



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY
identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



L 1

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 05 355 14068

Office: PHILADELPHIA

Date: DEC 26 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, Philadelphia. The director subsequently rejected the applicant's appeal as untimely filed. The director's decision rejecting the applicant's appeal will be withdrawn and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet. The director determined that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met his burden of proof and was, therefore, not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

The applicant's appeal from the denial decision was received on January 16, 2007. Any appeal with the required fee shall be filed with the Service Center within thirty (30) days after service of the notice of denial. The 30-day period for submitting an appeal begins 3 days after the Notice of Decision is mailed. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.20(b)(1). The record reflects that the denial decision, which was dated December 12, 2006, was not mailed to the applicant until December 13, 2006. The appeal was received on January 16, 2007, 34 days after the denial decision was mailed. However, the thirty-third day of the appeal period fell on January 15, 2007, a federal holiday. Since no mail was delivered on that day, the thirty-third day is properly considered to be the next business day, January 16, 2007. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The applicant's appeal was received on that date; therefore, the appeal was timely filed. Accordingly, the director's rejection of the appeal as untimely filed is hereby withdrawn.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that the denial decision was based on an "improper application of law."

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 Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). The applicant must also 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). The regulations clarify that the applicant must have been physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the term "until the date of filing" in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1) means until the date the applicant attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to

timely file during the original legalization application period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. CSS Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 6; Newman Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 10.

The applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite period, 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.* at 80. 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 he resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. Here, the submitted evidence is not relevant, probative, and credible.

In an attempt to establish continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period, the applicant submitted an affidavit that attests to the applicant’s residence in the United States after the requisite period and a “fill-in-the-blank” affidavit dated September 14, 2006, from [REDACTED]. Mr. [REDACTED] who indicated that he had resided in the United States since 1987, failed to provide any information as to the date he first met the applicant, the basis of his acquaintance with the applicant, the frequency of his contact with the applicant, or the

applicant's addresses in the United States during the requisite period. Therefore, this affidavit cannot be accorded any evidentiary weight.

On appeal the applicant objects to the denial of his application because his affidavits "were deficient in details." The applicant's objection is without merit. The applicant has submitted only one affidavit in support of his claim of continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period. As previously stated, the affiant, [REDACTED], did not provide *any* information regarding his knowledge of the applicant's residence and physical presence in the United States during the requisite period. Therefore, this one affidavit is insufficient to corroborate the applicant's claim.

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 a document with minimal probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date he 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.