

PUBLIC COPY

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

LI

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 05 094 10096

Office: NEW YORK

Date: APR 01 2008

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. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, 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 District Director, New York, and 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. The director determined that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. Specifically, the director determined that the single affidavit submitted in support of the applicant's claim lacked sufficient information. The director further stated that the affidavit did not overcome the previously submitted document that had been deemed fraudulent. Accordingly, the director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met his burden of proof and was, therefore, not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant challenges the director's decision, stating that the affiant whom Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) tried to reach for further comments was out of the country and argued that the applicant should be given further opportunity to overcome the adverse findings cited in the notice of intent.

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 Immigration and Nationality Act (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).

Under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, for purposes of establishing residence and presence in accordance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1), "until the date of filing" shall mean until the date the alien 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 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).

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.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the petitioner 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, 431 (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.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he resided in the United States during the requisite time period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden. The only documentation the applicant presented initially in support of his claim was an envelope with a falsified postage date, which, as properly pointed out by the director, did not match the date of issue on the stamp affixed to the envelope. The applicant was notified of this adverse finding in a notice of intent to deny dated August 11, 2005. However, in response, the applicant submitted a single, severely deficient, affidavit from [REDACTED] dated August 30, 2005. The only statements provided by the affiant were that he knew the applicant since 1981, that the applicant used to come to the affiant's apartment every weekend, and that he helped the applicant get a job at Ballroom on [REDACTED] where he worked for a short period of time. It is noted, however, that in the applicant's Form I-687, item No. 33 which instructs the applicant to provide information about his employment in the United States, the applicant filled in the letters "N/A" suggesting that this section of the application was not applicable to him. As such, the information provided by the affiant is inconsistent with information provided by the applicant with regard to his overall claim.

On August 3, 2006, the director reiterated the prior adverse findings and further noted that the above affiant was not available for questioning when CIS attempted to make contact with him.

On appeal, counsel claims that the affiant was previously unavailable because he was out of the country. The applicant submits evidence of the affiant's absence by providing copies of the affiant's U.S. passport containing a stamp of his reentry into the United States. While this documentation may explain the affiant's unavailability, it does not restore the applicant's damaged credibility.

Counsel further states that the applicant maintains the validity of all documentation previously provided. However, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). In the present matter, the applicant has been informed that the envelope he previously submitted as a testament of his residence in the United States during the statutory period was deemed fraudulent. The applicant was also given a valid reason for the director's findings. His mere statements on appeal and the assurances of his attorney cannot be deemed evidence and are in no way sufficient to overcome the adverse findings of the director. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

That being said, section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) provides:

Misrepresentation. – (i) In general. – Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

By engaging in such action, the applicant has negated his own credibility as well as the credibility of his claim of continuous residence in this country for the period from prior to January 1, 1982 to May 4, 1988. In addition, the applicant rendered himself inadmissible to the United States under any visa classification, immigrant or nonimmigrant pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act by committing acts constituting fraud and willful misrepresentation.

The director expressly informed the applicant that he was inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act as a result of his actions. The applicant was granted 30 days to provide substantial evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, these findings. However, the only documentation he provided was the written testimony of an affiant, whose credibility has been compromised by virtue of the applicant's actions. It is noted that doubt cast on any aspect of the evidence may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence. It is incumbent upon an applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

The absence of sufficiently detailed supporting documentation and the existence of derogatory information that establishes the applicant used postmarked envelopes in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations all seriously undermine the credibility of the applicant's claim of residence in this country for the requisite period, as well as the credibility of the documents submitted in support of such claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. The applicant has failed to submit sufficient credible documentation to meet his burden of proof in establishing that he has resided in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 to May 4, 1988 by a

preponderance of the evidence as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E- M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989).

Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal or no probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988 as required under section 245A(a)(2) of the Act. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis.

In addition, the fact that the applicant utilized documents in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations in an attempt to establish his residence within the United States for the requisite period rendered him inadmissible to this country pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act. By filing the instant application and submitting falsified documents, the applicant has sought to procure a benefit provided under the Act through fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact. Because the applicant has failed to provide independent and objective evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, our finding that he submitted falsified documents, we affirm the director's finding of fraud.

The applicant failed to establish that he is admissible to the United States as required by 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). Consequently, the applicant is ineligible to adjust to temporary residence under section 245A of the Act on this basis as well.

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