U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

A2

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: MIAMI, FLORIDA Date: SEP 26 2005

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The District Director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Colombia who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. The CAA provides, in pertinent part:

> [T]he status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, (now the Secretary of Homeland Security, (Secretary)), in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

The District Director determined that the applicant was not eligible for adjustment of status as the spouse of a native or citizen of Cuba, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA of November 2, 1966, because she entered into the marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. *See District Director's Decision* dated August 7, 2004.

The AAO notes that the record contains a Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative (Form G-28) that is not signed by the applicant. Therefore the AAO will not be sending a copy of the decision to the attorney mentioned on the Form G-28, but this office will accept the submitted information.

The record reflects that on July 8, 2001, at Miami, Florida, the applicant married [redacted] a native and citizen of Cuba who applied to have his immigration status adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident of the United States, pursuant to section 1 of the CAA. Based on that marriage, on November 27, 2001, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

On July 13, 2004, the applicant and her spouse, [redacted], appeared before Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) for an interview regarding the application for permanent residence. The applicant and [redacted] were each placed under oath and questioned separately regarding their domestic life and shared experiences. Citing *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983), and *Matter of Phillis*, 15 I&N Dec. 385 (BIA 1975), the District Director maintained that when there is reason to doubt the bona fides of a marital relationship, evidence must be presented to show that the marriage was not entered into solely for the purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States. The District Director determined that the discrepancies encountered during the interview, and the lack of material evidence presented, strongly suggested that the applicant and her spouse entered into a marriage for the primary purpose of circumventing the immigration laws of the United States.

On notice of certification, the applicant was offered an opportunity to submit evidence in opposition to the District Director's findings. In response to the notice of certification, counsel submits a letter in which he

addresses the discrepancies that arose during the couple's interviews. Counsel attributes these inconsistencies to the fact the applicants were unaware of the complex and confusing immigration laws and to the fact that the applicants decided to file their applications on their own without the assistance of an immigration attorney and therefore they did not know what would be required of them in a verbal interview. Counsel submits pictures from the wedding ceremony, from various vacations and family functions, a copy of a tax return, a copy of a bank statement, copies of electrical bills, a copy of a credit check, copies of insurance policies and notarized letters from neighbors in an attempt to establish the bona fide nature of their relationship.

A review of the record of proceedings and the explanation provided by counsel as to when the couple met and the discrepancies as to their places of residence has not been explained in a convincing manner.

Counsel's explanation of the inconsistencies in the couple's testimony and a review of the recently submitted documentation and the documentation previously contained in the record of proceedings do not overcome the discrepancies that were encountered during their interview on July 13, 2004.

Pursuant to section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361, the burden of proof is upon the applicant to establish that she is eligible for adjustment of status. Further, *Matter of Marques*, 16 I&N Dec. 314 (BIA 1977), held that when an alien seeks favorable exercise of the discretion of the Attorney General, it is incumbent upon him to supply the information that is within his knowledge, relevant, and material to a determination as to whether he merits adjustment. When an applicant fails to sustain the burden of establishing that she is entitled to the privilege of adjustment of status, her application is properly denied. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the District Director's decision will be affirmed.

ORDER: The District Director's decision is affirmed.