



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

L1

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CHICAGO Date: APR 20 2009
MSC-06-096-11348

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. 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.

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, Chicago, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office 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 after determining that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. The director noted that the applicant testified under oath during her immigration interview that she was absent from the United States from June of 1988 to October of 1996, and that she had gone to the Philippines to get married. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met her 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 she was absent from the United States only after her family had attempted to file for amnesty and were front-desked, and that therefore, she has continuously resided in the United States throughout the requisite periods. On appeal, she resubmits a copy of her legalization questionnaire and she submits a brief history of the CSS Settlement agreement.

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 245A(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).

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) 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. See 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.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet her burden of establishing continuous unlawful residence in the United States since before January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The applicant submitted as evidence tax documents that are dated subsequent to the requisite period and will therefore not be considered by the AAO to be relevant to her claimed continuous residence in the United States during that time. She submitted a letter from the International Research Foundation, Inc. in which it is stated that the applicant completed studies at the University of Santo Tomas, located in Manila, the Philippines from 1989 to 1983. The applicant also submitted a copy of a certification letter from the Commission on Higher Education located in the Philippines in which it is stated that the applicant graduated from a four-year course in Commerce leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Commerce on March 24, 1993, and a copy of her transcripts from the University of Santo Tomas. These documents are also dated subsequent to the requisite period and they demonstrate that the applicant was residing in the Philippines during that

time period. The applicant submitted a copy of her I-94 B-2 visitor's visa which shows her entry into the United States in 1998.

The applicant submitted fill-in-the-blank affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in which they stated that the applicant was their niece and they listed the applicant's addresses as [REDACTED] in Chicago, Illinois and [REDACTED] in Mt. Prospect, Illinois. Here, the affiants fail to specify when and under what circumstances they met the applicant in the United States. They also fail to specify the dates during which the applicant resided at the above noted addresses.

The applicant submitted a copy of a Legalization Questionnaire in which she stated that her family was turned away when they attempted to file the application for legalization during the amnesty period because they did not qualify. Here, the applicant fails to specify the approximate date that her family was turned away from filing their legalization application.

The director determined that the applicant had failed to demonstrate her continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant reasserts her claim of eligibility for the immigration benefit sought.

In the instant case, the applicant has failed to provide sufficient credible and probative evidence to establish her continuous unlawful residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period. She has failed to overcome the director's basis for denial. The affidavits submitted are lacking in detail.

The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period and the inconsistencies noted above seriously detract from the credibility of this 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. Given the applicant's reliance on evidence that is lacking in detail and which has minimum probative value, it is concluded that she has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period 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.