

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

LI

FILE:

MSC 05 166 13048

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

**FEB 27 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:

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, New York. The decision 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, and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet. The director denied the application because the applicant did not establish that he continuously resided in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant states he disagrees with the director's finding that he did not provide sufficient evidence to support his claim. The applicant further states he did not receive the director's Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), so he did not have an opportunity to respond. He forwards a notarized statement form [REDACTED] for consideration.

It is noted that the director's NOID was sent to the applicant's address of record but was not accepted by the addressee after two notices. It was then returned to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

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 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. 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).

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.* Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine the evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the facts to be proven are probably true.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the 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 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.

The pertinent evidence in the record is described below:

An affidavit from [REDACTED] who states that he knew the applicant during 1981. [REDACTED] also states that the applicant and his uncle were members of his church and participated in church activities in the State of Maryland.

Although [REDACTED] indicates he has known the applicant since 1981, his statement does not supply enough details to lend credibility to an at least 26 year relationship with him. For instance, the affiant did not indicate how he dates his initial meeting with the applicant, how frequently they had contact during the requisite period, or how he maintained personal knowledge of the applicant's presence in this country. Additionally, on his Form I-687, the applicant was asked to list any affiliations or associations that he had in the United States such as clubs, organizations, churches, unions or businesses. He did not list any church affiliation.

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. Further, the applicant must resolve any inconsistencies in the record with competent, independent, objective evidence. Attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence sufficient to demonstrate where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). These inconsistencies cast doubt not only on the evidence containing the conflicts, but on all of the applicant's evidence and all of his assertions.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and continuous residence during the requisite period.

The evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. 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 its amenability to verification. Given the absence of credible supporting documentation, the applicant has failed to meet his burden of proof and failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States during the requisite period. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act. The application was correctly denied on this basis, which has not been overcome on appeal. Consequently, the director's decision to deny the application is affirmed.

It is noted that on May 3, 2000, the applicant was granted the opportunity to voluntarily leave the United States by September 2, 2000 by the January 1, 1999 by the Director, Atlanta, Georgia, office of USCIS. The record does not show that he departed this country as required.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.