identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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: LOS ANGELES Date: JUL 30 2009
MSC 06 089 13659

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 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 denied the application, finding that the applicant had not provided credible evidence to establish that she had entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and thereafter continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant states that she entered the United States in 1981 and requests that her application be reconsidered.

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.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet her burden of establishing that she (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 1, 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by friends. The AAO will consider all of the evidence relevant to the requisite period to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) adjudicating officer's notes reveal that during the Form I-687 application interview, the applicant claims to have entered the United States in 1970.

The applicant submitted several affidavits from friends to establish her initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period. The affidavits of [redacted] and [redacted] all contain statements that the affiants have personally known and been acquainted with the applicant in the United States since 1981 and that they have personal knowledge that the applicant resided in the United States in Pacoima, California, from 1981 to 1988. They attest to the applicant's good moral character and the longest period in which they have not seen the applicant but provide no other information about the applicant. [redacted] states that she has known the applicant since

1947 when they were children and that they met again at a party in the United States in 1980. Ms. testimony conflicts with the applicant's statement on appeal that she first entered the United States in 1981. also submitted a copy of a photograph in which she states she and the applicant are together, but the photo is not dated and the persons in the photos have not been identified. provided a statement in the Spanish language which was not accompanied by an English translation. The witness does not state, in Spanish, when the applicant arrived in the United States or when he first met her. Therefore, it will be given no weight. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3).

The affidavits do not include sufficient detailed information about the claimed relationships spanning from 27 to 61 years and the applicant's continuous residency in the United States since before January 1, 1982 and throughout the requisite period. For instance, none of the witnesses supplies any details about the applicant's life, such as, knowledge about her family members, education, hobbies, shared activities and the date and manner she entered the United States. The affiants fail to indicate any other details that would lend credence to their claimed acquaintance with the applicant and the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

The affidavits do not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with her, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of those associations and demonstrate that they were a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence during the time addressed in the affidavits. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that the relationship probably did exist and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged.

The remaining evidence consists of copies of Certificates of Dedication for the applicant's sons, and , dated January 5, 1969, and a baptismal certificate for the applicant's son, dated November 2, 1969 from La Trinidad Church in San Fernando, California. However, the applicant claims in a written statement and in her testimony before an immigration officer to have entered the United States for the first time in 1970. The record also contains a diploma awarded to the applicant in nursing from Benfel School on October 4, 1976. However, the seal under the applicant's picture appears to have been drawn onto the diploma. Therefore, the evidence carries no weight.

The applicant also provided a letter signed by the senior pastor of the La Trinidad Church. The letter states that the applicant first attended the church in 1967. However, the applicant claims to have entered the United States for the first time in 1970. Further, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v) provides requirements for attestations made on behalf of an applicant by churches, unions, or other organizations. Attestations must (1) identify applicant by name; (2) be signed by an official (whose title is shown); (3) show inclusive dates of membership; (4) state the address where applicant resided during membership period; (5) include the seal of the organization impressed on the letter or the letterhead of the organization, if the organization has letterhead

stationery; (6) establish how the author knows the applicant; and (7) establish the origin of the information being attested to. The letter from does not contain most of the aforementioned requirements and conflicts with the applicant's testimony that she entered in 1970 and in 1981. It will be given no weight.

An applicant applying for adjustment of status under this part has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he or she is eligible for adjustment of status under section 245a of the Act. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). In the instant case, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to overcome the director's denial. The insufficiency of and the inconsistencies in the evidence call into question the credibility of the applicant's claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish the applicant's 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 requisite period.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and 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.

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