

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

PHOTIC COPY

41



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: LOS ANGELES
MSC 05 239 14065

Date: JUL 06 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:

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, Los Angeles. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director determined 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, and that the evidence submitted by her did not establish her eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. 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 submits additional evidence and asserts that she has submitted sufficient documentation establishing continuous residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

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).

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)(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. 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). 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 record contains the following evidence which is material to the applicant's claim:

- A sworn statement from [REDACTED] wherein [REDACTED] states that she has known the applicant since the applicant was 10 years of age (D.O.B. – 6/19/1974) as [REDACTED] was the applicant's babysitter “for some years.”
- A notarized statement from [REDACTED] wherein [REDACTED] states that she knows the applicant and the applicant's mother, [REDACTED] Ms. [REDACTED] states that she employed the applicant's mother as a domestic laborer in 1981 and grew to know the applicant through that relationship.

As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. The witness statements provided do not provide detailed evidence establishing how the witnesses knew the applicant, the details of their association or relationship, or detailed accounts of an ongoing association establishing a relationship under which the witnesses could be reasonably expected to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence, activities and whereabouts during the requisite period covered by the applicant's Form I-687. To be considered probative, witness statements must do more than simply state that a witness knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. The statements must contain sufficient

detail, generated by the asserted contact with the applicant, to establish that a relationship does in fact exist, how the relationship was established and sustained, and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts asserted. The witness statements submitted by the applicant, therefore, are not deemed probative and are of little evidentiary value.

- A statement signed by [REDACTED] records clerk, Foshay Learning Center (Los Angeles Unified School District), wherein [REDACTED] states that records indicate that the applicant attended the learning center from 1983 through 1992.
- School records/transcripts from Los Angeles, CA which indicate that the applicant attended the Foshay school from 1986 – 1989.

The above referenced evidence of the applicant's school attendance is inconsistent. The statement from [REDACTED] records clerk, Foshay Learning Center (Los Angeles Unified School District), states that records indicate that the applicant attended the learning center from 1983 through 1992. The school transcripts submitted by the applicant from the Foshay school, however, indicate that the applicant attended the school from 1986 – 1989. This inconsistency has not been explained and is material to the applicant's claim as it bears upon the applicant's residence during the requisite period. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

- Copies of the applicant's immunization records which indicate that the applicant was immunized and/or tested in the years 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985.

The immunization records submitted by the applicant are not deemed probative and are without evidentiary value. One document entitled "Immunization Record" bears the name of the applicant. That portion of the immunization record provided, however, which notes the dates for the various immunizations, does not indicate what medical provider performed the immunizations, or where the immunizations were performed. Further, the vaccination information on the immunization record is inconsistent with the information on the applicant's Form I-693 Medical Examination of Aliens. The vaccination data on the immunization record for measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) indicates that the applicant was vaccinated in 1981 and 1985; the examining physician for the Form I-693, however, indicates that the applicant received the MMR vaccines in 1994. The applicant's immunization record indicates that the applicant received the hepatitis B vaccine in 1984 and 1985; the Form I-693 indicates that she received the hepatitis B vaccine in January of 2005. There is no evidence of record resolving these inconsistencies.

The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period and noted inconsistencies seriously detract from

the credibility of her 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 documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that the evidence submitted fails to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States during the requisite period.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she has continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period 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.