

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

41

FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC-05-195-22377

Office: SAN FRANCISCO Date: **AUG 07 2009**

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. 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, San Francisco. 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. Specifically, the director noted that the applicant testified that he was admitted to the United States in B-2 visitor status for the first time in January of 1981. The director concluded that the applicant had not established that he entered the United States in 1981, and even if this fact was established, the applicant had not proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he violated his visitor status in a manner known to the government. Accordingly, the director denied the application on October 13, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that United States Citizenship & Immigration Services (USCIS) erred in finding that the applicant failed to prove that he was in unlawful status in the United States prior to January 1, 1982 in a manner known to the government. He asserts that he violated his lawful B-2 status by overstaying his B-2 visa prior to January 1, 1982. He further asserts, through counsel, that he is not required to demonstrate that he violated his nonimmigrant status by overstaying his admission.

Preliminarily, the AAO notes that the director adjudicated the application on the merits and presumptively found the applicant eligible for class membership under the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. On September 9, 2008 the court approved a Stipulation of Settlement in the class action *Northwest Immigrant Rights Project, et al vs. USCIS, et al*, 88-CV-00379 JLR (W.D. Was.) (NWIRP). Class members are defined, in relevant part, as:

1. Class Members [include] all persons who entered the United States in a nonimmigrant status prior to January 1, 1982, who are otherwise *prima facie* eligible for legalization under § 245A of the INA [Immigration & Nationality Act], 8 U.S.C. § 1255a, who are within one or more of the Enumerated Categories described below in paragraph 2, and who –

(A) between May 5, 1987 and May 4, 1988, attempted to file a complete application for legalization under § 245A of the INA and fees to an INS officer or agent acting on behalf of the INS, including a Qualified Designated Agency (“QDE”), and whose applications were rejected for filing (hereinafter referred to as ‘Subclass A members’); or

(B) between May 5, 1987 and May 4, 1988, attempted to apply for legalization with an INS officer, or agent acting on behalf of the INS, including a QDE, under § 245A of the INA, but were advised that they were ineligible for legalization, or were refused legalization application forms, and for whom such information, or inability to obtain the required application forms, was a substantial cause of their failure to file or complete a timely written application (hereinafter referred to as 'Sub-class B' members); or

(C) filed a legalization application under INA § 245A and fees with an INS officer or agent acting on behalf of the INS, including a QDE, and whose application

1. has not been finally adjudicated or whose temporary resident status has been proposed for termination (hereinafter referred to as 'Sub-class C.i. members'),
- ii. was denied or whose temporary resident status was terminated, where the INS or CIS action or inaction was because INS or CIS believed the applicant had failed to meet the 'known to the government' requirement, or the requirement that s/he demonstrate that his/her unlawful residence was continuous (hereinafter referred to as 'Sub-class C.ii members').

2. Enumerated Categories

- (1) Persons who violated the terms of their nonimmigrant status prior to January 1, 1982 in a manner known to the government because documentation or the absence thereof (including, but not limited to, the absence of quarterly or annual address reports required on or before December 31, 1981) existed in the records of one or more government agencies which, taken as a whole, warrants a finding that the applicant was in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982, in a manner known to the government.
- (2) Persons who violated the terms of their nonimmigrant visas before January 1, 1982, for whom INS/DHS records for the relevant period (including required school and employer reports of status violations) are not contained in the alien's A-file, and who are unable to meet the requirements of 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.1(d) and 245a.2(d) without such records.
- (3) Persons whose facially valid 'lawful status' on or after January 1, 1982 was obtained by fraud or mistake, whether such 'lawful status' was the result of
  - (a) reinstatement to nonimmigrant status;
  - (b) change of nonimmigrant status pursuant to INA § 248;
  - (c) adjustment of status pursuant to INA § 245; or

- (d) grant of some other immigration benefit deemed to interrupt the continuous unlawful residence or continuous physical presence requirements of INA § 245A.

The AAO finds that the applicant is a member of the NWIRP class as enumerated above and will adjudicate the application in accordance with the standards set forth in the settlement agreement.

NWIRP provides that I-687 applications pending as of the date of the agreement shall be adjudicated in accordance with the adjudication standards described in paragraph 8B of the settlement agreement. Under those standards, the applicant must make a *prima facie* showing that prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant violated the terms of his or her nonimmigrant status in a manner known to the government because documentation or the absence thereof (including, but not limited to, the absence of quarterly or annual address reports required on or before December 31, 1981) existed in the records of one or more government agencies which, taken as a whole, warrants a finding that the applicant was in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982, in a manner known to the government. It is presumed that the school or employer complied with the law and reported violations of status to the INS; the absence of such report in government records is not alone sufficient to rebut this presumption. Once the applicant makes such a showing, USCIS then has the burden of coming forward with proof to rebut the evidence that the applicant violated his or her status. If USCIS fails to carry this burden, the settlement agreement stipulates at paragraph 8B that it will be found that the alien's unlawful status was known to the government as of January 1, 1982. With respect to individuals who obtained their status by fraud or mistake, the applicant bears the burden of establishing that he or she obtained lawful status by fraud or mistake. The settlement agreement further stipulates that the general adjudicatory standards set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.18(d) or 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(k)(4), whichever is more favorable to the applicant, shall be followed to adjudicate the merits of the application once class membership is favorably determined.

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)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence under the NWIRP Settlement Agreement, 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. NWIRP Settlement Agreement paragraph 8 at pp. 14-15.

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.

In support of his claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States, the applicant asserts that he entered the United States with his parents in January 1981 using a valid nonimmigrant visitor visa. The applicant has not submitted any documentary evidence of his entry in 1981, such as his B-2 visa or I-94 card.

Where an applicant is claiming that he made a pre-1982 nonimmigrant entry and that his period of authorized stay expired prior to January 1, 1982, and the applicant has no documentary evidence of these claims, the AAO shall use as guidance instructions set forth in the 2008 Stipulation of Settlement in the class-action *Northwest Immigrant Rights Project, et al. vs. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, et al.*, 88-CV-00379 JLR (W.D. Was.) (NWIRP). In the attachment to this settlement titled: Exhibit 2 Instructions and Class Member Worksheet at page 5, the NWIRP class member without documentary evidence of his nonimmigrant entry or credible declarations regarding this entry is instructed that he may submit a sworn statement.

In this case, the applicant has submitted a statement, however, the statement indicates only that he entered in January 1981 with his parents, using a B-2 visitor visa. He does not indicate when or where he obtained the nonimmigrant visa, or the length of his original authorized period of stay. He does not indicate that he ever requested that his nonimmigrant status be extended. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the applicant has not established his entry to the United States prior to January 1, 1982. Additionally, even if the applicant supplied sufficient evidence of his initial entry in January 1981, he has not established that he violated this lawful status in a manner known to the government prior to January 1, 1982 as required by the NWIRP Settlement Agreement.

Furthermore, as noted by the director, this application cannot be approved because the applicant has failed to establish that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from prior to January 1, 1982 through the end of the relevant period. The evidence submitted lacks sufficient detail to be considered, and, as noted by the director, the record of proceedings contains multiple material inconsistencies.

The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of six affidavits and letters. The AAO has reviewed each to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The first affiant, [REDACTED] indicates that he met the applicant in 1985 when the applicant was living with his friend, [REDACTED] in Houston, Texas. He indicates that he has seen the applicant occasionally since their first meeting.

The second affiant, [REDACTED] indicates that he met the applicant at the North Point Mosque in Houston, Texas, in 1981.

The third affiant, [REDACTED] indicates that he met the applicant at a Houston flea market in December 1981. He provides no additional relevant details pertaining to the period in question.

The fourth affiant, [REDACTED], indicates that the applicant lived with him in 1982 at [REDACTED] in Houston. The applicant testified at his June 14, 2005 interview with United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) that he entered the United States with his parents in January 1981 and that they departed the United States after only two months, leaving the applicant with the affiant, [REDACTED]. This would have been in March 1981 and is inconsistent with the affiant's testimony that the applicant lived with him in 1982.

The fifth affiant, [REDACTED], indicates that he was the applicant's neighbor on [REDACTED] in Houston, Texas from 1985 until 1988.

The final affiant, [REDACTED], indicates that he has personal knowledge that the applicant departed the United States in July 1987 to return to Pakistan. He provides no information regarding the applicant's residence in the United States prior to 1987.

None of the affiants state where or under what circumstances they met the applicant, how they date their initial acquaintance with the applicant nor do they provide any specific details regarding the events and circumstances of the applicant's residence in the United States.

While an applicant's failure to provide evidence other than affidavits shall not be the sole basis for finding that he or she failed to meet the continuous residency requirements, an application which is lacking in contemporaneous documentation cannot be deemed approvable if considerable periods of claimed continuous residence rely entirely on affidavits which are considerably lacking in certain basic and necessary information. As discussed above, the affiants' statements are significantly lacking in detail and do not establish that the affiants actually had personal knowledge of the events and circumstances of the applicant's residence in the United States. Few of the affiants provided much relevant information beyond acknowledging that they met the applicant during the relevant period. Overall, the affidavits provided are so deficient in detail that they can be given no significant probative value.

Finally, as the director noted, the applicant indicates that he departed the United States to Pakistan on July 5, 1987 until August 14, 1987; January 2, 1991 to March 20, 1991; May 12, 1995 until August 12, 1995; and December 27 until February 27, 2005.

An applicant for temporary residence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements need only 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 applicant attempted to file a Form I-687 application or was caused not to timely file. The applicant testified at his June 14, 2005 interview with USCIS that he attempted to apply for legalization benefits in November 1987 but was turned away. Thus, the director's assertion that the applicant departed the United States for more than 45 days during the periods listed above, and that these departures constituted a break in any continuous residence that the applicant may have established, will be withdrawn. The AAO finds that, as explained above, the applicant's absence during those years is not relevant to establishing eligibility for temporary residence under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

As is stated above, 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). The applicant has been given the opportunity to satisfy his burden of proof with a broad range of evidence pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3).

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 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 upon affidavits with minimal 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 the date he attempted to file a Form I-687 application 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.