

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 2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

21



FILE:

MSC-05-194-13671

Office: HARTFORD

Date: NOV 21 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. 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.


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 Director, Hartford. 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. The director denied the application, finding 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, the director noted that the applicant entered the United States in October 1981 using a "leased" passport that she admits was fraudulent. The director also notes that the applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence of her continuous unlawful residency for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant indicates, through counsel, that she entered the United States in October 1981 using a "photo-substituted" passport and then returned it to Jamaica. She also asserts that the director failed to articulate specific reasons for denying the application and that the Citizenship and Immigration Service (CIS) misapplied the law. She asserts that the evidence already contained in the record establishes her eligibility for the benefit sought.

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).

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 issues in this proceeding are whether the applicant (1) is admissible to the United States; and, (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since a date prior to January 1, 1982.

The record contains affidavits from the following individuals: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Although the affiants state that they have known the applicant since before January 1, 1982, the statements do not supply enough details to lend credibility to a 24-year relationship with the applicant. For instance, the affiants do not indicate how they date their initial meeting with the applicant, how frequently they had contact with the applicant, or how they had personal knowledge of the applicant’s presence in the United States. Given these deficiencies, these affidavits have minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claims that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.

In addition to the affidavits noted above, the applicant submitted an affidavit from [REDACTED] of the Norwalk Church of God, Norwalk, Connecticut. In this letter, [REDACTED] states that the applicant has been a member of the Congregation since 1988. This letter does not conform to the statutory requirements for attestations by churches, unions, or other organizations, which is found at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2 ((d)(3)(v). That regulation requires such attestations to “show the inclusive dates of membership and state the address where the applicant resided during the membership period.” [REDACTED] does not provide an address where the applicant lived during the requisite period or any other information that is probative of the issue of her initial entrance to the United States prior to January 1981 or her continuous residence for the duration of the statutory period. Thus, it can be given no probative weight.

The record also contains a B-1 nonimmigrant visa issued to the applicant on September 10, 1986 and an entry stamp dated October 30, 1986. There is additional evidence in the record that provides some evidence of the applicant’s presence in the United States following this entry such as money order receipts, a Social Security statement evidencing employment from 1988 until 2002, W-2’s and family letters.

The record also contains a letter from [REDACTED]-Employment Agency, dated October 1987 and signed by [REDACTED]. In this letter the affiant indicates that the applicant worked “various jobs as a housekeeper/childcare person, from October 1986 until July 1987.” Although the statement is on company letterhead, it is not notarized. It also fails to meet certain regulatory standards set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i), which provides that letters from employers must include the applicant’s address at the time of employment; exact period of employment; whether the information was taken from official company records and where records are located and whether CIS may have access to the records; if records are unavailable, an affidavit form-letter stating that the employment records are unavailable may be accepted which shall be signed, attested to by the employer under penalty of perjury and shall state the employer’s willingness to come forward and give testimony if requested. The statement by [REDACTED] does not include much of the required information and can be afforded minimal weight as evidence of the applicant’s residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

As stated above, applicants for temporary residence must establish that they are admissible to the United States. The record reveals, and the applicant further admits on appeal, that she entered the United States in October 1981 using a fraudulent passport that she “leased” from an individual in Jamaica. This entry violates Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act which provides:

Misrepresentation. – (i) In general. – Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Because the applicant procured her entry into the United States in 1981 by misrepresenting a material fact (her identity) she is inadmissible and therefore, ineligible for the benefit sought.

Furthermore, the record does not include any evidence that the applicant has filed an application to waive this ground of inadmissibility.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of the applicant's statements and application forms, in which she claims that she entered the United States in 1981, the applicant's employment authorization card, and passport. 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.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that 1) she is admissible to the United States; and, 2). she entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and 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.