

identity data deleted to
prevent
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

AA

FEB 17 2008



FILE:



Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date:

IN RE:

Applicant:



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 PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

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 Cuba 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 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 District Director determined that the applicant was not eligible for adjustment of status because he was not inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States. The District Director, therefore, denied the application. See *District Director's decision* dated June 15, 2004.

The applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the District Director's findings. No additional evidence has been entered into the record.

The application for adjustment of status, filed on April 26, 2002, shows that the applicant claimed to have entered the United States on June 9, 1980. On August 2, 2003, the applicant appeared before Citizenship and Immigration Services, (CIS) for an interview regarding his application for permanent residence. The applicant stated that he entered the United States during the Mariel boatlift and that that he was issued an indefinite parole. No evidence was furnished by the applicant in support of this claim. In addition, a search of CIS electronic databases did not reveal any record of the applicant being issued a parole.

8 C.F.R. § 245.2(a)(2)(ii) provides, in part:

An application for the benefits of section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966 is not properly filed unless the applicant was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959. An applicant is ineligible for the benefits of the Act of November 2, 1966 unless he or she has been physically present in the United States for one year.

The applicant bears the burden of proving that he in fact presented himself for inspection as an element of establishing eligibility for adjustment of status. *Matter of Areguillin*, 17 I&N Dec. 308 (BIA 1980). The applicant has failed to meet that burden.

The applicant has presented no evidence that he was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States. Therefore, the applicant is not eligible for the benefit sought. The decision of the District Director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The District Director's decision is affirmed.