

PUBLIC COPY

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



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



LL6

FILE: 

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **OCT 20 2005**

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, 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 the Del Porto Farm.

On appeal, the applicant reaffirmed 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 105 man-days of qualifying employment for [REDACTED] at the Del Porto Farm in San Joaquin County, California, from May 1, 1985, to August 30, 1985. In support of this claim, the applicant submitted a corresponding Form I-705 affidavit and a separate employment letter, both signed by [REDACTED]. The applicant also submitted evidence of more recent non-qualifying employment.

In the course of attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the Service acquired information which contradicted the applicant's claim. [REDACTED] co-owner of Del Porto Farms, stated to the Service that his farm did not use farm labor contractors during the qualifying period May 1, 1985 to May 1, 1986 and the farm is not affiliated with the cultivation or harvesting of the crops mentioned in the applicant's employment letter, i.e. cherries, bell peppers and cucumbers.

On December 18, 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. In response, the applicant submitted two form affidavits, identical in content, from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who asserted that they had personal knowledge of the applicant's employment for farm labor contractor [REDACTED] from May 1, 1985 to August 30, 1985. However, the affiants did not indicate how they acquired such knowledge, nor did they provide any particulars regarding the number of days the applicant purportedly worked or the crops he purportedly harvested.

The director concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence, and denied the application on February 3, 1992. On appeal, the applicant reaffirmed his claimed employment and submitted copies of evidence, previously submitted.

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 fact that farm labor contractor [REDACTED] was not employed by Del Porto Farms during the eligibility period directly contradicts the applicant's claim. The applicant has not overcome such derogatory evidence.

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.