



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

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

PUBLIC COPY

41



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-217-10307

Office: NEW YORK

Date: SEP 12 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:



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 failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under this section. The director also noted that the applicant failed to submit additional evidence in response to the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID). As a result, the director denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant reiterated that he is eligible for temporary residence and submitted a new declaration in support of his application.

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 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 applicant 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 applicant 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 and 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 he resided 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 of 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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on May 5, 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 showed his only address during the requisite period to be [REDACTED] Brooklyn, New York from December 1981 to February 1989. The applicant did not include any evidence of his residence in the United States during the requisite period with his initial I-687 filing.

A Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) was issued to the applicant's last known address on March 7, 2006 and returned as unclaimed. In the NOID, the director explained that the applicant had not demonstrated eligibility for the benefit sought. Specifically, the applicant had provided no documentation to confirm his continuous unlawful presence in the United States during the requisite period.

In denying the application, the director explained that the applicant failed to submit additional documentation in response to the NOID in the time allotted. The director found that the applicant had failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under this section.

On appeal, the applicant reiterated that he meets the requirements for temporary resident status. He also submitted a signed declaration from the Kelly Temple Church in support of his application. In this declaration, [REDACTED] stated that the applicant visited his church in 1982 to learn English as a second language. This declaration fails to confirm the applicant resided continuously in the United States during the requisite period.

In summary, the applicant has not provided any contemporaneous evidence of residence in the United States relating to the 1981-88 period, and has submitted one declaration that fails to confirm his residence during the requisite period.

The absence of sufficiently detailed and consistent 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 fact that the applicant provided no evidence that directly supports 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 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.