


**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:



Office: HOUSTON

Date:

FEB 02 2010

MSC 05 285 10364


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. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter 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.

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, or *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, Houston, Texas, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director determined that the applicant had not established that she resided in the United States in a continuous unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through the date of attempted filing during the original one-year application period that ended on May 4, 1988.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to establish her eligibility for Temporary Resident Status. Counsel submits additional evidence on appeal.

An applicant for temporary resident status – under section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) – 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *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 applicant 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 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.

Although the regulations provide an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit, the list also permits the submission of affidavits and any other relevant document. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that letters from employers attesting to an applicant’s employment must: provide the applicant’s address at the time of employment; identify the exact period of employment; show periods of layoff; state the applicant’s duties; declare whether the information was taken from company records; and identify the location of such company records and state whether such records are accessible or in the alternative state the reason why such records are unavailable.

The applicant is a native of Mexico who claims to have resided in the United States since June 1980. She filed an application for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act (Form I-687), together with a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet, on July 12, 2005.

In the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), dated November 26, 2007, the director stated that the applicant failed to submit sufficient evidence demonstrating that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and her continuous unlawful residence and her physical presence in the United States, during the requisite period. The director noted that the applicant had failed to provide credible evidence to support her claim, and had made misrepresentations during her interview. The director granted the applicant thirty (30) days to submit additional evidence.

In the Notice of Decision, dated April 7, 2007, the director denied the instant application after determining that the evidence provided was insufficient to establish the applicant’s unlawful continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period. The director noted that the applicant, through counsel, responded to a notice of intent to deny but failed to overcome the reasons for denial stated in the NOID.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through the date she attempted to file a Form I-687 during the original one-year

application period that ended on May 4, 1988. After reviewing the entire record, the AAO determines that she has not.

The evidence provided which pertains to the requisite period consists of:

- 1) An affidavit from [REDACTED] attesting to knowing the applicant to have resided in the United States since 1980. [REDACTED] also attests that she and the applicant have been friends, in Mexico, since 1975; and, that their children are also good friends and play together. The affiant, however, does not provide details, such as to indicate how she dates her acquaintance with the applicant in the United States, and how frequently and under what circumstances she had contact with the applicant.
- 2) An affidavit from [REDACTED] attesting that the applicant resided with her at her home from 1980 through 1983, and that she has seen the applicant on a “weekly to monthly basis” between May 1980 and May 1988. The affiant, however, does not provide details, such as to indicate the circumstances under which the applicant shared her residence, or how she dates her acquaintance with the applicant in the United States.
- 3) An affidavit from [REDACTED] attesting to knowing the applicant to have resided in the United States since 1980. [REDACTED] also attests that she and the applicant had been friends, in Mexico, since 1975. The affiant, however, does not provide details, such as to indicate how she gained knowledge of the applicant’s residence since 1980, how she dates her acquaintance with the applicant in the United States, and how frequently and under what circumstances she had contact with the applicant since 1980.

In addition, the applicant submits earnings summaries and statements from [REDACTED] dating from February 18, 1982. The summaries show a hire date of February 18, 1982 and periodic earnings. However, it cannot be determined from the statements whether the applicant had been steadily employed since February 18, 1982. The remaining evidence in the record, including birth certificates, do not establish the requisite continuous residence. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence in support of her claim that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and she had resided continuously in the United States during the entire requisite period.

Contrary to counsel’s assertion, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to establish her continuous residence. As discussed above, the evidence provided lacks essential details, and does not establish the applicant’s residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982. As such, the evidence provided is insufficient to establish the requisite continuous residence.

As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. 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.

Based on the foregoing analysis of the evidence, the AAO concludes that the applicant has failed to establish her continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. Thus, the record does not establish that the applicant entered the United States before January 1,

1982 and resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status from that date through the date she attempted to file a Form I-687 during the original one-year application period that ended on May 4, 1988. Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A(a)(2) the Act.

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