

**PUBLIC COPY**



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

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



LI

FILE: [Redacted] Office: Cincinnati  
MSC 04 364 10019

Date: JUL 18 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, 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 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 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 reiterates her claim of residence in this country for the requisite period and indicates that she did not possess any additional evidence of her residence because of her young age during this period.

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 she 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 submitted evidence is not relevant, probative, and credible.

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 September 28, 2004. 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 listed [REDACTED] in New York, New York from October 1981 through at least the date of the termination of the original legalization application period on May 4, 1988.

In support of her claim of residence in this country since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted a notarized affidavit that is unsigned but attributed to [REDACTED]. The affidavit indicated that the affiant had known the applicant since 1986 and that she was a hardworking and

dedicated individual. However, the affidavit does not contain any direct testimony relating to the applicant's residence in the United States during the period in question.

The applicant included another notarized affidavit that is unsigned and attributed to Ayyub Howard. The affidavit indicated that the affiant had known the applicant since 1982 and that she was an easy going and dedicated person who cares a lot for people. However, the affidavit does not contain any direct testimony relating to the applicant's residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982.

The fact that the applicant has provided two notarized affidavits neither of which is signed brings into question the origin, authenticity, and credibility of such documents.

On January 18, 2006, the district director issued a notice of intent to deny to the applicant informing her of CIS' intent to deny her Form I-687 application because she had failed to submit sufficient credible evidence of continuous unlawful residence in the United States for the period in question. The applicant was granted thirty days to respond to the notice and provide additional evidence in support of her claim of residence in the requisite period. The record shows that the applicant failed to respond to the notice.

On March 20, 2006, the district director issued a notice of decision to the applicant informing her that her application was denied because she failed to submit sufficient evidence of continuous unlawful residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982.

On appeal, the applicant reiterates her claim of residence in this country for the requisite period and indicates that she did not possess any additional evidence of her residence because of her young age during this period. However, the applicant's young age during the period in question is insufficient to explain the fact that she submitted only two unsigned affidavits to corroborate her claim of residence in this country in the requisite period. Although the applicant herself testified that she resided in the United States from 1981 to June 1988, such testimony cannot be considered as sufficiently probative because she is an interested party with a direct and significant stake in the outcome of this proceeding.

The absence of sufficiently detailed supporting documentation and the questionable nature of the two affidavits contained in the record seriously undermines the credibility of the applicant's claim of residence in this country for the requisite period. 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 submit sufficient documentation to meet her burden of proof in establishing that she 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 failure to provide any credible evidence to corroborate her claim of residence 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 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.