

**PUBLIC COPY**

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



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

*LL6*

**NOV 09 2005**

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

IN RE:

Applicant: [REDACTED]

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*

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 for [REDACTED]

On appeal, the applicant states that he is appealing because he thinks he can acquire more evidence to support his claimed employment.

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 to have worked 130 man-days harvesting lettuce for [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] during the qualifying period. The I-700 application was prepared by the office of [REDACTED]

In support of the claim, the applicant submitted a corresponding Form I-705 affidavit and a man-days breakdown, both signed by [REDACTED] and a letter from [REDACTED] Bookkeeper of Senini Farming Company, affirming that Mr. [REDACTED] was employed at the farm during the qualifying period.

In attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the Service acquired information which contradicted the applicant's claim. [REDACTED] executed a sworn statement before a Service officer on June 6, 1990. Mr. [REDACTED] admitted in this statement that "my records showed that no one worked for me for ninety (90) days or more during the amnesty qualifying period in 1985 and 1986." Mr. [REDACTED] also indicated he had pled guilty to charges of Conspiracy and Creating and Supplying a False Writing and Document for use in Making an Application for Adjustment of Status as a Special Agricultural Worker.

On December 19, 1991, 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 concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence, and denied the application on January 31, 1992. On appeal, the applicant indicated that he would submit additional evidence. However, to date no additional evidence has been forthcoming.

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] the applicant's purported employer, has pled guilty to document fraud charges and admitted that no one worked for him for the minimum of 90 man-days. The applicant has not addressed nor overcome this

derogatory evidence which directly contradicts his 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 establish credibly 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.