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

L1

PUBLIC COPY



FILE: [redacted] Office: CHICAGO Date: OCT 1 6 2009
MSC 06 088 11241

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.

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, 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, Chicago, Illinois, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. This appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant, a native of Mexico who claims to have lived in the United States since November 1981, 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 on December 27, 2005. The director denied the application, finding that 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 period.

On appeal, the applicant reiterates his claim that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and has resided continuously in the country through the requisite period. The applicant does not submit additional evidence with this appeal.

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).

"Continuous residence" is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(c)(1)(i) as follows: "An alien shall be regarded as having resided continuously in the United States if no single absence from the United States has exceeded forty-five (45) days, and the aggregate of all absences has not exceeded one hundred and eighty (180) days between January 1, 1982, through the date the application for temporary resident status is filed, unless the alien can establish that due to emergent reasons, his or her return to the United States could not be accomplished within the time period allowed."

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.

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.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant (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. Here, the applicant has failed to meet his burden.

The record includes a letter of employment from [redacted] at Employment Services, Inc. in Chicago, Illinois, dated December 12, 1990, stating that the applicant was employed from July 1985 to February 1987. This letter does not comport with the regulatory requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) because it did not provide the applicant's address during the periods of employment, did not indicate whether the information was taken from

company records, and did not indicate whether such records are available for review. The letter is not supplemented by any earnings statements, pay stubs, or tax records demonstrating that the applicant was actually employed during any of the years claimed. Furthermore, the letter does not specify the applicant's duties and responsibilities at the company. Thus, the employment letter has limited probative value. It is not persuasive evidence that the applicant resided continuously in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through the requisite period.

The record includes a letter from at St. Mark's Catholic Church in Chicago, Illinois, dated July 21, 2006, stating that the applicant attended masses regularly at the church during the years 1982 through 1990. This letter does not comport with the regulatory requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v), which specifies that attestations by religious and related organizations (A) identify the applicant by name, (B) be signed by an official (whose title is shown), (C) show inclusive dates of membership, (D) state the address where the applicant resided during the membership period, (E) include the organization seal impressed on the letter or the letterhead of the organization, (F) establish how the author knows the applicant, and (G) establish the origin of the information about the applicant. The letter from did indicated whether the applicant was a member of the church and the specific dates of his membership, did not indicate where the applicant lived at any time during his association with the church, did not specify how and when met the applicant, and whether his information about the applicant was based on his personal knowledge, the Church's records, or hearsay. Since the letter did not comply with sub-parts (C), (D), (F), and (G) of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v), and did not claim to have known the applicant before January 1, 1982, the AAO concludes that the letter has little probative value. It is not persuasive evidence of the applicant's continuous residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through the requisite period.

The record includes several photocopied envelopes addressed to the applicant at , from individuals in Mexico. **The photocopied envelopes do not appear to be genuine.** Some envelopes bear illegible postmarks while other envelopes bear postmarks that appear to have been altered by hand. The original envelopes are not in the file for proper verification. The envelopes do not bear a United States Postal Service date or other markings to show that they were received and processed in the United States before delivery to the applicant. Most importantly, the envelopes were addressed to the applicant at however, the applicant indicated on the Form I-687 that his address during the period 1981 to 1992 was Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's evidence also reflects on the reliability of other evidence in the record. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Thus, the photocopied envelopes have little probative value as credible evidence of the applicant's continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

The record also includes a series of letters and affidavits from individuals who claim to have known rented an apartment to, worked with or otherwise known the applicant the applicant during the 1980s. The letters and affidavits have minimalist formats with little input from the authors. For the length of time they claim to have known the applicant – in most cases since 1981 – the authors provided very few details about the applicant's life in the United States such

as where he lived and the nature and extent of their interaction with him over the years. Nor are the letters and affidavits accompanied by any documentary evidence – such as photographs, letters, and the like – of the authors' personal relationships with the applicant in the United States during the 1980s. Some of the authors do not date when they met the applicant and none have personal knowledge of the events and circumstances of the applicant's entry and continuous residence in the United States. Furthermore, the authors did not provide document establishing their identities and residence in the United States during the requisite period. For all the reasons discussed above, the AAO finds that the letters and affidavits have little probative value. They are not persuasive evidence of the applicant's continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through 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.

Therefore, based on the foregoing analysis of the evidence, the AAO determines that 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.

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