

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



Li

MAY 02 2008

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-280-10396

Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER Date:

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. 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 Director, National Benefits Center. 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 7, 2005 (together, the I-687 Application). 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, specifically noting that “the information and documentation [that the applicant] submitted are insufficient to overcome the grounds for denial.” The director denied the application as 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, the applicant submitted a Form I-694 Notice of Appeal of Decision Under Section 210 or 245A and a statement. The applicant did not submit any additional evidence on appeal. 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)(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. 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 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 7, 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 his first address in the United States as [REDACTED] New

York, New York, from 1981 to 1984. At part #33, he listed his first employment in the United States as a self-employed peddler in New York, New York, from 1981 to 1987. At part #32, the applicant listed three absences from the United States since entry. During the requisite period, the applicant visited Senegal from March 1987 to April 1987. At part #31, the applicant did not list any affiliations or associations.

The applicant has provided two notarized statements, a birth certificate, and a Senegalese identification document. The birth certificate and Senegalese identification document are evidence of the applicant's identity, but do not demonstrate that he entered before 1982 and resided in the United States for the requisite period. The following evidence relates to the requisite period:

- A notarized declaration from [REDACTED] dated December 6, 2005. The declarant lives in Montreal, Canada. The declarant states that her "brother [the applicant] went to the United States of America in 1981" and that they have been in touch on a regular basis. She also states that "six year later, in 1987, [the applicant] told [her] that he was going to apply [for] benefits [under an] amnesty bill about illegal aliens who have been living in the U.S.A. for many years. But, a few months later, [the applicant] let [her] know that he was turned away because of a short absence from the U.S.A. in March-April 1987." Although the declarant states that the applicant "went to the United States of America in 1981," she does not provide information regarding how she dates his leaving for the United States or how frequently she had contact with the applicant. Given these deficiencies, 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 notarized declaration from [REDACTED] dated December 5, 2005. The declarant states that he lives at [REDACTED], Saint-Louis, Senegal. He also states that his "brother [the applicant] went to the United States of America in 1981" and that they have been in "touch till [the applicant] came back to Senegal in 1987 from the U.S.A. for a family visit for less than a month." The declarant states that the applicant told him that "President Reagan had introduced a bill that would grant amnesty to illegal aliens who had been living in the U.S.A. for many years" and that the applicant would apply for amnesty upon returning to the United States. He adds that "a few months later, [the applicant] told [him], from the U.S.A., that [the applicant's] application was turned away." Although the declarant states that the applicant "went to the United States of America in 1981," he does not provide information regarding how he dates the applicant's leaving for the United States or how frequently he had contact with the applicant. Given these deficiencies, 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.

For the reasons noted above, the documents submitted in support of the applicant's claim have been found to lack credibility or to have minimal probative value as evidence of the applicant's residence and presence in the United States for the requisite period.

The director issued a notice of intent to deny (NOID) on November 15, 2005 and denied the application for temporary residence on September 7, 2006. In denying the application, the director found that the applicant failed to establish that he entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 or that he met the necessary residency or continuous physical presence requirements. Thus, the director determined that the applicant failed to meet his burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence.

On appeal, the applicant stated on the Form I-694 that he has been in the United States prior to January 1982. The applicant also submitted a statement in which he claims to have entered the United States in New York prior to December 1981 and to have resided for the duration of the requisite period in the United States. As noted above, to meet his burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his own testimony. In this case, his assertions regarding his entry are not supported by any credible evidence in the record.

In his statement, the applicant suggests that the director's adjudication of the petition was unfair. The applicant has not demonstrated any error by the director in conducting his review of the petition. Nor has the applicant demonstrated any resultant prejudice such as would constitute a due process violation. *See Vides-Vides v. INS*, 783 F.2d 1463, 1469-70 (9th Cir. 1986); *Nicholas v. INS*, 590 F.2d 802, 809-10 (9th Cir. 1979); *Martin-Mendoza v. INS*, 499 F.2d 918, 922 (9th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 419 U.S. 1113 (1975).

On appeal, the applicant did not submit any additional evidence in support of his claim that he was physically present or had continuous residence in the United States during the entire requisite period or that he entered the United States in 1981.

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 his 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 he 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.