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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

A2

FILE: [redacted] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date: NOV 15 2005

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: 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 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 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 Acting 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 she entered into the marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. *See Acting District Director Decision* dated April 26, 2005.

The record reflects that on February 17, 2004, at Plantation, 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 March 10, 2004, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

On March 7, 2005, the applicant and her spouse [redacted] appeared before Citizenship and Immigration Services, (CIS) for an interview regarding the application for permanent residence. The applicant and [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 Acting 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.

On March 7, 2005, [redacted] admitted in writing and under oath that his marriage with the applicant was for the sole purpose of assisting her to obtain permanent resident status in the United States. [redacted] further stated that he was to be paid $6,000 ($3,000 at the time of the wedding and $3,000 after the interview) in order to assist the applicant acquire permanent resident status and that he and the applicant never resided together as husband and wife.

On notice of certification, the applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the Acting District Director's findings. No additional evidence has been entered into the record.

Based on the sworn statement by the applicant's spouse it is concluded that the applicant's marriage was entered into for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States.

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. Here the applicant has failed to meet that burden. Accordingly, the Acting District Director's decision to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The Acting District Director's decision is affirmed.