

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

41

FILE:

MSC 05 299 14354

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

JUL 31 2006

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. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, 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.

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, 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) was denied by the Director, Los Angeles, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director determined that the applicant had not established that he resided in the United States in a continuous unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through the date of attempted filing during the original one-year application period that ended on May 4, 1988. The director noted that the applicant had a single absence from the United States of over 45 days. The director, therefore, concluded that the applicant had not resided continuously in the United States for the requisite period and was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he has submitted sufficient evidence to establish his eligibility for Temporary Resident Status, and denies having been absent from the United States for over 45 days. The applicant does not submit additional evidence on appeal.

An applicant for temporary resident status – under section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) – 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See* CSS Settlement Agreement, paragraph 11 at page 6; Newman Settlement Agreement, paragraph 11 at page 10.

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."

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).

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 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 or petition.

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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that letters from employers attesting to an applicant’s employment must: provide the applicant’s address at the time of employment; identify the exact period of employment; show periods of layoff; state the applicant’s duties; declare whether the information was taken from company records; and identify the location of such company records and state whether such records are accessible or in the alternative state the reason why such records are unavailable.

The applicant claims to have resided in the United States since 1981. He filed an application for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act (Form I-687), together with a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet, on July 26, 2005.

In the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), dated November 17, 2005, the director stated that the applicant failed to submit sufficient evidence demonstrating his continuous unlawful residence, and continuous physical presence, in the United States during the requisite period. The director granted the applicant thirty (30) days to submit additional evidence.

In the Notice of Decision, dated June 12, 2007, the director denied the instant application based on the reasons stated in the NOID. The director noted that the applicant testified at his interview on October 20, 2006, that he had departed the United States in November 1987 and returned in 2004. The director, therefore determined that the applicant had a single absence from the United States of over 45 days which disrupted his continuous residence.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through the date he attempted to file a Form I-687 during the original one-year application period that ended on May 4, 1988. After reviewing the entire record, the AAO determines that he has not.

Contrary to the applicant's assertion, the record of proceeding indicates that the applicant had a prolonged absence of over 45 days. It is noted that the applicant indicated during at his interview on October 20, 2006 before an Immigration Officer that he had departed the United States in 1987. It is also noted that at part # 30 of the I-687 Application, which requires applicants to list their addresses in the United States since their first entry, the applicant indicated that he had resided at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from 1981 to 1987, but the applicant does not list any address in the United States for the period from 1987 to 1990. This evidence points to the applicant's absence from the United States during the period from 1987 to 1990. The applicant denies, on appeal, that he had absent during that period, but does not provide evidence of his residence in support of his assertion.

Continuous unlawful residence is broken if an absence from the United States is more than 45 days on any one trip unless return could not be accomplished due to emergent reasons. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(h)(1)(i). "Emergent reasons" has been defined as "coming unexpectedly into being." *Matter of C*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988). There is no evidence of record to indicate the applicant's absence was due to an emergent reason. As noted above, to meet his burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his own testimony, and in this case he has failed to do so.

The applicant's absence from the United States from 1987 to 1990, represents a single absence of a period of more than 45 days, and is clearly a break in any period of continuous residence he may have established. As he has not provided any evidence that there was an "emergent reason" for his failure to return to the United States in a timely manner, he has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he 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.

It is noted that the applicant's Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) results report reflects that:

1. The applicant was arrested on March 7, 2004, by the Los Angeles Police Department, Miami, Florida, and charged with "MFG/SELL COUNTERFEIT REG MK." The FBI results report indicates that Superior Court of Los Angeles convicted the applicant for a

violation of "415 PC - FIGHT NOISE OFFENSIVE WORDS," and the applicant was sentenced to 1 day jail and 24 months probation.

It is noted that the final court disposition is not in the record of proceeding.

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