

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



LI

FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC-06-059-11097

Office: NEW ORLEANS (FORT SMITH)

Date: JUN 30 2008

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. 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 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 Orleans. 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 November 28, 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, during the interview, the applicant stated that she first entered the United States in 1988. 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 additional evidence. On the Form I-694, the applicant states that she has been in the United States “since [she] was 12 years old.” She states that her parents registered her under the “old legislation of 1986 without receiving any answer.” She also states that she has been in the United States from November 6, 1986 through the date that the application was filed. The applicant asks that her application be reconsidered. As of this date, the AAO has not received 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).

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) 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. 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. Although not required, the credibility of an affidavit may be assessed by taking into account such factors as whether the affiant provided some proof that he or she was present in the United States during the requisite period. 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 he entered before 1982 and continuously 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 November 28, 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 Glendale, Arizona, from 1988 to 1992. At part #33, where applicants are asked to list all employment in the United States, the applicant wrote "n/a." At part #32, the applicant wrote "n/a" with regard to absences from the United States.

The applicant has provided two letters; a copy of the applicant's birth certificate; a copy of the applicant's marriage certificate; a copy of the applicant's employment authorization card issued on December 16, 2005; a copy of the applicant's social security card; a copy of the applicant's Mexican identification card; and a copy of the applicant's Kansas Medicaid Program card issued on August 27, 2008. The applicant's birth certificate, employment authorization card, and social security card are evidence of the applicant's identity, but do not demonstrate that she entered before January 1, 1982 and resided in the United States for the requisite period. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after the requisite time period. The following evidence relates to the requisite period:

- An unnotarized letter from [REDACTED] dated November 10, 2005. The declarant states that he has known the applicant and her husband "for many years." Although the declarant states that he has known the applicant "for many years," the statement does not supply enough details to lend credibility to a relationship with the applicant. The declarant does not indicate when he met the applicant, under what circumstances he met the applicant, how he dates his initial acquaintance with the applicant, or how frequently he had contact with the applicant. Moreover, [REDACTED] does not make any assertion about the whereabouts of the applicant during the requisite period. Given these aspects, this statement 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 letter from the City of Springdale Police Department dated November 14, 2005 and signed by [REDACTED] records clerk. The letter states that the applicant "does not have a record, as of [the date of the letter], on file with the Springdale Police Department." This letter does not address the applicant's date of entry into the United States or the time period that she resided in the United States. Given these deficiencies, this statement has no probative value in supporting a claim that the applicant 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 and application forms, in which she provides inconsistent information regarding her first entry into the United States. On the Form I-694, the applicant claims to have entered the United States in 1992, that is when she was "12 years old." However, during her interview on September 27, 2006, the applicant stated that she first entered the United States in 1988 without inspection. 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. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). 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. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). As noted above, to meet her burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from her own testimony. In this case, her assertions regarding her entry are not supported by any credible evidence in the record.

The director denied the application for temporary residence on September 30, 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. In addition, the director noted that during the interview the applicant stated that she first entered the United States in 1988. 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 has been in the United States “since [she] was 12 years old” which would be in 1992. She states that her parents registered her under the “old legislation of 1986 without receiving any answer.” She also states that she has been in the United States from November 6, 1986 through the date that the application was filed. The applicant asks that her application be reconsidered. The applicant did not address the director’s statement regarding her first entry into the United States in 1988. Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, including the applicant’s own statements 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.