



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

41

RE:

[REDACTED]
MSC 06 054 14417

Office: HOUSTON, TX

Date: DEC 02 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 forwarded to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services National Records 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 if the matter was remanded for further action, the record of proceedings was returned to the office that originally issued a decision in your case, and you will be contacted.

Perry Rhew
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, Houston, Texas, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be remanded to the director for further consideration in accordance with the following analysis.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review this matter on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) (“On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule.”); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp.*, NTSB, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The federal courts have long recognized the AAO’s *de novo* review authority. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted on appeal.

The record indicates that the applicant entered the United States as a nonimmigrant F-1 student on March 1, 1979, August 19, 1981 and August 25, 1982. The director stated that based on these lawful entries and the applicant’s enrollment in Texas A & M University from January 14, 1980 through May 7, 1982, the applicant was lawfully present in the United States for at least part of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant indicated through counsel that evidence in the record such as his U.S. Social Security Administration statement which lists him as having paid into Social Security each year from 1979 through 2003 supports the finding that the applicant was not lawfully present but was instead present in the United States in violation of his lawful status during the requisite period.

At the outset, the AAO notes that the director made statements in the notice of decision which suggest that the applicant does not qualify for CSS/Newman class membership. The director also adjudicated the Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status Under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, on the merits of that request and instructed the applicant to appeal the decision to the AAO by filing a Form I-694, Notice of Appeal. Thus, rather than denying the request based on a denial of the Class Membership Application and notifying the applicant of his right to seek review by a Special Master, the director adjudicated the application on the merits. Thus, the AAO will treat the application as if the director has found that the applicant has established class membership.¹

As a preliminary matter, the AAO points to the following: On September 9, 2008 the court approved a final 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). Class members are defined, in relevant part, as:

¹ This office does not have authority to review denials of CSS/Newman Class Membership Applications.

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 Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officer or agent acting on behalf of the INS, including a Qualified Designated Entity (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

2. Enumerated Categories

- a. 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.

NWIRP further provides that CSS/Newman Settlement Agreement legalization applications pending as of the date of the agreement shall be adjudicated in accordance with the adjudications standards described in paragraph 8B of the settlement agreement. Under those standards, the applicant must make a *prima facie* showing that after his or her lawful entry and prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant violated the terms of his or her nonimmigrant status in a manner known to the government in that, for example, documents and/or the absence of required documents (including, but not limited to, the absence of quarterly or annual address reports required on or before December 31, 1981) within the records of one or more government agencies, when taken as a whole, warrant a finding that the applicant was in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982 in a manner known to the government. 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 applicant's unlawful status was known to the government as of January 1, 1982. The settlement agreement states further that once USCIS finds that the applicant is a class member, USCIS shall follow 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.

Thus, when an NWIRP class member demonstrates that he was present in the United States in nonimmigrant status prior to 1982, the absence from his record of a required address update or notice of change of address due prior to January 1, 1982 is sufficient to demonstrate that he had violated his nonimmigrant status and was in unlawful status in a manner that was known to the government prior to January 1, 1982. *See* NWIRP settlement agreement, paragraph 8B. *See also*: section 265(a) of the Act as in place through December 29, 1981 (which indicates that nonimmigrants must report their addresses at the end of each three-month period after entering, regardless of whether there is any address change.)

The applicant entered as a nonimmigrant on March 1, 1979 and August 19, 1981. The record indicates that, after these entries, he remained in the United States through July 1981 and July 1982, respectively. As a nonimmigrant, he was required to file quarterly address reports with the INS prior to January 1, 1982. No address reports are in the record. As such, the record indicates that the applicant was in the United States in unlawful status in a manner that was known to the government prior to 1982. The record indicates that the applicant is an NWIRP class member as enumerated above.

Also there is no indication in the record: that the applicant ever acknowledged to U.S. officials that he had committed immigration violations and that he had his lawful status properly reinstated, despite his previous violations. Thus, the AAO also finds, in keeping with the NWIRP settlement agreement, that his nonimmigrant entry made subsequent to January 1, 1982 on August 25, 1982 was made through fraud or mistake; also the November 10, 1982 extension of the applicant's F-1 status through May 30, 1984, authorizing the applicant to transfer to Blinn College, Bryan, Texas documented in the record on the Form I-94, Arrival Departure Record, completed in San Antonio, Texas, was obtained through fraud or mistake.

The applicant has established that, under the terms of the NWIRP settlement agreement, his presence in the United States during the requisite period was unlawful.

On appeal, the applicant also indicated through counsel that the record establishes that he is otherwise eligible to adjust to temporary resident status.

Under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, USCIS shall adjudicate each Form I-687 under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, regulations and administrative and judicial precedents which the INS, now USCIS, followed in adjudicating the Forms I-687 timely filed during the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) application period. *See* CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

For purposes of establishing residence and presence as defined at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b), the term “until the date of filing” shall mean until the date the alien was “front-desked” or discouraged from filing the Form I-687 consistent with the definition of the CSS/Newman class membership. *See id.*

An applicant who files for temporary resident status pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements 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 through the date of filing the Form I-687 during the original application period or through the date that the applicant attempted to file but was dissuaded from doing so by an agent of the INS. *See id.* and § 245A(a)(2)(A) of the Act. An alien who applies for temporary resident status under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements has the burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of Section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. *See* CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and § 245A(a) of the Act.

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).

Failure to provide evidence other than affidavits shall not be USCIS’ sole basis for finding that an applicant failed to meet the continuous residence requirement. *See* CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. In evaluating the sufficiency of the applicant’s proof of residence, [USCIS] shall take into account the passage of time and other related difficulties in obtaining documents that corroborate unlawful residence during the requisite periods. *See id.*

Although the regulations provide an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit, the list also permits the submission of affidavits and any other relevant document. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The application and other statements of the applicant, both oral and written, are evidence to be considered. *See Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 at 79. The applicant’s statements must not be the applicant’s only evidence used to establish eligibility, but they should be viewed as valid evidence. *Id.*

Documentary evidence may be in the format prescribed by USCIS regulations. *See id.* at 80. For example, 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that a letter from an employer should be signed by the employer under penalty of perjury and “state the employer’s willingness to come forward and give testimony if requested.” *Id.* Letters from employers that do not comply with such requirements do not have to be accorded as much weight as letters that do comply. *Id.* However, even if not in compliance with this regulation, a letter from an employer should be considered as a “relevant document” under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(iv)(L). *Id.* Also, affidavits that have been properly attested to may be given more weight than a letter or statement. *Id.* Nonetheless in determining the weight of a statement, it should be examined first to determine upon what basis it was made and

whether the statement is internally consistent, plausible and credible. *Id.* What is most important is whether the statement is consistent with the other evidence in the record. *Id.*

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. *Id.* at 79-80. In evaluating the evidence, *Matter of E-M-* also states 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 or applicant 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, to deny the application or petition.

On November 23, 2005, the applicant filed the Form I-687 pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. He also indicated on the CSS/Newman (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet, Form I-687 Supplement, which is dated October 31, 2005 and was submitted with the Form I-687 received on November 23, 2005, that he is a CSS or Newman (LULAC) class member.

The record includes extensive contemporaneous evidence in support of the applicant’s claim of continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. The record also indicates that the applicant was absent from the United States for less than 45 days in 1982 and there is no indication in the record that the applicant ever departed the United States again after his August 25, 1982 re-entry and through the end of the requisite period.

The AAO finds that that the applicant has established continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from some date prior to January 1, 1982 and throughout the statutory period.

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO notes that the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b) provides in pertinent part:

(b) Eligibility. The following categories of aliens, who are otherwise eligible to apply for legalization, may file for adjustment to temporary residence status:

(9) An alien who would be otherwise eligible for legalization and who was present in the United States in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982, and reentered the United States as a nonimmigrant, such entry being documented on Service Form I-94, Arrival-Departure Record, in order to return to an unrelinquished unlawful residence.

(10) An alien described in paragraph (b)(9) of this section must receive a waiver of the excludable charge 212(a)(19) as an alien who entered the United States by fraud.

The ground of excludability at section 212(a)(19) of the Act has been replaced by the ground of inadmissibility listed at section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, as amended.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides in pertinent part:

Misrepresentation. – (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

The record indicates that the applicant willfully misrepresented himself as a lawful nonimmigrant upon entry during August 1982, even though his intent was to continue living indefinitely in the United States and to continue working without authorization in this country. He did this in order to gain a benefit under the Act. Namely, he sought to gain entrance into the United States. Thus, the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act.

The applicant has not yet submitted to the director the Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, which is the form he must file to request a waiver of this ground of inadmissibility. The AAO hereby provides the applicant the opportunity to file the Form I-690 with the director.

The AAO remands the matter to the director that she might adjudicate the Form I-690 and determine if the applicant is eligible for a waiver of the grounds of inadmissibility that apply in this case and otherwise complete the adjudication of this application.

ORDER: The application is remanded to the director for further action in accordance with the foregoing and entry of a new decision which, if adverse to the applicant, is to be certified to the AAO for review.