


PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

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



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



L4

FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **SEP 16 2005**

IN RE:



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, Western Service Center, reopened and denied again by the Director, California Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

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. This decision was based on adverse information acquired by the Service relating to the applicant's claim of employment for [REDACTED]

On appeal from the initial denial, the applicant stated that he would submit additional evidence in due time.

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 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).

On the Form I-700 application, the applicant claimed 211 man-days of qualifying agricultural services for farm labor contractor [REDACTED] from June 9, 1985 to May 3, 1986. In support of his claim, the applicant submitted a corresponding Form I-705 affidavit purportedly signed by [REDACTED]

In attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the Service acquired information which contradicted the applicant's claim. The Service obtained a letter from [REDACTED] dated November 18, 1987 with an exemplar of her authentic signature and the genuine letterhead she used for the employment verification affidavits she issued. [REDACTED] informed the Service that she issued all employment letters on original printed letterheads only, never on stamped or photocopied letterhead. The documentation submitted by the applicant contains a stamped letterhead.

On October 21, 1992, the applicant was advised in writing of the adverse information obtained by the Service and of the Service's intent to deny the application. The applicant was granted thirty days to respond. The record does not contain a response to the notice.

The Director, Western Service Center concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence and denied the application. On appeal, the applicant stated that he would submit additional evidence in due time. To date, no additional evidence has been forthcoming.

Subsequently, the application was reopened and the applicant was advised in writing of the adverse information obtained by the Service and of the Service's intent to deny the application. Specifically, the applicant was informed that forensic analysis of the signature on his supporting documentation and the exemplar in possession of the Service had determined that his documentation was probably not signed by [REDACTED]. The applicant was granted thirty days to respond. The record does not contain a response to the notice.

The Director, California Service Center concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence and denied the application again on January 12, 2004. The applicant did not respond to the director's notice.

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 signature discrepancy noted by the director calls into question the origin and authenticity of the applicant's documentation. The applicant has not overcome this derogatory evidence. Therefore, the documentary evidence submitted by the applicant cannot be considered as having any probative value or evidentiary

The applicant has failed to credibly 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 appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.