

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

FUBLIC COPY



41

FILE: [Redacted] Office: NEW YORK Date: DEC 11 2008
MSC 06 053 11643

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. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, all documents have been returned to the National Benefits Center. 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. If your appeal was sustained or remanded for further action, you will be contacted.

John F. Grissom, Acting 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. S-86-1343-LKK (E.D. Cal) January 23, 2004, and *Felicity Mary Newman, et al., v. United States Immigration and Citizenship Services, et al.*, CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK (C.D. Cal) February 17, 2004 (CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements), was denied by the Director, New York. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet on November 22, 2005. Upon review, the director determined that insufficient evidence had been presented to establish eligibility under section 245A of the Act. On January 11, 2006, the director issued a notice of intent to deny (NOID) stating that the applicant had not established eligibility for temporary residence under section 245A of the Act. Specifically, the applicant had failed to provide additional evidence to establish that he first entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and thereafter resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. The director also determined that the applicant had not established that he was continuously physically present in the United States for the requisite period and admissible as an immigrant. The applicant was granted 30 days from the date of the notice to submit additional evidence in response to the NOID. In response to the NOID on February 8, 2006, the applicant submitted two sworn affidavits and a copy of his Senegalese passport. The director denied the application on June 6, 2006, finding that the applicant had not provided credible evidence in support of his application for temporary residence under section 245A of the Act.

On appeal, the applicant submits two affidavits from people who he states have known him since 1981

An applicant for temporary resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the date the application is filed. Section 245A(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). The applicant must also establish that he or she has been continuously physically present in the United States since November 6, 1986. Section 245(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(3). The regulations clarify that the applicant must have been physically present in the United States from November 6, 1986 until the date of filing the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the term “until the date of filing” in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1) means until the date the applicant attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to timely file during the original legalization application period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. CSS Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 6; Newman Settlement Agreement paragraph 11 at page 10. The applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite period, 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. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own testimony, and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

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 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.* at 80. 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, 431 (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 submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time and (3) has continuous physical presence in the United States from November 6, 1986 through the requisite period.. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

At part #30 of the Form I-687 application where the applicant was asked to list his places of residence in the United States he indicated that he resided in New York from August 1979 to September 1995. He indicated at part #33 of his Form I-687 application that he has been self-employed as a street vendor in New York from May 1979 and works part-time as a security guard in New York starting from July 2004 until present.

In an attempt to establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuous unlawful residence in the United States, the applicant provided four affidavits and a copy of his Senegalese passport. On appeal, the AAO will consider only evidence that is relevant to the requisite period and

his continuous physical presence and residence in the United States. In the instant case, this evidence includes the affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

The affidavit from [REDACTED] states that he has personal knowledge that the applicant resided in the United States from 1980 and that the applicant used to visit his family in the affiant's building in 1979. [REDACTED] states that he has personal knowledge that the applicant resided in the United States from 1981 and that the applicant was his tenant in 1981. Neither affidavit gives an address where the applicant resided in the United States nor does either contain any other factual information concerning the applicant's entry and residency in the United States.

The sworn affidavit from [REDACTED] states that she has known the applicant since 1981 and attests to the applicant's character. The affidavit from [REDACTED] states that he knows the applicant from New York since 1981.

Considered together the affidavits neither confirm the applicant's entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982 nor his continuous residency in the United States. The affidavits fail to explain the circumstances surrounding their initial meeting and how they developed and maintained a friendship with the applicant over the requisite period. The affiants fail to specify the frequency with which they saw and communicated with the applicant during the requisite period. The affiants fail to indicate any other details that would lend credence to the claimed acquaintance with the applicant and the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. Their content must include sufficient detail from the claimed relationship to indicate that the relationship probably did exist and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the affidavits do not contain sufficient detail to establish their credibility. Therefore, the affidavits will be afforded little weight.

In the instant case, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to overcome the director's denial. The lack of evidence calls into question the credibility of the applicant's claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish the applicant's entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through the requisite period.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E- M--*, *supra*. The applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence to establish that he has continuous physical presence in the United States from November 6, 1986

through the requisite period. 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.