

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

41



FILE:



MSC 05 221 10971

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

APR 10 2009

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 "John F. Grissom".

John F. Grissom
Acting 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 Director, Los Angeles. 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 denied the application, finding that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982 and through the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant provided additional evidence for consideration.

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.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1, 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by friends and other evidence. The AAO will consider all of the evidence relevant to the requisite period to determine the applicant’s eligibility.

According to the notes taken by a United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) adjudicating officer, during an interview conducted on February 7, 2006, the applicant entered first grade in May 1983. No other information regarding the applicant’s entry and continuous residence in the United States is included in the officer’s notes.

The applicant provides two affidavits with his appeal from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The affidavits submitted do not supply enough detail to lend credibility to the affiant’s relationship with the applicant. The affidavits have not confirmed the applicant’s residency in the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and throughout the requisite period. The affidavit submitted with the appeal and signed by [REDACTED] states that to her personal knowledge the applicant resided in the United States at [REDACTED], Los Angeles, California, from November 1981 to January 1984; [REDACTED], Los Angeles, California, from January 1984 to June 1985; and [REDACTED], Los Angeles, California, from July 1985 to October 1989.

On his Form I-687 application, the applicant listed his place of residence as [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] Los Angeles, California, from 1981 to September 2004.

In a letter from the [REDACTED] signed by the clerk, [REDACTED], it states that the applicant attended Fletcher Drive Elementary School since August 1, 1983 and that he came to Fletcher from Atwater Elementary School. The Cumulative Record Card for Elementary Schools in Los Angeles, California, indicates that the applicant entered Atwater on May 19, 1983 and that he resided at [REDACTED], Los Angeles. The letter from the Fletcher Drive School goes on to state that on January 27, 1984, the applicant was transferred to Glendale Unified School District and on November 9, 1988, he returned to Fletcher Drive Elementary School. The copy of the Official Registration Card located on the letter gives the applicant's address as [REDACTED] Los Angeles. None of the school records indicate that the applicant was residing in the United States earlier than May 19, 1983.

The inconsistencies regarding the dates the applicant resided in Los Angeles, California, are material to the applicant's claim in that they have a direct bearing on the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. No evidence of record resolves these inconsistencies. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

The affidavit from [REDACTED] states that she has known the applicant since 1981 when his family moved into the same apartment building where she resides. The affidavit contains no other information.

The affidavits do not include sufficient detailed information about the claimed relationship and the applicant's continuous residency in the United States since 1981. The affidavits fail to explain how the affiants and the applicant developed and maintained a friendship. The affiants fail to specify social gatherings and other special occasions or social events where they saw and communicated with the applicant during the requisite period. The affiants also fail to indicate any other details that would lend credence to their claimed acquaintance with the applicant and the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

None of the affidavits provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, which 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 witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Upon review, the AAO finds that the affidavits do not contain sufficient detail to establish the reliability of

their assertions. Therefore, they have minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claim that he resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.

The applicant's remaining evidence consists of copies of rent receipts dated February 2, 1982, June 18, August 18 and September 18, 1986 and February 23 and March 18, 1987. The receipts show that rent was received from the applicant's mother, [REDACTED]. However, copies of six rent receipts do not establish the applicant's continuous residence throughout the requisite period. Further, the letter submitted by the landlord, whose name is illegible, states that [REDACTED] was a tenant at [REDACTED] in the year 1982. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish the applicant's 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 requisite period.

In the instant case, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to overcome the director's denial. The insufficiency of the evidence calls into question the credibility of the applicant's claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and 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.