

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

PUBLIC COPY



LI

FILE:



Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: JUN 01 2009

MSC-05-363-12666

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:

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 denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The director stated that the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to overcome the burden of proof necessary to establish his eligibility for the benefit sought.

On appeal, the applicant states that he arrived into the United States in 1981 and that he was nervous and confused during his interview. The applicant states that the dates became confused during the interview. The applicant has resubmitted evidence already in the record of proceeding.¹

The AAO notes that in his statement on appeal the applicant states that he arrived into the United States in 1981 in the first page but on the second page, the applicant states that he arrived in 1980. The Form I-694 states that he arrived in 1981. The Form I-765 signed by the applicant on September 24, 2005 and the Form I-687 signed by the applicant on September 24, 2005 state that the applicant arrived in December 1980. Finally, the record of proceeding contains a statement written in Spanish and signed by the applicant stating that the applicant arrived in July 1982. Although the applicant claims that he was confused by the dates during his interview, the record of proceeding does not contain a consistent date for his first entry into the United States. On appeal, the applicant provides two different dates for his entry into the United States. 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 applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

¹ The AAO has reviewed the affidavits in the record of proceeding and agrees with the director that the evidence submitted does not provide sufficient evidence to overcome the burden of proof necessary to establish his eligibility for the benefit sought. None of the witness statements provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, 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. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal which is filed that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed.

A review of the decision reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal, the applicant has not presented any new evidence of his entry into the United States or his continuous residence during the requisite period. The applicant fails to specify how the director made any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the application. Nor has he specifically addressed the basis for denial. As the applicant presents no additional evidence relevant to the grounds for denial, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv).

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