the AAO's request.

The AAO has reviewed all of the evidence, and has made a *de novo* decision based on the record and the AAO's assessment of the credibility, relevance and probative value of the evidence.

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 Notice, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

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

---

[1] 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.

[2] The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. *See Soltane v. DOJ,* 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).