



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

41

[REDACTED]

FILE:

MSC 05 158 10544

Office: NEW YORK

Date: MAR 10 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:

[REDACTED]

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 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 challenges the director's conclusion, asserting that the director failed to give proper weight to the affidavits submitted in support of the applicant's claim.

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). 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).

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)(1), "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 has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite period, 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).

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, 431 (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 during the requisite time period. Here, the documentation submitted in support of the applicant's claim is insufficient. More specifically, none of the affiants whose statements were submitted to establish the applicant's unlawful residence claimed that they had known the applicant prior to 1984. In fact, [REDACTED], whose affidavit was dated October 25, 2005, and [REDACTED] whose affidavit was dated October 29, 2005, both indicated that they did not meet the applicant until 1985. Thus, none of the affiants can actually attest to the applicant's unlawful residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982. Moreover, the AAO finds that all four of the attestations are severely lacking in detailed information concerning the events and circumstances of the applicant's life in the United States during the requisite time period. As such, the affidavits have minimal probative value in even establishing the applicant's residence from 1984 through the remainder of the requisite period.

On February 11, 2006, the director issued a notice of intent to deny (NOID) informing the applicant that the affidavits submitted to support his application were deficient. Although the applicant responded to the notice, he failed to provide additional evidence documenting his claimed unlawful residence.

Therefore, the director denied the application in a decision dated August 16, 2006. Although the AAO finds that a denial in this matter was properly issued, the director's adverse finding being based in part on the applicant's failure to provide evidence of his 1981 entry into the United States was not warranted. It is unreasonable for the director to expect the applicant to provide documentary evidence of entry into the United States when there is neither a claim nor an indication that the applicant's initial entry was lawful. The director also improperly found that the affidavits provided in this matter were not accompanied by proper proof of the affiants' respective identities. This statement, however, suggests that the director failed to take into account the fact that each affidavit was signed before a notary public, whose signature indicates that each affiant provided proof of identity at the time he/she signed their respective statement. Accordingly, both of these erroneous findings by the director are hereby withdrawn.

Nevertheless, an analysis of the affidavits submitted in support of the applicant's claim indicates that they lacked sufficient information and did not attest to the applicant's residence in the United States during the full requisite time period.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the director failed to give due consideration to the applicant's supporting evidence. However, having fully considered each of the affidavits, the AAO cannot dispute that the director's decision to deny the application was warranted.

The absence of sufficiently detailed 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 applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative 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 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*, 20 I&N Dec. 77. 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.