



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

L1

NOV 23 2009

FILE:

MSC 06 073 13796

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

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.

Perry J. 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 in Los Angeles, California. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant, a native of the Philippines who claims to have lived in the United States since 1980, 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 (together comprising the I-687 Application), on December 12, 2005. The director noted that the applicant had been absent from the United States for about six years (from 1982 to 1988) and had failed to establish that her return had been delayed due to an emergent reason. The director, therefore, concluded that the applicant had not resided continuously in the United States for the requisite period and was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's prolonged absence from the United States was because the applicant "feared cultural stigma of being labeled a bad woman for conceiving while unmarried and a bad mother for giving birth while unmarried and then abandoning her child." Counsel further asserts that this reason qualifies as "emergent reasons" that prevented the applicant from returning to the United States within the 45 day period. Counsel then concludes that the absence did not interrupt the applicant's continuous residence in the United States.

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 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 shall be regarded as having resided continuously in the United States if at the time the application for temporary resident status is considered filed, as described above pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, no single absence from the United States has

exceeded 45 days, and the aggregate of all absences has not exceeded 180 days during the requisite period unless the applicant can establish that due to emergent reasons the return to the United States could not be accomplished within the time period allowed, the applicant was maintaining a residence in the United States, and the departure was not based on an order of deportation. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(h).

If the applicant's absence exceeded the 45-day period allowed for a single absence, it must be determined if the untimely return of the applicant to the United States was due to an "emergent reason." Although this term is not defined in the regulations, *Matter of C-*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988), holds that "emergent" means "coming unexpectedly into being."

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.

In this case, the applicant indicated on her Form I-687 Application that she first entered the United States in 1980, that she left the United States and traveled back to the Philippines in March 1982

and that she returned to the United States in February 1988. An absence of such duration interrupts an alien's continuous residence in the United States under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(c)(1), unless (s)he can show that a timely return to the United States could not be accomplished due to emergent reasons. While the term "emergent reasons" is not defined in the regulations, there is some pertinent case law. In *Matter of C-*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988), the Board of Immigration Appeals held that *emergent* means "coming unexpectedly into being."

In a statement submitted in 2005 with her application, the applicant indicated that the reason for the extended trip outside the United States (1982 to 1988), was that she missed her boyfriend in the Philippines and returned to the Philippines to get married and raise a family. The reason given by the applicant for her extended absence is completely different from the reasons offered by counsel on appeal as to why the applicant was unable to return to the United States in a timely manner. The AAO determines that neither reason qualifies as "emergent reasons" within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(c)(1) because getting married and starting a family do not "came unexpectedly into being." The applicant was, or should have been, fully aware when she departed for the Philippines in 1982 that she might not be able to return to the United States within 45 days. Therefore getting married and raising a family in the Philippines did not come unexpectedly into being. The applicant did not provide any explanation why she could not have returned to the United States from the Philippines within 45 days. As noted above, to meet her burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from her own testimony, and in this case the applicant has failed to do so.

Continuous unlawful residence is broken if an absence from the United States is more than 45 days on any one trip unless return could not be accomplished due to emergent reasons. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(h)(1)(i). "Emergent reasons" has been defined as "coming unexpectedly into being." *Matter of C*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988).

The applicant's admitted absence from the United States from 1982 to 1988, an absence of more than 45 days for a single absence and more than 180 days aggregate for all absences, is clearly a break in any period of continuous residence she may have established. As the applicant has failed to establish that emergent reasons, within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(c)(1), prevented her return to the United States from the Philippines within the 45-day period allowed in the regulation, she has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she has 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.

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