

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L1



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-173-11640

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **OCT 15 2009**

IN RE: Applicant:



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:



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.

Perry Rhew
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, Los Angeles. 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. 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. The director noted that many of the affidavits submitted were vague and that it did not appear from the evidence that the applicant was present in the United States prior to January 1, 1982. 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, counsel asserts that the evidence submitted on behalf of the applicant is not inconsistent and that affidavits submitted by two of the affiants are sufficiently detailed. Counsel also asserts that the evidence submitted is sufficient to demonstrate the applicant's continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period.

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).

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) 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. See 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 burden of establishing continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The applicant submitted copies of IRS W-2 forms and IRS 1040 forms for the tax years 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988. The applicant also submitted photocopies of his California Identification Cards dated November 1984 and October 1985. Although these documents establish that the applicant resided in the United States for some or all of the period from 1985 to 1988, they are insufficient to demonstrate his continuous residence in the United States since before January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period.

The applicant submitted the following evidence:

- A letter from the [REDACTED] who stated that she employed the applicant as a sewing machine operator from July 1986 to July 1988. The letter does not conform to regulatory standards for attestations by employers. Specifically, the letter does not specify the address(es) where the applicant resided throughout the claimed employment period,

or the exact dates of employment. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). Here, the declarant fails to indicate whether the employment information was taken from company records. Neither has the availability of the records for inspection been clarified. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i).

- An affidavit dated July 31, 1990 and a declaration dated November 16, 2004 from [REDACTED] who stated that he has known the applicant since February 1980.
- A declaration from [REDACTED] who stated that he has known the applicant to be in the United States since 1980, that they lived in the same block of [REDACTED] in Los Angeles, California, and that they would participate in various social activities together. Here, the declarant fails to specify the length of time during which he remained neighbors with the applicant.
- Affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who stated that they have known the applicant since June 1981.
- Declarations from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who stated that they have known the applicant since February 1981, and that they shared an apartment with the applicant at [REDACTED] in Los Angeles, California from that time to September 1981 and November 1981, respectively. The declarants fail to specify the type of relationship they had with the applicant subsequent to November 1981.

These affidavits and declarations fail to establish the applicant's continuous unlawful residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality; 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.

None of the witness statements provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of those associations and demonstrate that they were a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence during the time addressed in the statements. To be considered probative and credible, witness statements must do more than simply state that an affiant or declarant 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 a 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 collectively, the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

The applicant submitted copies of handwritten rent receipts bearing the name [REDACTED] and dated May 1981, and January and March 1982. This evidence, without more probative evidence of record, does not demonstrate the applicant's claimed continuous residence during the requisite period.

In the instant case, the applicant has failed to provide sufficient credible and probative evidence to establish his continuous unlawful residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period. Without more persuasive evidence to demonstrate the applicant's initial arrival in the United States and his continuous unlawful residence thereafter, his eligibility for temporary residence status cannot be established. The applicant has failed to overcome the director's basis for denial.

The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation 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. Given the applicant's reliance on evidence with little probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period 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.