

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

PUBLIC COPY

L 1

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-166-10075

Office: NEW YORK

Date: AUG 15 2007

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided 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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreements reached in *Catholic Social Services, Inc., et al., v. Ridge, et al.*, CIV. NO. S-86-1343-LKK (E.D. Cal) January 23, 2004, and *Felicity Mary Newman, et al., v. United States Immigration and Citizenship Services, et al.*, CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK (C.D. Cal) February 17, 2004, (CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements) was denied by the District Director, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director determined the applicant had not demonstrated that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through the date that she attempted to file a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident, with the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services or CIS) in the original legalization application period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. Therefore, the director determined that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she has resided in the United States from 1981 until May 1988. The applicant maintains that the evidence she submitted is credible.

An applicant for temporary resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2).

An applicant applying for adjustment to temporary resident status must establish that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States since November 6, 1986. Section 245A(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(3).

For purposes of establishing residence and presence in accordance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b), "until the date of filing" shall mean until the date the alien attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to timely file, consistent with the class member definitions set forth in the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. CSS Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 6; Newman Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 10.

An alien applying for adjustment of status has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. 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. § 245a.2(d)(5).

Although the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit in support of his or her claim of continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982, the submission of any other relevant document is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The “preponderance of the evidence” standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant's claim is “probably true,” where the determination of “truth” is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). In evaluating the evidence, *Matter of E-M-* also stated that “[t]ruth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality.” *Id.* Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the petitioner submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is “probably true” or “more likely than not,” the applicant or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. See *U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421 (1987) (defining “more likely than not” as a greater than 50 percent probability of something occurring). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application or petition.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that she resided in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date she attempted to file a Form I-687 application with the Service in the original legalization application period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. Here, the submitted evidence is not relevant, probative, and credible.

The record shows that the applicant filed a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident, and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet, with CIS on March 15, 2005. Part 30 of this application requests the applicant to list all of her residences in the United States since her first entry. The applicant responded that she resided at [REDACTED] Bronx, New York from December 1981 until February 1994. Part 33 of this application requests the applicant to list her employment in the United States since her entry. The applicant responded that she has been self-employed as a vendor in New York, New York from December 1981 until February 2005. The applicant failed to indicate on her application the location of her employment as a vendor, other than to indicate New York City.

The applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that she has resided in the United States for the requisite period. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). To meet her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from her own testimony. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of

documentation that may be provided to establish proof of continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period. This list includes: past employment records; utility bills; school records; hospital or medical records; attestations by churches, unions or other organizations; money order receipts; passport entries; birth certificates of children; bank books; letters or correspondence involving the applicant; social security card; selective service card; automobile receipts and registration; deeds, mortgages or contracts; tax receipts; and insurance policies, receipts, or letters. An applicant may also submit "any other relevant document." 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The applicant submitted in support of her application a letter from [REDACTED]; a letter from the President of the Ghanaian Association of Westchester, Inc.; and a letter from Yaw Fia. The letter from the Ghanaian Association of Westchester, Inc. provides that the president of the association has known the applicant since May 1990. The letter from [REDACTED] provides that [REDACTED] has known the applicant since late 1989. The issue in this proceeding is the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite time period. Since the letters from the Ghanaian Association of Westchester and [REDACTED] verify the applicant's presence in the United States subsequent to the requisite time period, they are not relevant evidence for this proceeding.

The letter from [REDACTED] provides that, "[t]he above named patient is known to this office since 11/11/86 and we still provide her medical needs from this office." This letter is not probative evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite time period because it lacks considerable detail. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(iv) provides that credible proof of residence may be in the form of "medical records showing treatment or hospitalization of the applicant . . . must show the name of the medical facility or physician and the date(s) of the treatment." This letter fails to provide medical records showing the medical treatment of the applicant. The letter, dated November 22, 2005, also fails to indicate the source of information [REDACTED] referred to in order to obtain the applicant's November 11, 1986 start date as his patient.

Although the letter from [REDACTED] provides some information on his knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period, it does not alone satisfy the applicant's burden of proof. This letter can only be afforded minimal value as probative evidence because it lacks considerable detail. As stated above, the "preponderance of the evidence" standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant's claim is "probably true," where the determination of "truth" is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). The applicant has been given the opportunity to satisfy her burden of proof with a broad range of evidence pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3). The applicant submitted one letter, as corroborating evidence of her residence during the requisite period, to satisfy her burden of proof. On May 14, 2006, the applicant received the director's Notice of Decision, which provides, "[g]iven the paucity of the evidence contained in the record, you have failed to submit documents that would constitute a preponderance of evidence as to your residence in the United States." On appeal, the applicant submitted her written statement, which provides, "[m]y testimony and documentation provided

at the interview were sufficient to warrant a favorable exercise of discretion because I demonstrated eligibility for the benefit sought.” The applicant failed to provide any other documentation to corroborate her claim of continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period. The applicant’s failure to provide any other evidence to establish her continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period renders a finding that she has failed to satisfy her burden of proof, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). The applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence to establish that her claim is “probably true” pursuant to *Matter of E-M-, supra*.

The absence of sufficiently detailed supporting documentation to corroborate the applicant’s claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of this claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. Given the applicant’s reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that she has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date she attempted to file a Form I-687 application as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E-M-, supra*. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis.

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