



(b)(6)



Date: **JAN 29 2014** Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: 

IN RE: Applicant: 

APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Temporary Resident pursuant to Section 210 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1160

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case. This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Western Service Center [now known as the California Service Center] Director denied the application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application for Group 2 status because the applicant failed to establish the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the 12-month period ending on May 1, 1986. This decision was based on adverse information acquired by the Service relating to the applicant's claim of employment for [REDACTED]

On appeal, the applicant requested a copy of the record of proceedings and reserved his right to amend the statement of reasons for his appeal. The request was processed on November 14, 2013 [REDACTED]. The applicant failed to supplement his appeal.

In order to be eligible for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker, an alien must have engaged in qualifying agricultural employment for at least 90 man-days during the twelve-month period ending May 1, 1986, and must be otherwise admissible under section 210(c) of the Act and not ineligible under 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(d). 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(a). An applicant has the burden of proving the above by a preponderance of the evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b).

On the I-700 application, the applicant claimed he performed 102 man-days of labor for [REDACTED] California. In support of his claim, the applicant submitted a notarized statement purportedly signed by [REDACTED]

In the course of attempting to verify the applicant's claimed employment, the Service acquired information which contradicted the applicant's claim. In a sworn statement before an officer of this Service on April 10, 1990, [REDACTED] stated he pled guilty to violating 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and 2 for aiding and abetting false statement to federal agent. He stated that the only agricultural workers he employed in 1985 and 1986 were a crew of 35 individuals and he did not provide employment verification letters for those individuals. He stated that every employment verification letter and Form I-705 he signed was false and fraudulent.

The director advised the applicant in writing of the adverse information obtained by the Service, and of the Service's intent to deny the application. The applicant was granted thirty days to respond. The applicant failed to respond to the notice. The director concluded the applicant had not overcome the derogatory evidence, and denied the application.

Generally, 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. § 210.3(b)(1). Evidence submitted by an applicant will have its sufficiency judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b)(2). Personal testimony by an applicant which is not corroborated, in whole or in part, by other credible evidence (including testimony by persons

other than the applicant) will not serve to meet an applicant's burden of proof. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(b)(3).

There is no mandatory type of documentation required with respect to the applicant's burden of proof; however, the documentation must be credible. *United Farm Workers (AFL-CIO) v. INS*, Civil No. S-87-1064-JFM (E.D. Cal.).

The derogatory information obtained by the Service from [REDACTED] directly contradicts the applicant's claim. The applicant has not overcome such derogatory evidence.

The applicant has failed to credibly establish the performance of at least 90 man-days of qualifying agricultural employment during the twelve-month statutory period ending May 1, 1986. Consequently, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal which is filed that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed. The record reflects that the director set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. The applicant has failed to address the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence on appeal. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

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