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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

A2

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date:

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The District Director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Costa Rica who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. The CAA provides, in pertinent part:

> [T]he status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, (now the Secretary of Homeland Security, (Secretary)), in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

The District Director determined that the applicant was not eligible for adjustment of status as the child of a native or citizen of Cuba, pursuant to section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966, because his mother's marriage to his stepfather was entered into the marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. *See District Director's Decision* dated March 19, 2004.

The record reflects that on April 19, 2002, at Coral Gables, Florida, the applicant's mother married a native and citizen of Cuba whose immigration status was adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident of the United States, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA. Based on that marriage, on May 13, 2002, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

Based on an interview conducted by Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) between the applicant's mother and Mr. it was concluded that the marriage between the applicant's mother and Mr. was deemed fraudulent and the application was denied.

The applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the District Director's findings. The applicant submits the same documentation his mother submitted on notice of certification for her own case. The AAO affirmed the District Director's decision regarding the applicant's mother's case. Since the applicant's mother's marriage to Mr. was fraudulent the claimed relationship between the applicant and Mr. is not valid and he is ineligible for adjustment of status pursuant to section 1 of the CAA.

The AAO notes that although counsel submits an affidavit from the applicant's mother and stepfather the record of proceedings does not contains a Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative (Form G-28). Therefore the AAO will not be sending a copy of the decision to the attorney mentioned on the affidavit, but this office will accept the submitted information.

Pursuant to section 291 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that he is eligible for adjustment of status. He has failed to meet that burden.

The decision of the District Director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The District Director's decision is affirmed.