

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

[REDACTED]

L,

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: FORT SMITH

Date:

MAR 03 2011

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:

[REDACTED]

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 applicant's status as a temporary resident, granted 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 terminated by the Director, Forth Smith, Arkansas. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

According to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records, the applicant was granted temporary resident status on January 19, 2007. On June 22, 2009 the director issued a Notice of Intent to Terminate (NOIT) and granted the applicant 30 days in which to submit evidence in rebuttal to the proposed termination of his temporary resident status. Based on the evidence submitted, the applicant failed to overcome the reasons stated in the NOIT. Therefore, the director determined that the applicant was not eligible for status as a temporary resident pursuant to Section 245A of the Act. The applicant's temporary resident status was terminated on November 16, 2009. The applicant filed a timely appeal.

On appeal, the applicant indicates that he has submitted evidence that is sufficient to establish his eligibility for the benefit sought and that the affidavits submitted are credible and consistent. The applicant also requests a copy of the record of proceedings. He also denies entering the United States using fraudulent documentation. This request was processed on September 4, 2010.¹

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).

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

¹ [REDACTED]

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. 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, "[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.

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 (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.

In support of his assertion that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status throughout the relevant period, the applicant submitted affidavits from [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. While the affiants indicate that they knew the applicant during the relevant period, they fail to provide sufficient details regarding the applicant's residence in the United States. They do not indicate how they date the applicant's initial entry or residence, or how frequently they saw him during the relevant period. Furthermore, several of the affiants indicate that they met the applicant in 1988. [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant lived with him from 1985 until 1988 at [REDACTED], however, the applicant does not indicate on his Form I-687 a residential address in the United States prior to 1988.

It is further noted that the applicant lists no absences from the United States during the relevant period on his Form I-687. However, on his CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet he indicates that he was turned away from filing his Form I-687 during the original filing period because he traveled outside the United States after November 6, 1986 without permission. This inconsistency casts doubt on the reliability of the applicant's testimony.

It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the applicant submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the application. *Id.* at 591.

Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO agrees with the director that the evidence submitted by the applicant has not established that he is eligible for the benefit sought.

Furthermore, the application may not be approved because the evidence establishes that the applicant is inadmissible to the United States. Section 245A(a)(4)(A) of the Immigration & Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(4)(A), requires an alien to establish that he or she is admissible to the United States as an immigrant in order to be eligible for temporary resident status.

The record reflects that the applicant sought through misrepresentation to procure an immigration benefit under the Act. As noted above, the applicant attempted to enter the United States on May 11, 1998 using a fraudulent border crossing card.

An alien is inadmissible if he seeks through fraud or misrepresentation to procure an immigration benefit under the Act. Section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i). Thus, the applicant is inadmissible and ineligible for legalization benefits.

Pursuant to section 245A(d)(2)(B)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(d)(2)(B)(i), the cited grounds of inadmissibility may be waived in the case of individual aliens for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest. The AAO notes that the applicant has not filed a Form I-690 Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability relating to the misrepresentation. Even if a waiver were approved, the application would not be approvable since the applicant failed to establish his continuous residence for the duration of the relevant period. Accordingly, the applicant's appeal will be dismissed.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, 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 has also failed to establish his admissibility. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis. Any previous temporary resident status granted to the applicant is hereby terminated.

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