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

L1

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: MIAMI Date: DEC 0 2 2009
MSC 05-244-13410

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 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 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 Director, Miami, denied the Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident Under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, filed 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, or *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). The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The director's decision will be withdrawn, and the case will be remanded.

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 director found that the applicant entered the United States in lawful nonimmigrant status before January 1, 1982, and reentered the United States multiple times during the requisite period, each time on a valid nonimmigrant visa. The director found that the applicant was in lawful status, and had not established continuous unlawful presence during the requisite period. The director denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant states that she entered the United States on August 22, 1981 as a B-2 visitor and was authorized to remain for 30 days. The applicant states that she enrolled in high school within a month of her arrival, and thus violated the terms of her tourist visa. The applicant states that she began working without authorization in October 1981 and that each renewal of her visa and each subsequent reentry into the United States were obtained by fraud or mistake, in that she did not disclose her unlawful employment, and intended to reside permanently in the United States. The applicant asserts that she established continuous unlawful residence throughout the requisite period and that she is otherwise eligible to adjust to temporary resident status.

As a preliminary matter, the AAO notes that 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. 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 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

. . . .

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.

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 lawful entry and prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant violated the terms of his 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, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.18(d)[the regulation relating to whether an applicant is at risk of becoming a public charge as analyzed under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act of 2000] or at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(k)(4)[the regulation relating to whether an applicant is at risk of becoming a public charge as analyzed under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986], whichever is more favorable to the applicant.

Thus, when an [redacted] class member demonstrates that she was present in the United States in nonimmigrant status prior to 1982, the absence from her record of a required address update due prior to January 1, 1982 is sufficient to demonstrate that she violated her nonimmigrant status and was in unlawful status in a manner that was known to the government prior to January 1, 1982. *See* [redacted] settlement agreement, paragraph 8B. *See also*: section 265(a) of the Act as in place through December 29, 1981 (which indicates that nonimmigrants must notify the U.S. government in writing of a change of address within 10 days of the address change and must report their addresses at the end of each three-month period after entering, regardless of whether there is any address change.)

The record establishes that the applicant entered the United States as a nonimmigrant tourist on August 22, 1981. On September 24, 1981 she paid [redacted] nonresident tuition to the Dade County School Board. The record reflects that she attended the Miami Sunset Senior High School in 1981-1982. The applicant states that she was employed without authorization beginning in October 1981. She submits a letter from [redacted]. indicating that she was employed from October 1, 1981 – August 1, 1986. This letter does not comply with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i), and will be given no weight as evidence of the applicant's unauthorized employment. Nevertheless, as a nonimmigrant tourist, the applicant was required to file quarterly address reports, and there are no address reports in the record. The AAO finds that in keeping with the terms of the [redacted] settlement agreement the record establishes that the applicant entered the United States as a nonimmigrant and was in unlawful status in a manner known to the government prior to January 1, 1982. The applicant is an [redacted] class member, and the application will be adjudicated in accordance with the standards set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement.

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). The applicant shall be regarded as having resided continuously in the United States if at the time the initial application for temporary resident status is considered filed, no single absence from the United States has exceeded 45 days, and the aggregate of all absences has not exceeded 180 days during the requisite period unless the applicant can establish that due to emergent reasons the return to the United States could not be accomplished within the time period allowed, the applicant was maintaining a residence in the United States, and the departure was not based on an order of deportation. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(h).

If the applicant's absence exceeded the 45-day period allowed for a single absence, it must be determined if the untimely return of the applicant to the United States was due to an "emergent reason." Although this term is not defined in the regulations, *Matter of C-*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988), holds that "emergent" means "coming unexpectedly into being."

For purposes of establishing residence and physical presence, 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. 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 (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 her claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by friends and family, the applicant's statements, pay stubs beginning in December 1986, social security records indicating earnings in 1987 and 1988, school records, a copy of her high school diploma, and copies of receipts, bank statements, correspondence, identity cards, pages from the applicant's passport and two Forms I-20A.

The evidence of record establishes that the applicant entered the United States as a nonimmigrant and that her unlawful status was known to the government prior to January 1, 1982. The evidence of record also establishes that the applicant probably resided continuously unlawfully in the United States from before January 1, 1982 and through the end of the requisite period.

The application may not be approved, however, as the applicant has not established that she is admissible to the United States. 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 applicant's testimony indicates that she willfully misrepresented herself as a lawful nonimmigrant student or as a lawful nonimmigrant visitor at the consular office in June 1983, and December 5, 1985, and upon subsequent entries into the United States, even though by her own admission she intended to return to an unrelinquished domicile, to work without authorization and to reside indefinitely in the United States. Thus, during the statutory period, the applicant procured entry into the United States by willfully misrepresenting a material fact. The applicant is not admissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act based on these misrepresentations.

The record reflects that the applicant was arrested for driving without a license. This violation does not make the applicant inadmissible to the United States.

The applicant has submitted to the director the Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability, which is the form she must file to request a waiver of this ground of inadmissibility. The Form I-690 remains unadjudicated. Thus, under the current record, the applicant has not established that she is admissible to the United States. The case will be remanded and the director shall allow the applicant the opportunity to submit evidence in support of the Form I-690 application. After adjudicating the waiver application, the director shall complete the adjudication of this temporary residence application.

ORDER: The matter is remanded for action consistent with the above. If the decision is adverse to the applicant, it shall be certified to the AAO for review.