



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



L1

Date: Office: LOS ANGELES

FILE: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

NOV 01 2012

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:

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

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 of the Los Angeles office. 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. Initially, the director denied the application, finding the applicant had failed to establish that she was a class member. The Special Master granted her appeal. The director subsequently denied the application on the merits, finding that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status because she had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States throughout the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant responds to several issues raised by the director in her decision.¹ The applicant submitted a copy of a 1986 Form W-2. She requested a copy of the record of proceedings. The request was processed on May 6, 2012. The AAO has considered the applicant's assertions, reviewed all of the evidence, and has made a *de novo* decision based on the record and the AAO's assessment of the credibility, relevance and probative value of the evidence.²

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)(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.

¹ She said that she could not get any identification under the assumed name as it was not her own. She further indicated that the number of dependents she claimed on her tax form was not relevant.

² 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).

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 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 applicant has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that she has resided in the United States for the requisite statutory period. The issue in this proceeding is whether the

applicant has established that she (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 her claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of witness statements/affidavits, an employer letter, and miscellaneous documents. The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility. 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 submitted an affidavit from [REDACTED] who asserts she has known of the applicant's physical presence in the United States since 1981 and has known the applicant for many years prior to her arrival in this country. Although Ms. [REDACTED] claims to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period, her affidavit does not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with her, 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 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 the applicant's arrival in the United States, 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. The AAO finds that the witness statement does not provide sufficient details that would lend credence to the affiant's claimed knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. For these reasons the AAO finds that the witness statement does not indicate that their assertions are probably true.

The record contains an employment verification letter from [REDACTED] who states that the applicant worked for him as a domestic employee from January 15, 1981 to December 1984.

The employment verification letter from Mr. [REDACTED] does not meet the requirements set forth in the regulations, which provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) provides that letters from employers must include: (A) Alien's address at the time of employment; (B) Exact period of employment; (C) Periods of layoff; (D) Duties with the company; (E) Whether or not the information was taken from official company records; and (F) Where records are located and whether the Service may have access to the records. If the records are unavailable, an affidavit-form letter stating that the alien's employment records are unavailable and why such records are unavailable may be accepted in lieu of subsections (E) and (F). The employment verification letter fails to comply with the above cited regulation because it lacks

considerable detail regarding the applicant's employment. For instance, the witness does not state the applicant's daily duties, the number of hours or days she was employed, or the location at which she was employed. The witness does not state the applicant's address at the time of employment. Furthermore, the witness does not state how he was able to date the applicant's employment. It is unclear whether he referred to his own recollection or any records he may have maintained. For these reasons, the employment verification letter is of little probative value.

The applicant submitted a copy of a doctor's prescription and of receipts. The director noted that the prescription form is dated February 1988 but that it was purportedly issued on October 29, 1982. The applicant did not provide an explanation for this discrepancy. The receipt dated 1984 has the applicant's name but no other information such as the name of the issuer of the receipt, so it is not verifiable.

The applicant submitted a copy of her 1986 federal tax return. There is no evidence that the return was filed but it will be given some weight as the applicant later submitted a copy of her corresponding W-2 Form.

On her application, the applicant indicated that she used an assumed name, [REDACTED]. She submitted copies of several paystubs in the name of [REDACTED].

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d) states in pertinent part that:

(2) *Assumed names* - (i) *General*. In cases where an applicant claims to have met any of the eligibility criteria under an assumed name, the applicant has the burden of proving that the applicant was in fact the person who used that name The assumed name must appear in the documentation provided by the applicant to establish eligibility. To meet the requirements of this paragraph documentation must be submitted to prove the common identity, i.e., that the assumed name was in fact used by the applicant.

(ii) *Proof of common identity*. The most persuasive evidence is a document issued in the assumed name which identifies the applicant by photograph, fingerprint or detailed physical description. Other evidence which will be considered are affidavit(s) by a person or persons other than the applicant, made under oath, which identify the affiant by name and address, state the affiant's relationship to the applicant and the basis of the affiant's knowledge of the applicant's use of the assumed name. Affidavits accompanied by a photograph which has been identified by the affiant as the individual known to affiant under the assumed name in question will carry greater weight.

The applicant failed to provide any evidence in the proscribed format to establish the common identity; therefore, the [REDACTED] paystubs will be given no weight.

Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO finds that the applicant has not established that she is eligible for the benefit sought.

Based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she 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.

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