



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



41

FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **NOV 18 2005**

IN RE:


Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 210 of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1160

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the service center that processed your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, you no longer have a case pending before this office, and you are not entitled to file a motion to reopen or reconsider your case.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker was denied by the Director, Western Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to establish the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the eligibility period. This decision was based on adverse information acquired by the Service relating to the applicant's claim of employment for [REDACTED]

On appeal, the applicant reaffirmed his claimed employment.

In order to be eligible for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker, an alien must have engaged in qualifying agricultural employment for at least 90 man-days during the twelve-month period ending May 1, 1986, and must be otherwise admissible under section 210(c) of the Act and not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(d). 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(a). An applicant has the burden of proving the above by a preponderance of the evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b).

On the Form I-700 application, the applicant claimed to have worked 94 man-days thinning lettuce and picking cantaloupes for [REDACTED] in Yuma, Arizona from October 1985 to March 1986.

In support of this claim, the applicant submitted a corresponding Form I-705 affidavit signed by [REDACTED] and a photocopied letter from [REDACTED] Bookkeeper of Senini Farming Company, affirming Mr [REDACTED] employment there on a seasonal basis.

In attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the Service acquired information which contradicted the applicant's claim. On August 9, 1988 [REDACTED] pled guilty to a document fraud charge stemming from his sale of employment documents. Mr [REDACTED] admitted that "no one with an amnesty letter from me is eligible for amnesty through employment with me, and all my amnesty letters and affidavits are false."

On November 22, 1991, the applicant was advised in writing of the adverse information obtained by the Service, and of the Service's intent to deny the application. The applicant was granted thirty days to respond. The record does not contain a response to the notice.

The director concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence, and denied the application January 10, 1992. On appeal, the applicant requested a copy of his file through the Freedom of Information Act. The Service complied with the request on June 1, 2004. The applicant stated that he did work more than 90 man-days, but that he did not keep any documentary evidence of his employment.

Generally, the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility, and amenability to verification. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b)(1). Evidence submitted by an applicant will have its sufficiency judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b)(2). Personal testimony by an applicant which is not corroborated, in whole or in part, by other credible evidence (including testimony by persons other than the applicant) will not serve to meet an applicant's burden of proof. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b)(3).

There is no mandatory type of documentation required with respect to the applicant's burden of proof; however, the documentation must be credible. All documents submitted must have an appearance of reliability, i.e., if the documents appear to have been forged, or otherwise deceitfully created or obtained, the documents are not credible. *United Farm Workers (AFL-CIO) v. INS, Civil No. S-87-1064-JFM (E.D. Cal.)*.

After examining his records, admitted under oath that all employment verification letters signed by him are false. This directly contradicts the applicant's claim. The applicant has not overcome such derogatory evidence. Therefore, the documentary evidence submitted by the applicant cannot be considered as having any probative value or evidentiary weight.

The applicant has failed to establish credibly the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the twelve-month statutory period ending May 1, 1986. Consequently, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.