

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 20529-2090
MAIL STOP



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L1

FILE:

MSC 06 031 14720

Office: NEW YORK

Date: DEC 01 2008

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:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the National Benefits [or Records] Center. 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.

John F. Grissom, Acting 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 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.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant reasserted the applicant's claim and stated that Citizenship and Immigration Services' (CIS') expectations regarding document production are unfair and contrary to the settlement agreements.

Subsequent to the filing of the appeal, the applicant submitted a letter to the AAO on July 30, 2008 requesting that his Form I-687 application and appeal be withdrawn. Although this request to withdraw the appeal shall be honored, the following facts must be noted.

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 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

Under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, 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 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 made a claim to class membership in a legalization class-action lawsuit and as such, was permitted to file a Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status Pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), on June 29, 1990 and again on October 31, 2005. In support of his claim of residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted, *inter alia*, seven original postmarked envelopes. Of the seven envelopes, one envelope, i.e., the envelope postmarked July 13, 1986, bore a United Nations fortieth anniversary stamp, which is listed at page 185 of Volume 5 of the *2006 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* (Scott Publishing Company 2005) and is listed as catalogue number 871 A345. The catalogue lists this stamp's date of issue as August 8, 1986.

The fact that the envelope purportedly mailed from Peru to the applicant in the United States in 1986 bears a stamp that was not issued until after the postmark date that appears on the envelope, establishes that the applicant utilized this document in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations in an attempt to establish his residence within the United States for the requisite period. By engaging in such action, the applicant negated his own credibility as well as the credibility of his claim of continuous residence in this country for the period from prior to January 1, 1982.

Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

By filing the instant application and submitting a falsified document, the applicant has sought to procure a benefit provided under the Act through fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact. Because the applicant has failed to provide independent and objective evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, our finding that he submitted a falsified document, we affirm our finding of fraud. Consequently, the applicant is ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed based upon its withdrawal. This decision constitutes a final notice of eligibility.