

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



61

FILE:



MSC-05-223-10950

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

**SEP 22 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:

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. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, 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. 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 on February 1, 2007. The director determined that the applicant failed to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. Specifically, the director noted that the witness affidavits submitted by the applicant referenced the applicant's uncle rather than the applicant himself.

On appeal the applicant states that he was living with his uncle during the requisite period and that "it goes without saying" that the witnesses who knew his uncle knew the applicant as well. The applicant has not submitted additional evidence in support of his appeal.

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 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.* 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 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, 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 for the duration of the requisite period. Here, the applicant has not met his burden of proof.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687 application and Supplement to Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) on May 11, 2005. The applicant submitted the following documents in support of his application:

- An affidavit from [REDACTED] dated December 6, 2005. There is also an affidavit from [REDACTED] dated March 27, 2006. The language in these affidavits is identical, although the affiant’s signature is significantly different in each affidavit. The affiant states that he met the applicant in 1981. However, the affiant does not claim to have personal knowledge of the applicant’s residence in the United States during the requisite period and does not provide details regarding the frequency or nature of his contact with the applicant during the requisite period. Instead, the affiant merely states that he has known the applicant’s uncle since 1981 and that the applicant’s uncle is a friendly and hardworking man. Given these deficiencies, the affidavit has little probative value and will be given minimal weight as evidence of the applicant’s residence in the United States during the requisite period.
- An affidavit from [REDACTED] dated March 27, 2006. The affiant states that he met the applicant in 1981. The affiant, similar to the affidavit from [REDACTED], explains that he has known the applicant’s uncle since 1981 and that the applicant’s uncle is a friendly and hardworking man. The affiant does not provide details regarding the frequency or nature of his contact with the applicant during the requisite period. Given these deficiencies, the affidavit has little probative value and will be given minimal weight as evidence of the applicant’s residence in the United States during the requisite period.

- A letter from [REDACTED] dated November 15, 2005. The letter states that the applicant “requires physical therapy to work on his motor milestones.” The subject line of the letter reads “Re: January 1982.” It is not clear from this letter when the physical therapy began, when it ended, or the nature and frequency of the physical therapy received by the applicant. Given these deficiencies, this letter will be given little weight as evidence of the applicant’s residence in the United States during the requisite period.

In summary, the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence in support of his claim of residence in the United States during the entire requisite period. 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 for the requisite period. 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.