

**PUBLIC COPY**




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

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



L4

FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **FEB 27 2006**

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director 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 [REDACTED]

On appeal, the applicant requested a copy of his legalization file. The Service complied with the request on February 25, 2005. The applicant reaffirms his claimed employment [REDACTED] stating that he worked under the supervision of [REDACTED]

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 115 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment for [REDACTED] in Maricopa County, Arizona from September 1985 to April 1986.

In support of his claim, the applicant submitted a corresponding Form I-705 affidavit and a separate employment statement, both signed by [REDACTED]

In the course of attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the Service acquired information which contradicted the applicant's claim. On January 22, 1990, in the presence of Service officers, [REDACTED] admitted in a signed, sworn statement that all of the employment documents signed by him were fraudulent.

On March 22, 1991, the Service advised the applicant in writing of the adverse information obtained by the Service, and of the Service's intent to deny the application.

The applicant failed to respond, and the director denied the application on August 6, 1991.

On appeal, the applicant stated that he got his documentation directly from [REDACTED]. The applicant reaffirmed his claimed employment stating that he worked under [REDACTED] who was a supervisor under [REDACTED]. The applicant stated that he was submitting documentation to that effect. However, the record contains no such documentation.

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.)*.

[REDACTED] admitted under oath that all employment documents which he prepared are fraudulent. The applicant has not overcome such derogatory evidence which directly contradicts the applicant's claim. Therefore, the documentary evidence submitted by the applicant cannot be considered as having any probative value or evidentiary weight.

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.