

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



41

FILE:



Office: DALLAS

SEP 18 2008

MSC 05 265 21360


IN RE: Applicant:



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:



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 "Robert P. Wiemann".

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, Dallas. 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). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her 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).

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 the following documentary evidence that is relevant to the requisite period:

Affidavits

- [REDACTED] submitted a sworn affidavit wherein she states that she met the applicant and his mother “in Dallas since 1982.” The affiant states that the applicant’s family is friendly and helpful, but provides no additional information.
- [REDACTED] submitted a sworn affidavit wherein he states that he has known the applicant since 1982, and that he has remained friends with the applicant and his mother since that time. The affiant states that the applicant has been friendly toward his family, but provides no additional information.
- [REDACTED] submitted a sworn affidavit wherein he states that he has known the applicant since 1982, having met the applicant and his mother in church. The affiant states that the applicant has been his friend since that time and that the applicant has been friendly toward the affiant’s family. The affiant provides no additional information.

- [REDACTED] submitted a sworn affidavit wherein he states that he has known the applicant and his mother since 1984. The affiant states that the applicant is a caring and friendly man, but provides no additional information.
- [REDACTED] submitted a sworn affidavit wherein she states that she met the applicant's mother in 1986 selling tamales. The two then became friends and the affiant then met the applicant and has been friends with him since that time. The affiant provides no additional information.
- [REDACTED] submitted a sworn affidavit wherein he states that he met the applicant's mother in church. The affiant states that the applicant also attended church and that he has known the applicant and his mother since 1982 as friends.
- [REDACTED] submitted a notarized witness statement wherein he states that he has known the applicant since 1981 after meeting the applicant at church. Mr. [REDACTED] states that he and the applicant were in the same Sunday school class and that the applicant was introduced to the class as having just arrived in the United States. Mr. [REDACTED] states that he saw the applicant in church every Sunday, and that the applicant's mother brought the applicant to the United States so that she could earn enough money to care for the applicant after the applicant's father died. The statement writer further states that his mother helped the applicant's mother complete an amnesty application, and that the applicant's family attempted to apply for amnesty but were not allowed to because they had traveled outside the United States without authorization in 1987. The witness provides no additional information.
- [REDACTED] submitted a notarized witness statement wherein she states that she has known the applicant and his mother since 1981 after meeting them in church. The witness states that she was the applicant's Sunday school teacher and taught him each Sunday. The witness states that the applicant's mother brought the applicant to the United States for financial reasons after her husband died. The witness assisted the applicant's mother with the amnesty application process and states that the application was not accepted by immigration officials because the applicant and his mother had traveled outside the United States in 1987. The witness provides no additional information.

Although the applicant has submitted several affidavits in support of his application, the applicant has not established his continuous unlawful residence in the United States for 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; an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own testimony; and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility.

The witness affidavits state generally that the witnesses have known the applicant and his mother for stated periods of time (i.e., since 1981). However, none provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, that 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 during the time addressed in the affidavits. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that the relationship probably did exist and that the affiant does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the witness affidavits do not contain sufficient detail to establish the reliability of their assertions. Therefore, they have little probative value.

The evidence submitted by the applicant, and listed above, does not establish the applicant's continuous residence in the United States for the requisite time period. Taken as a whole, the evidence submitted lacks sufficient detail to establish the applicant's presence in this country for the requisite time period. 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. As previously stated, 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. 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 upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence 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.