

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



41

FILE:

MSC 05 169 13456

Office: Columbus

Date: **SEP 28 2007**

IN RE:

Applicant:



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 claims that the CIS officer who conducted his interview yelled at him and would not allow him to use the translator that he had brought to the interview. The applicant contends that he does not possess any documents to support his claim of residence in this country since prior to January 1, 1982 as a result of the passage of time. The applicant asserts that it is unfair that he be asked to provide such evidence in light of the fact that such events occurred more than twenty years ago.

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. 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. 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 March 18, 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 listed [REDACTED] from September 1981 through at least the date of the termination of the original legalization application period on May 4, 1988. In addition, at part #31 of the Form I-687 application where applicants were asked to list all affiliations or associations with clubs, organizations, churches, unions, business, etc., the applicant indicated that he was affiliated with the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] September 1981 to June 1999. Nevertheless, the

applicant failed to include any documentation in support of his claim of continuous residence in this country for the period in question. The fact that the applicant failed to submit any supporting documentation seriously diminished his claim of continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982.

The record shows that the applicant subsequently appeared for an interview relating to his Form I-687 application at the CIS office in Columbus, Ohio on October 20, 2005. The notes of the interviewing officer simply state the following: "No proof of residing prior to 1982. No explanation."

On November 22, 2005, the district director issued a notice of intent to deny to the applicant informing him of CIS's intent to deny his application. Specifically, the district director noted that this was based upon the applicant's failure to submit any evidence of continuous unlawful residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982. The applicant was granted twelve weeks to respond to the notice.

In response, the applicant submitted a statement in which he declared that he was unable to provide any documentation in support of his claim of his unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period at this time because he had returned to his home country of Niger with all of these documents. The applicant indicated that he wished to return to Niger and attempt to retrieve all of his documents. However, the applicant failed to provide any explanation as to why such documentation could not be retrieved and mailed to him in this country by a family member or friend currently residing in Niger.

The district director determined that the applicant failed to submit any evidence demonstrating his residence in the United States in an unlawful status from prior to January 1, 1982 and, therefore, denied the Form I-687 application on February 25, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant claims that the CIS officer who conducted his interview yelled at him and would not allow him to use the translator that he had brought to the interview. However, the applicant's claims regarding the events that transpired during his interview can neither be confirmed nor denied from the evidence contained in the record. Rather, the interviewing officer's notes merely reflect that the applicant failed to submit any evidence of his residence in the United States in an unlawful status from prior to January 1, 1982 and that he did not advance any explanation as to why he could not submit such evidence. Further, it must be noted that the applicant failed to raise any objections to the behavior and actions of the interviewing officer in his previous response to the notice of intent to deny.

The applicant contends that he does not possess any documents to support his claim of residence in this country since prior to January 1, 1982 as a result of the passage of time. The applicant asserts that it is unfair that he be asked to provide such evidence in light of the fact that such events occurred more than twenty years ago. While it is acknowledged that it may be difficult to obtain supporting documentation relating to a period that occurred some twenty or more years

ago, the mere passage of time is insufficient to explain the applicant's failure to submit any evidence. The applicant's assertion that it is unfair that he be asked to provide evidence of residence in light of the fact that such events occurred more than twenty years ago is without merit as this is the same burden of proof imposed upon any and all applicants for temporary residence under the provisions of section 245A of the Act by 8 C.F.R. § 245a. 2(d)(5). Moreover, the applicant's statements on appeal regarding his inability to produce evidence demonstrating his residence in the United States must be viewed as less than credible as he had previously claimed in his response to the notice of intent to deny that such documentation was available but that it was located in his home country of Niger.

The absence of any supporting documentation that provides testimony to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date he purportedly 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 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 submit any credible 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 failure to provide any independent evidence to corroborate his claim of residence 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 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.