U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

A2

[redacted]

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]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native and citizen of Peru 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. The CAA 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 spouse of a native or citizen of Cuba, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA of November 2, 1966, because he entered into the marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. *See District Director Decision* dated March 30, 2004.

The record reflects that on March 30, 2002, at Miami, Florida, the applicant 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 April 11, 2002, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

On March 29, 2004, the applicant and his spouse [redacted] appeared before Citizenship and Immigration Services, (CIS) for an interview regarding the application for permanent residence. The applicant and Ms. [redacted] were each placed under oath and questioned separately regarding their domestic life and shared experiences. Citing *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983), and *Matter of Phillis*, 15 I&N Dec. 385 (BIA 1975), the District Director maintained that when there is reason to doubt the bona fides of a marital relationship, evidence must be presented to show that the marriage was not entered into solely for the purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. The District Director determined that the discrepancies encountered at the interview, and the lack of material evidence presented, strongly suggest that the applicant and his spouse entered into a marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States.

On notice of certification, the applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the District Director's findings. Counsel submits a brief and affidavits from the applicant and [redacted] Both the applicant and [redacted] state that their marriage was a bona fide one but due to differences they decided to separate on May 1, 2004. The applicant, [redacted] and counsel all state that the marriage was not entered into for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws. No additional documentary evidence was provided except for their own affidavits.

A review of the recently submitted documentation, and the documentation in the record, when considered in its totality, cannot overcome the discrepancies that were encountered during the interview on March 29, 2004.

Although the provisions of section 1 of the Act are applicable to the spouse or child of an alien described in the Act, it has been held in *Matter of Bellido*, 12 I&N Dec. 369 (Reg. Comm. 1967), that an applicant who is not a native or citizen of Cuba and is not residing with the Cuban citizen spouse in the United States, is ineligible for adjustment of status pursuant to section 1 of the CAA.

The applicant is not a native or a citizen of Cuba, nor is he residing with his Cuban citizen spouse in the United States. He is, therefore, ineligible for adjustment of status pursuant to section 1 of the CAA.

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 he is eligible for adjustment of status. He has failed to meet that burden.

The decision of the District Director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The District Director's decision is affirmed.