

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

LI

JUL 11 2007

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: Cincinnati  
MSC 05 257 12495

Date:

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, Cleveland, Ohio, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The district director determined that the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through the date that he 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 between May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. Therefore, the district director concluded 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 contends that any discrepancy in his testimony at his interview regarding the date he first entered the United States was the result of miscommunication arising from his inability to understand English. The applicant requests that he be granted another interview with his interpreter. The applicant submits documents in support of his appeal.

An alien applying for adjustment to temporary resident status must establish that he or she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he or she has resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. Section 245A(a)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b).

An alien 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 and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

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. *See* Paragraph 11, page 6 of the CSS Settlement Agreement and paragraph 11, page 10 of the Newman Settlement Agreement.

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. *See* 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 including affidavits 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.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to establish continuous residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date he attempted to file a Form I-687 application with the Service in the original legalization application period from May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. Here, the applicant has failed to submit any evidence to support his claim of residence in this country for the period in question.

The record shows that the applicant submitted a Form I-687 application and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet, to CIS on June 14, 2005. At part #30 of the Form I-687 application where applicants were asked to list all residences in the United States since first entry, the applicant failed to list any residences in this country prior to the year 2000. The fact that the applicant failed to list any residence in this country prior to 2000 at part #30 of the Form I-687 application seriously diminished his claim of continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982. Further, the applicant failed to include any documentation in support of his claim of continuous residence in this country for the period in question.

The record shows that the applicant subsequently appeared for an interview relating to his Form I-687 application at the Citizenship and Immigration Services office in Cincinnati, Ohio on January 9, 2006. The notes of the interviewing officer reflect that the applicant testified under oath that he first entered the United States in October 26, 1999. In addition, the record contains the applicant's Form I-94, Arrival/Departure Record, which reflects that he entered this country this country as a B-1 visitor at New York, New York on October 26, 1999 with a period of authorized stay until January 25, 2000. The applicant's testimony that he first entered the United States on October 26, 1999 directly contradicted his claim to have continuously resided in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982.

On January 13, 2006, the district director issued a notice of decision to the applicant informing him that his application was denied because of his sworn testimony at his interview on January 9, 2006 that he first entered this country on October 26, 1999.

On appeal, the applicant contends that any discrepancy in his testimony at his interview regarding the date he first entered the United States was the result of miscommunication arising from his inability to understand English. The applicant requests that he be granted another interview with his interpreter. However, the applicant failed to list any residence in this country prior to the year 2000 at part #30 of the Form I-687 application that was submitted on June 15, 2005. The record shows that the applicant testified under oath that he first entered the United States on October 26, 1999 at his interview on January 9, 2006. In addition, the applicant failed to submit any independent evidence to corroborate his claim of residence in this country for the requisite period. Although the applicant provided documentation relating to his identity and residence in this country subsequent to October 26, 1999, such evidence is neither relevant nor probative of his claim of residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982. The applicant has failed to advance any compelling reason as to how another interview with an interpreter would overcome his admission that he first entered this country on October 26, 1999, his failure to list any residence in the United States prior to the year 2000 on the Form I-687 application, and his failure to submit any evidence to substantiate his claimed residence in the United States for the period in question.

The applicant's contradictory testimony regarding the date he first entered the United States and the absence of independent evidence that provides relevant and material testimony to corroborate his claim of continuous residence for the 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. The applicant has failed to any documentation to meet his burden of proof in establishing that he has resided in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 by a preponderance of the evidence as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. at 77.

Given the applicant's contradictory testimony and failure to provide any independent evidence to corroborate his claim of residence, 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 as required under section 245A(a)(2) of the Act. 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.