

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**



LI

FILE:



Office: NEWARK

Date:

SEP 27 2010

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Temporary Resident Status under 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.

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director of the Newark office terminated the temporary resident status of the applicant, pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, finding that the applicant was ineligible for temporary resident status based on a lack of documentation in the record of proceedings.

The AAO notes that director has incorrectly titled his decision a notice of denial of application for status as a temporary resident, since the application for status as a temporary resident was approved on August 10, 2006. Instead, the director's decision is a notice of termination of temporary resident status. In addition, the director's decision incorrectly states that the application is being denied, in part, based upon the director's finding that the applicant's continuous residence was broken by an absence from the United States in the summer of 1985. This finding of the director is not supported by the information contained in the record. In the I-687 application the applicant does not list any absences from the United States. In addition, at the time of his interview on August 27, 2009, the applicant testified that he has not left the United States since his entry into the United States in August 1981. However, the director's error is harmless because the AAO conducts a *de novo* review, evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence in the record according to its probative value and credibility as required by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).<sup>1</sup>

On appeal, the applicant states that he will submit a brief within 30 days. The applicant has not submitted a brief or any additional evidence on appeal.<sup>2</sup> The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

The temporary resident status of an alien may be terminated upon the determination that the alien was ineligible for temporary residence. Section 245A(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(b)(2)(A), and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(u)(i).

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).

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 periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. The

---

<sup>1</sup>The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

<sup>2</sup> The record reflects that the applicant's FOIA request, number [REDACTED] was processed on February 19, 2010.

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). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's 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).

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.* 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. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The weight to be given any affidavit depends on the totality of the circumstances, and a number of factors must be considered. More weight will be given to an affidavit in which the affiant indicates personal knowledge of the applicant's whereabouts during the time period in question rather than a fill-in-the-blank affidavit that provides generic information. The regulations provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment or attestations by churches or other organizations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.2(d)(3)(i) and (v).

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 or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. *See U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421 (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. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established his eligibility for temporary resident status. As stated, the applicant must establish that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the

requisite period consists of one witness statement and one envelope. The AAO has reviewed the documents in their entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each statement in this decision. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed.

The applicant has submitted a witness statement from [REDACTED] who states that she met the applicant in early 1982 in New York, at which time she states that applicant had been in the United States for a few months. However, since the witness states that she met the applicant in early 1982, she would not have first-hand knowledge of the applicant's presence in the United States prior to that date.

Although the witness claims to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period, the witness's statement does not 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 in the United States during the requisite period. To be considered probative and credible, witness statements must do more than simply state that a witness 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 it probably did exist and that the witness, by virtue of that relationship, does have knowledge of the facts alleged. For instance, the witness does not state how she dates her initial meeting with the applicant or specify social gatherings, other special occasions or social events when she saw and communicated with the applicant during the requisite period. The witness also does not state how frequently she had contact with the applicant during the requisite period, although she states that she lost contact with the applicant for some period of time. The witness does not provide sufficient details that would lend credence to her claimed knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. For these reasons the AAO finds that the witness's statement does not indicate that her assertions are probably true.

The record contains a stamped enveloped addressed to the applicant in New York with a postmark date of 1981. This document is some evidence in support of the applicant's residence in the United States for some part of 1981.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of copies of the applicant's statements, the I-687 application and a Form I-698, application to adjust status from temporary to permanent resident.<sup>3</sup>

In the I-687 application the applicant does not list any residences or employment in the United States during the requisite period.

---

<sup>3</sup> The applicant's I-698 application is pending.

At the time of his interview on August 27, 2009, the applicant testified that he first entered the United States in August 1981, and resided and worked in New York from that time through the end of the requisite period, except for several months when he was in Atlanta. The applicant stated that he does not remember the addresses where he resided in the United States. The applicant states that he worked in New York as a stock clerk in a store in 1981 and as a street peddler from 1983 through the end of the requisite period.

The director of the Newark office cited the lack of evidence in the record to establish the applicant's eligibility for temporary residence, in a notice of intent to terminate (NOIT) the applicant's temporary residence. The applicant did not file a response to the NOIT.

As stated previously, to meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony, and the sufficiency of all the evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). Here, the applicant has failed to provide probative and credible evidence of his continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

Based on the foregoing, the AAO finds that 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 is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis. As the applicant has not overcome the basis for the termination of status, the appeal must be dismissed.

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