




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identity data deleted to
protect privacy of individuals
in accordance with Departmental policy

PERMITS TO REMAIN

A2



FILE: [Redacted]

Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA

Date: OCT 13 2008

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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 Argentina 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 and his spouse are not residing together. The District Director, therefore, denied the application. See *District Director's Decision* dated January 24, 2005.

The record reflects that on February 29, 2004, at Hialeah, 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 15, 2004, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

On January 24, 2005, the applicant and his spouse [REDACTED] appeared before Citizenship and Immigration Services, (CIS) for an interview regarding the application for permanent residence. On the same day [REDACTED] stated under oath and in writing that she and the applicant have never resided together as husband and wife, that she married the applicant in order to help him and that she continues to reside with her previous spouse.

Although the provisions of section 1 of the CAA are applicable to the spouse or child of an alien described in the CAA, 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.

On notice of certification, 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.

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.