

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



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 06 095 12966

Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER

Date: FEB 29 2008

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.

Robert K. 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. 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 District Director, National Benefits Center. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant¹ 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. The director determined that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. Specifically, the director found that the documentary evidence submitted did not prove that the applicant entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and resided in an unlawful status since such date as required by the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met his burden of proof and was, therefore, not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, the applicant indicated on the Form I-694 appeal form that he would submit a brief within 30 days of August 1, 2006, but no brief was submitted. As reason for the appeal the applicant stated "Appellant hereby ask [sic] for hearings to submit further." Presumably the applicant is requesting an oral argument. The regulations provide that the requesting party must explain in writing why oral argument is necessary. Furthermore, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) has the sole authority to grant or deny a request for oral argument and will grant argument only in cases involving unique factors or issues of law that cannot be adequately addressed in writing. *See* 8 C.F.R. 103.3(b). In this instance, the applicant identified no unique factors or issues of law to be resolved. In fact, the applicant has set forth no specific reasons why oral argument should be held. Moreover, the written record of proceeding fully represents the facts and issues in this matter. Consequently, the request for oral argument is denied.

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 245A(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).

¹ The applicant is also known as

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).

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 has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his or her burden of establishing continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The record shows that the applicant submitted a Form I-687 Application and Supplement to CIS on January 3, 2006. 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 showed his first address in the United States to be in Detroit, Michigan, with no commencement date stated to present (i.e. December 15, 2005). At part #33, the applicant did not provide any employment history on that Form.

The applicant submitted a birth certificate with translation stating that the applicant was born October 16, 1971, in Santa Ana, Xalmimilulco, Puebla, Mexico.

The applicant submitted a form affidavit prepared by [REDACTED], a U.S. citizen, made February 17, 2006, stating that the affiant associated closely with the applicant since 1979, provided the applicant's then current address, stated that "in or around 1980" the applicant indicated to her that he tried to legalize his status through the amnesty program, and that to her knowledge the applicant is of good character. As already noted by the director, the statement has minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claim that he entered the United States in 1981 since "the amnesty program" referred to in the affidavit did not arise until the passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA).

The director denied the application for temporary residence on July 3, 2006. In denying the application, the director found that the applicant's testimony was not credible. Specifically, the director found that the documentary evidence submitted did not prove that the applicant entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and resided in an unlawful status since such date as required by the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5).

In summary, the applicant has not provided any evidence of residence in the United States relating to the requisite period or of entry to the United States before January 1, 1982. Also the applicant did not provide any employment history.

Information provided by the applicant and an affidavit of [REDACTED] found in the record of proceeding lack credibility and probative value for the reasons noted.

In this case, the absence of credible and probative documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period, as well as the inconsistencies and contradictions noted in the record, seriously detract from the credibility of his 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. Given the inconsistencies in the record and the lack of credible supporting documentation, it is concluded that he has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he has 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 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.