

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

L (



FILE:



Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **JAN 07 2010**

MSC 06 102 16700

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, Los Angeles, California, 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 he 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 his 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 November 1979. He 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 January 10, 2006.

In the Notice of Decision, dated February 26, 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 issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through the date he 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 he has not.

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

Affidavits

- 1) An affidavit from [REDACTED], attesting to having known the applicant to have resided in the United States from 1979 to 1985. [REDACTED] also attests she first met the applicant at a Mormon church, and that from 1981 to 1985, the applicant resided at [REDACTED]. The affiant, however, does not provide details, such as to indicate how she dates her acquaintance with the applicant, and whether and under what circumstances she has had contact with the applicant. Also, the affiant does not indicate whether the applicant has been a continuous resident in the United States after 1985.
- 2) Affidavits from [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] attests to having known the applicant since 1980; that he rented a room from the applicant from 1980 to 1985 for \$100 dollars; and, that he and the applicant "have been good friends and coworkers at the Barber shop that [he [REDACTED]] own [s] in North Pasadena. Mr. [REDACTED] attests to having known the applicant since 1979; that he and the applicant know each other's families very well; and, that he and the applicant "have been good friends and coworkers at the Barber shop that [he ([REDACTED])] own [s] in Los Angeles." It is noted that [REDACTED] does provide the address where he rented the room from the applicant. Also, the affiants do not provide details, such as to indicate how they date their acquaintance with the applicant; during what period the applicant worked at their Barber shop(s); the capacity in which the applicant worked at their barber shop(s); and, whether, the applicant has been a continuous resident in the United States since their acquaintance.

In addition, the applicant submitted a 1986 W-2 Wage and Tax Statement showing \$524.45 of wages, tips, and other compensation from his employer, [REDACTED]; Western Union money transfer receipts, dated July 7, 1986, and November 24, 1986, and a Pan American money transfer receipt, dated February 20, 1987. These documents, however, do not establish the applicant's residence.

Contrary to counsel's assertion, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to establish his continuous residence. As discussed above, the affidavits lack essential detail, and the W-2 form and money transfer receipts are not probative of the applicant's continuous residence. As such, the evidence provided does not establish the applicant's residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982.

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 his 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 he 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.