

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: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-089-10132

Office: HOUSTON

Date:


NOV 06 2009

IN RE: Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Temporary Resident Status under 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.

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, 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 of the Houston office 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 (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status because he 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 time period.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the evidence which the applicant previously submitted establishes 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.¹

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) 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.

¹ 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 long been recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n.9 (2d Cir. 1989).

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 periods, 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, 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).

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.* 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. See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The weight to be given any affidavit depends on the totality of the circumstances, and a number of factors must be considered. More weight will be given to an affidavit in which the affiant indicates personal knowledge of the applicant's whereabouts during the time period in question rather than a fill-in-the-blank affidavit that provides generic information. The regulations provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment or attestations by churches or other organizations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.2(d)(3)(i) and (v).

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 or petitioner 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. 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established that he (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 his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of several witness statements and several documents. The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote the witness statement in this decision. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed.

The record contains witness statements from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].² The statements are general in nature and state that the witnesses have knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States for all, or a portion of, the requisite period. In addition, the testimony of [REDACTED] whose date of birth is stated as January 4, 1966, is that she has known the applicant since 1974. The testimony of the witness is inconsistent with that of the applicant in a statement dated October 22, 2007, in which he states that he has known [REDACTED], his cousin, since her date of birth. Due to this inconsistency, the affidavit of [REDACTED] has minimal probative value.

Although the witnesses claim to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period, the witness statements do not 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 in the United States during the requisite period. 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 it probably did exist and that the witness, by virtue of that relationship, does have knowledge of the facts alleged. For instance, the witnesses do not state how they date their initial meeting with the applicant or specify social gatherings, other special occasions or social events when they saw and communicated with the applicant during the requisite period. The affiants also do not state how frequently they had contact with the applicant during the requisite period. The affiants do not provide sufficient details that would lend credence to their claimed knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. For these reasons the AAO finds that the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true.

The applicant has also submitted an employment verification letter from [REDACTED] who states that the applicant worked as a laborer in Austin, Texas for some time in the years 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, although the witness does not state how he acquired this information. In addition,

² The affidavits of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are almost identical.

the witness states that the applicant worked with him several times, in the years 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983.

The employment verification letter of [REDACTED] does not meet the requirements set forth in the regulations, which provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) provides that letters from employers must include: (A) Alien's address at the time of employment; (B) Exact period of employment; (C) Periods of layoff; (D) Duties with the company; (E) Whether or not the information was taken from official company records; and (F) Where records are located and whether the Service may have access to the records. If the records are unavailable, an affidavit-form letter stating that the alien's employment records are unavailable and why such records are unavailable may be accepted in lieu of subsections (E) and (F). The employment verification letter fails to comply with the above cited regulation because it lacks considerable detail regarding the applicant's employment. For instance, the witness does not state the applicant's daily duties, the number of hours or days he was employed, or the location at which he was employed. Furthermore, the witness does not state how he was able to date the applicant's employment. It is unclear whether he referred to his own recollection or any records he may have maintained. For these additional reasons, the employment verification letter is of little probative value.

The applicant has submitted copies of eight pay stubs for the period of time from March 30, 1979 to October 4, 1979. Although these documents are some evidence of the applicant's presence in the United States from March 30, 1979 to October 4, 1979, they do not establish the applicant's continuous residence for the duration of the requisite period.

The record contains several documents from the period of time from January 7, 1984 to December 19, 1984 as follows: a registration form for classes at Austin Community Education with an accompanying receipt, three additional receipts, a W-2 form from [REDACTED], five pay stubs from [REDACTED] and a copy of a car title.

The applicant has submitted several documents from the period of time from February 21, 1985 to October 3, 1985 as follows: a receipt, an automobile insurance declarations page and identification card, a Texas driver's license, a W-2 form from [REDACTED] a wage and tax statement from [REDACTED], three receipts for cashier's checks, a registration form for classes at Austin Community Education, a request form from the Social Security Administration, and a pay stub.

The record contains several documents from the period of time from February 1, 1986 to December 12, 1986 as follows: copies of two postmarked envelopes, copies of five registered mail receipts, copies of five money order receipts, a pay stub, an automobile insurance declarations page and an accompanying receipt. The record establishes that the applicant resided in the United States from January 1984 to December 1986.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of copies of the applicant's statements and the I-687 application. As stated previously, to meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony, and the sufficiency of

all the evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). Here, the applicant has failed to provide probative and credible evidence of his continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO agrees with the director that the evidence submitted by the applicant has not established that he is eligible for the benefit sought. The various statements currently in the record which attempt to substantiate the applicant's residence and employment in the United States during the statutory period are not objective, independent evidence sufficient to establish the applicant's claim that he maintained continuous residence in the United States throughout the statutory period, and thus are not probative.

The record also reveals that on July 6, 1985, the applicant was charged with *Driving Under the Influence*. On January 13, 1986, the applicant was convicted of the charge, a misdemeanor. (County Court of Travis County, Texas, [REDACTED]) On August 10, 1986, the applicant was charged with *Criminal Mischief*. On November 5, 2001, the charge was dismissed. (County Court of Travis County, Texas, [REDACTED]) On August 26, 1990, the applicant was charged with one count of violating § 245(A) of the California Penal Code (PC), *Assault with a Deadly Weapon Not Firearm Great Bodily Injury Likely*, a felony, and one count of violating § 242 (PC), *Battery*, a misdemeanor. (Municipal Court Metro Los Angeles) The applicant was convicted of an offense. However, the applicant has not provided a final court disposition which identifies the charge for which the applicant received a conviction.

On August 12, 2005 and December 13, 2005, the director requested the applicant to submit a final court disposition for the Assault with a Deadly Weapon offense. In response, the applicant submitted a "No Record" statement from the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles. The applicant failed to submit a final court disposition for the felony charge, or evidence identifying the offense for which he was convicted.

The applicant has not provided the evidence requested by the director. For this reason alone, the application cannot be approved. The applicant's declaration at the time of his interview that he does have a criminal record is subject to verification by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). The applicant must agree to fully cooperate in the verification process. Failure to assist USCIS in verifying the information necessary for the adjudication of the application may result in a denial of the application. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(k)(5). The applicant failed to submit a final court disposition for the felony assault offense, or evidence identifying the offense for which he was convicted as a result of his August 26, 1990 arrest.

An alien who has been convicted of a felony or three or more misdemeanors in the United States is ineligible for temporary resident status. 8 C.F.R. § 210.3(d)(3).

"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).

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, continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status, as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E- M--*, *supra*. The applicant has failed to establish that he maintained continuous residence in the United States throughout the statutory period, and that he does not have a disqualifying criminal conviction. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act on this basis. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.18(a)(1).

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