

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 05 358 11709

Office: HOUSTON

Date: NOV 20 2009

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Perry Rhew".

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, Houston, Texas. The decision 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, on September 23, 2005.

The director denied the application on October 31, 2007, because 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 time period.

The applicant, through counsel, filed an appeal from the director's decision on November 30, 2007. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and additional documentation.

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).

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).

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.

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.

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). *See* 8 C.F.R. 245a.15(b). 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.12(f). Affidavits indicating specific, personal knowledge of the applicant’s whereabouts during the relevant time period are given greater weight than fill-in-the-blank affidavits providing generic information.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review this matter 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 federal courts have long recognized the AAO’s *de novo* review authority. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient evidence to demonstrate that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982.

The applicant, a native and citizen of Syria, claims to have initially entered the United States without inspection in December 1981 and to have departed the United States to Syria on two occasions - from February to April 1985 to teach courses at Damascus University and from November to December 1987 to visit family.

The record reveals the applicant attended the University of Damascus from September 1976 through April 1982, when he was awarded a degree in Mechanical Engineering. The record also reveals the applicant entered the United States as a non-immigrant visitor for pleasure on December 13, 1987.

In an attempt to establish his continuous unlawful residence in this country since prior to January 1, 1982, through December 13, 1987, the applicant has provided documentation including the following: a letter from [REDACTED] stating the applicant resided with him in Houston, Texas, from December 1, 1981, through February 15, 1985, and again from April 2, 1985, through November 1, 1987; a letter from [REDACTED] stating she met the applicant in 1982 when he came to her house

looking for a room to rent; a letter from [REDACTED] stating he met the applicant in the early 1980's; a letter from [REDACTED] stating he had a business relationship with the applicant since 1986; a letter from Spring Branch Community Church in Houston, Texas, indicating the applicant was a student in conversational English from September 1987 to May 1988; a letter from [REDACTED] stating the applicant left Syria for the United States in late 1981; and, statements from the applicant's family regarding his obtaining a visa to enter the United States in 1988.

In summary, the applicant has provided no employment letters that comply with the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i)(A) through (F), no utility bills according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(ii), no school records according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(iii), no hospital or medical records according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(iv), and no attestations from churches, unions, or other organizations that comply with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v). The applicant also has not provided documentation (including, for example, money order receipts; passport entries; children's birth certificates; bank book transactions; letters of correspondence; a Social Security card; automobile, contract, and insurance documentation; deeds or mortgage contracts; tax receipts; or insurance policies) according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(A) through (K).

The documentation provided by the applicant consists solely of third-party affidavits ("other relevant documentation"). The only affiants attesting to the applicant's presence in the United States prior to January 1, 1982 are [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. These documents lack specific details as to how the affiants knew the applicant – how often and under what circumstances they had contact with the applicant in the United States – throughout the requisite time period.

The absence of sufficiently detailed supporting documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous unlawful residence for the entire requisite period 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 applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date he attempted to file a Form I-687 application 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.

As always in these proceedings, the burden of proof rests solely with the applicant. Section 245a.2(d)(5) of the Act.

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