L4

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 13 2004

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

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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.

PUBLIC COPY

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker was denied by the Director, Northern Regional Processing Facility. The matter was remanded by the Chief, Legalization Appeals Unit, now the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The application was then denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and certified for review to the AAO. The decision will be affirmed.

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. The decisions were based on adverse information relating to the applicant's claim of employment for KCP).

On appeal of the first decision, the applicant reiterated that he had worked for KCP as claimed.

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 Immigration and Nationality 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).

The applicant claimed on his application that he had engaged in 140 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment for KCP from May to November 1985. In support of that claim he submitted two corresponding affidavits from and a photocopied affidavit from who identified themselves as foremen at KCP. He provided no indication that he ever worked in agriculture other than during the period required to qualify for temporary resident status. In fact, the record reveals he worked in a factory subsequent to the 1985-86 period.

Subsequent to the filing of his application, the applicant was interviewed by an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The officer noted that the applicant could not explain the duties he had performed and the crops he had worked with at KCP. The officer found the applicant's employment claim to lacking in credibility, and recommended that the application be denied.

In attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the facility director acquired information that seemingly contradicted the applicant's claim. According to the director, the owner of KCP stated that did not work there during the requisite twelve-month period. The director further concluded that KCP's payroll records supported the owner's statement.

On December 20, 1990, the applicant was advised in writing of the adverse information obtained by the director, and of the director's intent to deny the application. The applicant was granted thirty days to respond. However, no response was received.

The director concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence, and denied the application. In the denial notice the director also noted that Paul Ramirez did not begin working at KCP until April 1986 and therefore could not testify to anyone's employment there prior to that date.

On appeal, the applicant stressed that he had worked at KCP as claimed. He did not provide any additional evidence.

On January 5, 1994 the Legalization Appeals Unit remanded the matter, finding that some of the director's conclusions had not been adequately documented in the record.

The center director wrote to the applicant on February 2, 1998 and provided him with an extensive package of documents concerning the KCP investigation, including evidence of having pled guilty in United States District Court to creating a false application for special agricultural worker status. The applicant did not respond to this notice, or to the subsequent notice of denial.

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 applicant was accorded the opportunity to review the derogatory evidence regarding failed to respond, much less provide any favorable evidence. In fact, the applicant has not made any statement since the appeal was filed on June 5, 1991. Although in other cases, later provided a statement reiterating that he had truly supervised the alien whose application had been denied, he has not done so in this case. Nor has the applicant provided any affidavits from coworkers, or employees of non-profit organizations, who have clearly stated in other cases that they provided outreach and nursing services for the migrant workers at KCP, and named such workers.

Under these circumstances, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to 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 decision is affirmed; the application is denied. The previous appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.