

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



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

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

4

**FILE:**

[REDACTED]

**Office: BALTIMORE**

**Date:**

**MAY 30 2008**

MSC 06 026 31278

**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. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter 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.

*for Michael F. Kelly*  
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, Baltimore. 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. 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. 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, the applicant asserts that he has established his unlawful residence for the requisite time period, that he is qualified under Section 245A of the Act and the CSS/NEWMAN settlement agreements, and that his application for temporary resident status should be granted.

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 245(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 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.* at 80. 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 for the duration of the requisite period. Here, the applicant submitted his unsworn statement, the unsworn statement of his mother, and (on appeal) the sworn affidavit of his mother. For the reasons hereinafter discussed, that evidence does not establish the applicant’s unlawful presence in the United States during the requisite time period. The applicant has failed to meet his burden of proof.

#### Affidavits and unsworn statements

- On appeal, the applicant submitted the sworn affidavit of his mother. The affidavit states that the applicant’s mother illegally enter the United States, accompanied by the applicant who was a minor child at that time, in August of 1981. The affiant states that her son lived with her in the United States from August of 1981 till June of 1987. The affiant states that she entered the United States using false documents, but that she never saw the documents and cannot state the names used at the United States border crossing. The affiant further states that a family member attempted to file for a change of status on behalf of the affiant and her son, but was turned away by immigration officials. The affiant states that she was informed that immigration officials were attempting to arrest “illegal people” and that she decided to return to her country with the applicant.
- The applicant submitted a sworn statement to an immigration officer on September 1, 2006. The applicant states that he entered the United States illegally with his mother in August of 1981, and that he continuously resided in the United States until June of 1987 when he

returned to Tanzania. The applicant states that he then reentered the United States in lawful status in April of 2000. The applicant further states that a family member attempted to apply for legalization on the applicant's behalf in 1987, but the application was refused due to a lack of documentation. The applicant provided no documentation at his legalization interview to establish his presence in the United States during the requisite period.

- The applicant submitted an unsworn statement in response to a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID). The applicant states that he entered the United States illegally with his mother in August of 1981, and that he continuously resided with family members until he returned to his country. The applicant states that he returned to the United States in April of 2000 with a student visa and filed this application.
- An unsworn statement was submitted by [REDACTED] (the applicant's mother) which states that the applicant is her son, that he was born on March 21, 1975 in Arusha Tanzania, and that she first came to the United States with her son in August of 1981.

The applicant has not provided any contemporaneous evidence of residence in the United States during the duration of the requisite period. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone, but by its quality. Although not required, neither the affidavits nor any of the unsworn statements provided included any supporting documentation of the affiants presence in the United States during the requisite period. Examples of supporting documentation to establish the applicant's unlawful residence could include, but is not limited to: proof of residence documents such as real estate records or a lease agreement; medical records; school records; bank statements; or receipts for purchases. Further, the applicant has not provided detailed affidavits from individuals who knew the applicant during the requisite period who could attest to the applicant's presence in the United States, detailing how they knew the applicant and establishing their presence in the United States during the period in question. The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of his claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States during the requisite period.

Therefore, based on the above, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and that he has 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 on this basis.

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