

PUBLIC COPY

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



14

FILE:



Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **MAY 25 2004**

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 210 of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1160

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 service center that processed 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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker was denied by the Director, Northern Regional Processing Facility. The matter was remanded by the Director, Legalization Appeals Unit, now the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The application was then denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and certified for review to the AAO. The decision will be affirmed.

The directors denied the application because the applicant failed to establish the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the eligibility period. The decisions were based on adverse information relating to the applicant's claim of employment for Kansas City Produce (KCP).

On appeal of the first decision, the applicant provided the same form-letter statement that many aliens did who claimed to have worked for [REDACTED] KCP. The applicant incorrectly stated that the facility director had not given her the additional time that she had requested to respond to the notice of adverse information. As did many other aliens on appeal, the applicant provided 58 photocopied affidavits from individuals stating they had worked for [REDACTED] during the qualifying period.

In order to be eligible for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker, an alien must have engaged in qualifying agricultural employment for at least 90 man-days during the twelve-month period ending May 1, 1986, and must be otherwise admissible under section 210(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(d). 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(a). An applicant has the burden of proving the above by a preponderance of the evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b).

The applicant claimed on her application that she had engaged in 110 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment for KCP from May to November 1985. She provided no indication that she ever worked in agriculture other than during the period required to qualify for temporary resident status. In support of the agricultural claim, the applicant submitted a corresponding affidavit from [REDACTED] who indicated he was a foreman at KCP.

In attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the facility director acquired information that seemingly contradicted the applicant's claim. According to the director, the payroll records of KCP showed that [REDACTED] was employed there for only one week during the requisite twelve-month period. The director concluded that Mr. [REDACTED] could not genuinely attest to anyone working there for other than that one week.

On December 20, 1990 the applicant was advised in writing of the adverse information obtained by the director, and of the director's intent to deny the application. The applicant was given until January 19, 1991 to respond. On February 6, the director received a request from the applicant that she be granted more time, until February 20, to respond further.

The applicant failed to make any further statement, or provide any additional documentation. The director concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence, and denied the application on April 2, 1991.

On October 14, 1993 the Legalization Appeals Unit remanded the matter, finding that some of the facility director's conclusions had not been adequately documented in the record. The center director later supplemented the record with copies of the KCP payroll records. That director sent copies of that evidence, and other documents, to the applicant on February 2, 1998 with a notice of intent to deny. The applicant did

not respond, and the center director subsequently denied the application. The applicant did not respond further.

Generally, 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. § 210.3(b)(1). Evidence submitted by an applicant will have its sufficiency judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b)(2). Personal testimony by an applicant which is not corroborated, in whole or in part, by other credible evidence (including testimony by persons other than the applicant) will not serve to meet an applicant's burden of proof. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b)(3).

There is no mandatory type of documentation required with respect to the applicant's burden of proof; however, the documentation must be credible. All documents submitted must have an appearance of reliability, i.e., if the documents appear to have been forged, or otherwise deceitfully created or obtained, the documents are not credible. *United Farm Workers (AFL-CIO) v. INS*, Civil No. S-87-1064-JFM (E.D. Cal.).

The applicant has not made any statement since the appeal was filed on April 18, 1991. Nor has the applicant provided any affidavits from employees of non-profit organizations, who have clearly stated in other cases that they provided outreach and nursing services for the migrant workers at KCP, and named such workers. The 58 photocopied affidavits submitted on appeal each state that the affiant worked for [REDACTED] KCP. The affiants do not indicate that the applicant worked there.

Under these circumstances, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the twelve-month statutory period ending May 1, 1986. Consequently, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker.

ORDER: The decision is affirmed; the application is denied. The previous appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.