U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

[redacted]

A2

JAN 13 2004

FILE: [redacted] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date:

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[redacted]

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Acting District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The acting district director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Colombia who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. This Act provides, in pertinent part:

> [T]he status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, (now the Secretary of Homeland Security, (Secretary)), in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

The district director determined that the applicant was not eligible for adjustment of status as the child of a native or citizen of Cuba, pursuant to section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966, because her stepmother's marriage to her father was determined to be fraudulent. The district director, therefore, denied the application.

The record reflects that on March 25, 2002 at Miami, Florida, the applicant's father married [redacted] a native and citizen of Cuba whose immigration status was adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident of the United States, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA. Based on that marriage, on July 2, 2002, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

The record contains a Memorandum of Investigation dated June 19, 2003. Based on the investigation it was determined that the marriage between the applicant's father and Ms. [redacted] was fraudulent and the acting district director denied the application

for adjustment of status. Since the applicant father's marriage to Ms. was deemed fraudulent the claimed relationship between the applicant and Ms. is not valid and the application for adjustment was denied accordingly.

On notice of certification, the applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the acting district director's findings. In response to the notice of certification, counsel submitted a statement addressing the memorandum of investigation, refuting the finding of the acting district director. Counsel's statement was taken into consideration, but the acting district director's decision regarding the validity of the marriage between Ms. and the applicant's father was affirmed by the AAO.

The applicant is not a native or a citizen of Cuba, nor is she residing with her Cuban citizen stepmother in the United States. She is, therefore, ineligible for adjustment of status pursuant to section 1 of the CAA of November 2, 1966.

Pursuant to section 291 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she is eligible for adjustment of status. She has failed to meet that burden.

The decision of the acting district director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The acting district director's decision is affirmed.