

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



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

PUBLIC COPY



LI

FILE: 
MSC-05-279-12693

Office: NEWARK

Date: **JUL 24 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:
SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, all documents have been returned to the National Benefits Center. 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. If your appeal was sustained or remanded for further action, you will be contacted.


Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals

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, Newark. The decision 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, on July 6, 2005 (together, the I-687 Application). The director determined that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period, specifically noting that the applicant “failed to submit additional evidence for consideration” in response to the director’s June 15, 2006 notice of intent to deny. The director denied the application as the applicant had not met her 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, the applicant submitted a Form I-694 Notice of Appeal of Decision Under Section 210 or 245A and waived the right to submit a written brief or statement. On the Form I-687, the applicant states that she is eligible for the benefit sought. The applicant also states that consideration should be given to “the passage of time” because “it is very difficult and sometimes impossible to provide documentary evidence of unlawful residence.” As of this date, the AAO has not received a brief or any additional evidence from the applicant. Therefore, the record is complete.

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. Section 245A(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(3). The regulations clarify that the applicant must have been physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the term “until the date of filing” in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1) means until the date the applicant 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 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 is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony, and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

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. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The weight to be given any affidavit depends on the totality of the circumstances, and a number of factors must be considered. More weight will be given to an affidavit in which the affiant indicates personal knowledge of the applicant's whereabouts during the time period in question rather than a fill-in-the-blank affidavit that provides generic information. The regulations provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment or attestations by churches or other organizations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.2(d)(3)(i) and (v).

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the applicant 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 she entered before 1982 and resided in the United States for the requisite period.

The record shows that the applicant submitted a Form I-687 Application and Supplement to Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on July 6, 2005. At part #30 of the Form I-687 application where applicants are asked to list all residences in the United States since first entry, the applicant listed her first address in the United States as [REDACTED] Newark, New Jersey, from October 1981 to December 1990. At part #33, she listed her first employment in the United States as a hair dresser in Newark, New Jersey, from December 1988 to December 2004. At part #32, the applicant listed two absences from the United States since entry. According to the Form I-687, the applicant visited Canada from April 1987 to April 1987 and Nigeria from November 2004 to December 2004.

The following evidence relates to the requisite period:

- A notarized form-letter affidavit from [REDACTED] dated November 9, 2005. The declarant states that she has known the applicant in the United States since 1981. Although the declarant states that she has known the applicant since 1981, the statement does not supply enough details to lend credibility to a 24-year relationship with the applicant. For instance, the declarant does not indicate how she met the applicant, how she dates her initial acquaintance with the applicant in the United States, or how frequently she had contact with the applicant. Given these deficiencies, this affidavit has minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claims that he entered the United States in 1981 and resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.
- A notarized affidavit from [REDACTED] dated November 8, 2005. The declarant states that he has known the applicant in the United States since 1981. Although the declarant states that he has known the applicant since 1981, the statement does not supply enough details to lend credibility to a 24-year relationship with the applicant. For instance, the declarant does not indicate how he met the applicant, how he dates his initial acquaintance with the applicant in the United States, or how frequently he had contact with the applicant. Given these deficiencies, this affidavit has minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claims that he entered the United States in 1981 and resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.
- A notarized affidavit from [REDACTED] dated November 10, 2005. The declarant indicates that he is the senior pastor of the Brooklyn First Free Methodist Church in Brooklyn, New York. The declarant states that the applicant is a member in good standing and has "maintained a continuous residence in the United States of America since 1981." Although the letter is notarized, it was not written on Brooklyn First Free Methodist Church letterhead. Furthermore, the letter fails to conform with regulatory guidelines in that it does not state the address where the applicant resided during the membership period, establish how the author knows the applicant, or state the origin of the information provided. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v). The AAO notes further that this affiliation was not included in the applicant's Form I-687 at part #31. Given these deficiencies, the letter has minimal probative value in supporting the

applicant's claims that he entered the United States in 1981 and resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of the applicant's statements, in which she claims to have entered the United States in 1981 and to have resided for the duration of the requisite period in New Jersey. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence in support of her claim that she was physically present or had continuous residence in the United States during the entire requisite period or that she entered the United States in 1981.

The director issued a notice of intent to deny (NOID) on June 15, 2006. The director denied the application for temporary residence on July 20, 2006. In denying the application, the director found that the applicant failed to establish that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 or that she met the necessary residency or continuous physical presence requirements. Thus, the director determined that the applicant failed to meet her burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence.

On appeal, the applicant states that she is eligible for the benefit sought. The applicant also states that consideration should be given to "the passage of time" because "it is very difficult and sometimes impossible to provide documentary evidence of unlawful residence." The passage of time was taken into consideration and as noted above, 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. Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO agrees with the director that the evidence submitted by the applicant has not established that she is eligible for the benefit sought.

In this case, the absence of sufficient credible and probative documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of her 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 lack of credible supporting documentation, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she has continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period, 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.