

**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] Office: LOS ANGELES
MSC 05 244 18720

Date: **OCT 02 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, 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, Los Angeles. In a subsequent motion to reopen, the director vacated the previous decision dated July 10, 2006 denying the application for status as a temporary resident under section 245A of the Act. In his current decision dated November 8, 2007, the director again denied the application. 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 (Act), and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not provided credible evidence to establish that he had entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and thereafter continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant states that he provided sufficient evidence to overcome the director's decision.

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 245(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 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). To meet his or her burden of proof, 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. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

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 submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing 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 1, 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by friends, letters from previous employers, a letter from the pastor of the St. Emydius Church, and other evidence. The AAO will consider all of the evidence relevant to the requisite period to determine the applicant’s eligibility.

The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) adjudicating officer’s notes reveal that during the Form I-687 application interview, the applicant claimed to have first entered the United States without inspection in January, 1981.

The applicant’s Form G-325A, Biographic Information, signed by the applicant states that the applicant was married on January 15, 1983 in Jalisco, Mexico. The applicant’s current Form I-687 application does not list his trip to Mexico and the applicant does not state when, where and how he reentered the United States after his marriage in Mexico.

The applicant submitted affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

██████████, and ██████████ to establish his initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period. The affidavits all contain statements that the affiants have personally known and been acquainted with the applicant in the United States since 1981 with the exception of ██████████ and ██████████, who have known the applicant since 1984, and ██████████, who has known the applicant since 1985. ██████████ state that they rented ██████████ to the applicant and ██████████ and ██████████ during the beginning of 1981 to March, 1984. The affiants generally attest to socializing with the applicant and to his good moral character but provide no other information about the applicant.

The affidavits do not include sufficient detailed information about the claimed relationships and the applicant's continuous residency in the United States since before January 1, 1982 and throughout the requisite period. For instance, none of the witnesses supplies any details about the applicant's life, such as, knowledge about his family members, work life, and shared activities with the applicant. The affiants fail to indicate any other details that would lend credence to their claimed acquaintance with the applicant and the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

The affidavits 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 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 the affidavits do not contain sufficient detail to establish the reliability of their assertions. The affidavits are insufficient to establish the applicant's 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 requisite period. Therefore, the affidavits have little probative value.

The letter signed by associate pastor, ██████████ of the St. Emydius Church, Lynwood, California, states that the applicant has been a parishioner of this church from 1984 to present date, June 17, 2004, the date the letter was signed. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v) provides requirements for attestations made on behalf of an applicant by churches, unions, or other organizations. Attestations must (1) identify applicant by name; (2) be signed by an official (whose title is shown); (3) show inclusive dates of membership; (4) state the address where applicant resided during membership period; (5) include the seal of the organization impressed on the letter or the letterhead of the organization, if the organization has letterhead stationery; (6) establish how the author knows the applicant; and (7) establish the origin of the information being attested to. The

letter from St. Emydius does not contain most of the aforementioned requirements. Moreover, the applicant does not claim to be a member of this organization on his Form I-687 application.¹ The evidence will be given nominal weight.

states in his letter that the applicant worked as a landscaper for the Country Squire Apartments from March, 1981 to September, 1989. The applicant does not claim that he worked at the apartment complex on his Form I-687 application. states in his letter that the applicant has been doing business with his company, and Saw Shop, since 1982. states in his affidavit that he employed the applicant from January 1981 until January 1985. states in his affidavit that he employed the applicant from January 1985 to September 1998. The witnesses have not provided evidence of the applicant's employment or the business they conducted with the applicant. The applicant has not explained how he worked for the Country Squire Apartments, and simultaneously. 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 petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. 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. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Further, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that letters from employers attesting to an applicant's employment must: provide the applicant's address at the time of employment; identify the exact period of employment; show periods of layoff; state the applicant's duties; declare whether the information was taken from company records; and, identify the location of such company records and state whether such records are accessible or in the alternative state the reason why such records are unavailable. As these requirements have not been complied with, the statements will be given nominal weight.

The remaining evidence consists of copies of photographs and an identification card issued to the applicant on April 26, 1984. The copies of photographs are not dated and the persons in the photos have not been identified. The copy of the identification card suggests that the applicant was present in the United States for some part of the requisite period, but an applicant applying for adjustment of status under this part has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he or she is eligible for adjustment of status under section 245a of the Act. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). The record is unclear about the applicant's simultaneous residences at for one month in 1984, which is the address on the identification card, and at where the applicant claims to have resided from 1981-1990. The affidavit of and who rented the property to the applicant, is also inconsistent with the applicant's testimony that he resided on for one month in March-April 1984.

¹ Two of the affiants indicated that they met the applicant at St. Helen's and St. Mathias' churches, respectively. The AAO notes further that testified that two of the applicant's children received first communion at the church. The applicant does not submit any school or immunization records of his children in the United States.

In the instant case, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to overcome the director's denial. The insufficiency of the evidence calls into question the credibility of the applicant's claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish the applicant's 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 requisite period.

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.

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