


identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



L

MAY 10 2007

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 04 300 10912

Office: MILWAUKEE

Date:

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 245A of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

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 office that originally decided 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 be "R. P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreements reached in *Catholic Social Services, Inc., et al., v. Ridge, et al.*, CIV. NO. [REDACTED] (E.D. Cal) January 23, 2004, and *Felicity Mary Newman, et al., v. United States Immigration and Citizenship Services, et al.*, CIV. NO. [REDACTED] (C.D. Cal) February 17, 2004, (CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements) was denied by the District Director, Chicago, Illinois, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed

The district director determined that the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through the date that he purportedly attempted to file a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident, with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the Service), now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS), in the original legalization application period between May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. Therefore, the district director concluded that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant claims that he has been in the United States since 1980 and submits an affidavit in support of his claim.

An alien applying for adjustment to temporary resident status must establish that he or she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he or she has resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. *See* section 245A(a)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b).

An alien applying for adjustment to temporary resident status must establish that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States since November 6, 1986. *See* section 245A(a)(3) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and presence in accordance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b), “until the date of filing” shall mean until the date the alien attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to timely file, consistent with the class member definitions set forth in the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. *See* Paragraph 11, page 6 of the CSS Settlement Agreement and paragraph 11, page 10 of the Newman Settlement Agreement.

An alien applying for adjustment of status has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. The inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5).

Although the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit in support of his or her claim of continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982, the submission of any other relevant document including affidavits is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The “preponderance of the evidence” standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant's claim is “probably true,” where the determination of “truth” is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). In evaluating the evidence, *Matter of E-M-* also stated that “[t]ruth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality.” *Id.* Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the petitioner submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is “probably true” or “more likely than not,” the applicant or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. *See U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421 (1987) (defining “more likely than not” as a greater than 50 percent probability of something occurring). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application or petition.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to establish continuous residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date he claims that he attempted to file a Form I-687 application with the Service in the original legalization application period from May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. Here, the submitted evidence is not relevant, probative, and credible.

The record shows that the applicant submitted a Form I-687 application and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet, to CIS on July 26, 2004. At part #30 of the Form I-687 application where applicants were asked to list all residences in the United States since first entry, the applicant indicated that he resided at “[redacted] California,” from February 1982 through October 1999. He did not list any residence in the United States prior to February 1982.

The record contains an employment letter dated May 17, 1988, from [redacted] a farm labor contractor in Porterville, California. Mr. [redacted] stated that the applicant worked for him pruning and picking fruit for 21 days in 1983, 69 days in 1984, 73 days in 1985, and 49 days in 1986. Mr. [redacted] did not list any employment prior to 1983.

On appeal, the applicant claims that he has lived in the United States since 1980. In support of his claim, the applicant submits an affidavit dated October 22, 2003, from [redacted] who

identifies himself as a farm laborer. Mr. [REDACTED] states that he and the applicant worked together as seasonal farm laborers for several employers in 1980. Mr. [REDACTED] further states that he has personal knowledge that the applicant has lived in the United States since 1980.

As stated above, the applicant did not list any residences in the United States prior to February 1982 on the Form I-687. He submitted a separate statement with the Form I-687 explaining that he had worked in fields as a farm laborer in past years in California. However, he did not provide any specific information regarding dates or places of employment during the period from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, nor did he provide any independent evidence to corroborate his claim other than the employment letter from Mr. [REDACTED]. Mr. [REDACTED] employment letter does not reflect any work performed by the applicant for him prior to 1983. Furthermore, Mr. [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant worked for him for less than 75 days during period from 1983 through 1986. This affidavit is not sufficient to establish the applicant's entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982, or his continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period.

The affidavit from Mr. [REDACTED] lacks sufficient detail and contains no verifiable information regarding the applicant's claim of continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

The absence of sufficiently detailed supporting documentation that provides testimony to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the **entire** requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of this claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. The applicant has failed to submit sufficient credible documentation to meet his burden of proof in establishing that he has resided in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 by a preponderance of the evidence as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E- M-*, 20 I&N Dec. at 77.

Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 as required under section 245A(a)(2) of the Act. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.