

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

L1



FILE:



Office: NEW YORK

Date: JUN 16 2009

MSC-05-306-15870

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, and 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 after determining that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. The director noted that the evidence submitted by the applicant was not credible and had little if any probative value. The director also noted that the copy of the handwritten records of rent payment could not be verified as being authentic and that the originals were never presented as evidence. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met his 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, counsel asserts that the director's decision was in error and the applicant submitted sufficient proof of his residence in the United States prior to 1981 and throughout the requisite period. The applicant does not submit any evidence on appeal.

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).

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. See 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).

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 has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The AAO notes that the record of proceeding contains sufficient documentation to demonstrate the applicant's presence in the United States up to January 1, 1982; therefore, the director's decision with respect to that issue will be withdrawn. However, the AAO will adjudicate the applicant's appeal as it relates to his claim of continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period.

The applicant submitted a copy of a handwritten list of rent payments for the premises known as [REDACTED] bearing his name as tenant and dated 1980, 1983, 1985, and 1988. However, on his Form I-687 application at part #30, the applicant stated that he resided at [REDACTED] in Mt. Pleasant, Iowa from August 1968 to March 1988, and at [REDACTED] in Bloomington, Illinois from April 1988 to April 2000. It is noted that the applicant has failed

to provide the original documents as evidenced by the director in her decision. This inconsistency casts doubt on the applicant's proof. 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. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

The applicant submitted the following attestations:

- A declaration dated December 1, 2005 from [REDACTED] who stated that he has known the applicant since the fall of 1971 when they were both graduate students at the same university. The declarant further stated that he and the applicant served in the ISU Chinese Bible Study together for 2 years until they graduated. He also stated that they have been good friends for more than 30 years and that they have written each other and phoned each other frequently.
- A letter from [REDACTED] who stated that the applicant attended her wedding held on August 15, 1986 in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. She submitted a copy of her wedding program and love poem. Here, the declarant fails to specify the nature of her relationship with the applicant other than his attending her wedding in 1986.

The declarations submitted are insufficient to support the applicant's claimed continuous residence in the United States. Declarant [REDACTED] does not indicate how she dates her initial meeting with the applicant, how frequently she had contact with the applicant, or how she had personal knowledge of the applicant's presence in the United States. It is noted that neither declarant provides information regarding where the applicant lived during the requisite period. Given these deficiencies, the declarations have minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claims that he continuously resided in the United States throughout the requisite period.

In the instant case, the applicant has failed to provide sufficient credible and probative evidence to establish his continuous unlawful residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period. He has failed to overcome the director's basis for denial.

The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period and the inconsistencies noted above seriously detracts from the credibility of this 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 inconsistency found in the applicant's statements and his reliance on evidence with minimum probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite

period 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.