

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, R.M. 3000  
Washington, D.C. 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

L1



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEW YORK  
MSC 05-239-11065

Date: **NOV 28 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John F. Grissom".

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, New York. 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 he entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and then continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he has established his unlawful residence for the requisite time period and he submits additional evidence for consideration.

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 245(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 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). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her 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).

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.* at 80. 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 established that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time. The documentation other than his own testimony that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by the applicant’s friends. The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant’s eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The affidavit from [REDACTED] states that the affiant has known the applicant since February of 2000. Because this affiant did not meet the applicant until after the requisite period ended, his testimony is not relevant to the applicant’s residence in the United States during that period.

Affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] state that they know that the applicant resided in New York from 1981 to 1999, residing on [REDACTED] in New York from 1981 to 1984 and then residing on [REDACTED] also in New York from 1984 to 1999. Affiant [REDACTED] states that he did not see the applicant for a period of two years and five months and affiant [REDACTED] states that he did not see him for two years and three months. However, neither affiant states when the period that they did not see the applicant occurred or whether it occurred during the requisite period. Though affiant [REDACTED] states that he resided with the applicant, he does not state when they resided together or whether they resided together in the United States. Both affiants fail to state the frequency with which they saw the applicant during the requisite period. Further, though these affiants both attest to the applicant’s residence in New York from 1984 to 1999, at the time of the applicant’s interview with a United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) officer regarding his Form I-687 application, he stated that he was absent from the United States from 1987 until 1999. This indicates that the applicant did not reside in New York for that period, casting doubt on the assertions made by these affiants regarding the applicant’s residence in the United States during that period.

To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that the relationship probably did exist and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the above noted witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

The record also contains both the applicant's Form I-687 and notes taken by a USCIS officer at the time of the applicant's interview regarding that form. The notes detailing the applicant's testimony taken under oath in March 2006 indicate that he repeatedly stated that he first entered the United States in April 1982. Though the applicant changed his testimony and later stated that he first entered the United States in 1981, the record shows that he changed his testimony after the interviewing officer informed him that a first entry into the United States in April 1982 would cause him to be unqualified to adjust to temporary resident status. That he initially repeatedly stated that he first entered the United States in April 1982 casts doubt on the applicant's current claim that he first entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982. Also during this interview, the applicant stated that he was absent from the United States from 1987 until 1999. However, the affidavits from both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and the applicant's own Form I-687 all state that he resided in New York continuously from 1984 until 1999. This inconsistency is significant, as it is material to whether he has accurately represented to USCIS both his residence in and absences from the United States during the requisite period.

The evidence in the record presented provides contradictory information as previously noted, and no explanation is provided for those contradictions. The contradictions are material to the applicant's claim in that they have a direct bearing on the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. 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. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he 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.