

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

L (

FILE:

MSC 05 358 10859

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

NOV 06 2009

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 if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted.

Perry Rhew  
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 for temporary residence (Form I-687) on December 14, 2006 because the applicant did not establish by a preponderance of credible, probative evidence that he entered the United States on or before January 1, 1982, and remained here in an unlawful status for the requisite period. Additionally, the director noted that the evidence in the record indicated that the applicant had one misdemeanor and one felony conviction in the state of California. The director concluded that the applicant had not met his burden of proof to establish eligibility for temporary resident status, and that his felony conviction was a further disqualification.

The applicant is represented by counsel on appeal. Counsel asserts that the documents and affidavits which the applicant previously submitted establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite time period. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence on appeal. The AAO has considered the applicant's assertions, reviewed all of the evidence, and has made a *de novo* decision based on the record and the AAO's assessment of the credibility, relevance and probative value of the evidence.<sup>1</sup>

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)(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

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

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).

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). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

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, "[t]ruth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality." *Id.* 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 (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.

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 applicant submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the application. *Id.* at 591.

Additionally, an alien who has been convicted of a felony or of three or more misdemeanors committed in the United States is ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status. 8 C.F.R.

§ 245a.2(c)(1). "Felony" means a crime committed in the United States punishable by imprisonment for a term of more than one year, regardless of the term such alien actually served, if any, except when the offense is defined by the state as a misdemeanor, and the sentence actually imposed is one year or less, regardless of the term such alien actually served. Under this exception, for purposes of 8 C.F.R. Part 245a, the crime shall be treated as a misdemeanor. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(p).

"Misdemeanor" means a crime committed in the United States, either (1) punishable by imprisonment for a term of one year or less, regardless of the term such alien actually served, if any, or (2) a crime treated as a misdemeanor under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(p). For purposes of this definition, any crime punishable by imprisonment for a maximum term of five days or less shall not be considered a misdemeanor. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(o).

The term 'conviction' means, with respect to an alien, a formal judgment of guilt of the alien entered by a court or, if adjudication of guilt has been withheld, where - (i) a judge or jury has found the alien guilty or the alien has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or has admitted sufficient facts to warrant a finding of guilt, and (ii) the judge has ordered some form of punishment, penalty, or restraint on the alien's liberty to be imposed.

Section 101(a)(48)(A) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(48)(A).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established that he (1) entered the United States on or before January 1, 1982, (2) has continuously resided here in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time, and (3) is otherwise admissible. The relevant documents that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States on or before January 1, 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period include several affidavits from friends and associates, including [REDACTED], and [REDACTED].

The AAO will not quote from each individual affidavit, except to state that each one attests to having known the applicant for part of the qualifying period of time (1985 – 1991). All contain statements that the affiants have known the applicant for years and that they attest to the applicant being physically present in the United States during all, or part of, the required period. These affidavits fail, however, to establish the applicant's continuous unlawful residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality; 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.

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.

Additionally, the applicant submitted a statement from an employer, who states that the applicant was engaged in harvesting farm produce from December of 1985 to April of 1987. The statement from the employer does not comply with the requirements for attestations from employers in that it fails to state the applicant's address at the time of employment, the exact period of employment, periods of layoff, whether or not the information was taken from official company records, and where records are located and whether USCIS may have access to the records. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) (2007).

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he 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 on this basis.

Further, the AAO finds in its *de novo* review that the record contains evidence of two criminal convictions. The director referred to a misdemeanor and a felony conviction in his Notice of Denial. The record before the AAO contains a certified record from the San Francisco Police Department that identifies two convictions. The applicant was convicted on September 27, 1990 for a misdemeanor violation of section 12025(a) of the California Penal Code – carrying a concealed weapon on person/vehicle. The applicant was sentenced to 36 months probation and 15 days in jail. Thereafter, the applicant was convicted on June 12, 1997 for a felony violation of section 422 of the California Penal Code – threat crime with intent to terrorize. This conviction was successfully diverted under section 10001.7 of the California Penal Code, and thus is not considered a valid conviction for immigration purposes. As the criminal record in this case consists of one misdemeanor conviction, the applicant is not ineligible for temporary resident status on criminal grounds. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(c)(1).

Finally, the AAO notes that the record contains an order of deportation issued on June 20, 1995 and a warrant, indicating that the applicant left the United States pursuant to the order of deportation on June 20, 1995. The applicant reentered the United States within five years of deportation and is therefore inadmissible. 8 C.F.R. § 212.2(a) (1995). This is another independent basis for the applicant's ineligibility for temporary resident status.

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