

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

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

LI

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **SEP 08 2009**

MSC 06 097 10618

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.

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

[REDACTED]

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.

John F. Grissom
Acting 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, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director determined that the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through the date that he attempted to file a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident, with the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Service (now United States Citizenship and Immigration Services or USCIS) in the original legalization application period between May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. The director concluded that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), and therefore, denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant's former counsel reiterated the applicant's claim of residence in this country for the requisite period and asserted that the applicant had provided sufficient evidence in support of such claim. The applicant's former counsel included copies of previously submitted documentation as well as new documents in support of the appeal.

An applicant for temporary residence 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 Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b).

An alien applying for adjustment to temporary resident status must 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 and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b)(1).

For purposes of establishing residence and presence in accordance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b), "until the date of filing" shall mean until the date the alien attempted to file a completed Form I-687 application and fee or was caused not to timely file, consistent with the class member definitions set forth in the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. Paragraph 11, page 6 of the CSS Settlement Agreement and paragraph 11, page 10 of the Newman Settlement Agreement.

An alien applying for adjustment of status 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 including affidavits 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.* 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 (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 has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The record shows that the applicant submitted a Form I-687 application and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman Class Membership Worksheet, to USCIS on January 5, 2006.

In support of his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period, the applicant submitted affidavits of residence, a letter of membership, employment letters, and photocopied envelopes postmarked September 4, of an indeterminate year, July 10, of an indeterminate year, an indeterminate month and day in 1984, July 7, 1985, June 10, 1986, August 10, 1987, and March 19, 1988.

The director determined that the applicant failed to submit sufficient evidence demonstrating his residence in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period. Therefore, the director concluded that the applicant was ineligible to adjust to temporary residence and denied the Form I-687 application on May 3, 2007.

The applicant's previous attorney's remarks on appeal regarding the sufficiency of evidence submitted in support of the applicant's claim of continuous residence are noted. However, during the adjudication of the applicant's appeal, information came to light that adversely affects the applicant's overall credibility as well as the credibility of his claim of residence in this country for the requisite period. As has been previously discussed, the applicant submitted supporting documentation including photocopied envelopes postmarked September 4, of an indeterminate year, July 10, of an indeterminate year, an indeterminate month and day in 1984, July 7, 1985, June 10, 1986, August 10, 1987, and March 19, 1988. These envelopes were represented as having been mailed from Pakistan to the applicant at various addresses in this country with the envelope postmarked an indeterminate month and day in 1984 being mailed to the address that the applicant claimed as his residence in the United States from February 1981 to April 1984. A review of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue Volumes 5* (Scott Publishing Company 2008) reveals the following:

- The photocopied envelope postmarked on an indeterminate month and day in 1984 bears a postage stamp with a value of two rupees that contains the picture of Mohammad Ali Jinnah framed by a multicolor oval. This stamp is listed at page 19 of Volume 5 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number 714 A357. The catalogue lists this stamp's date of issue as August 14, 1989.

The fact that a photocopied envelope postmarked on an indeterminate month and day of 1984 bears a stamp that was not issued until well after the date of this postmark establishes that the applicant utilized this document in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations in an attempt to establish his residence within the United States for the requisite period. This derogatory information establishes that the applicant made material misrepresentations in asserting his claim of residence in the United States for the period in question and thus casts doubt on his eligibility for adjustment to temporary residence pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and section 245A of the Act. By engaging in such an action, the applicant has negated his own credibility, the credibility of his claim of continuous residence in this country for the requisite period, and the credibility of all documentation submitted in support of such claim.

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 visa petition. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

The AAO issued a notice to the applicant and counsel on June 24, 2009, informing the parties that it was the AAO's intent to dismiss the applicant's appeal based upon the fact that he utilized the postmarked envelope cited above in a fraudulent manner and made material

misrepresentations in an attempt to establish his residence within the United States for the requisite period. The parties were granted fifteen days to provide evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, these findings.

In response, the applicant's current attorney contends that the AAO's claim that the photocopied envelope postmarked on indeterminate month and day in 1984 bears a stamp issued in 1989 is false. Counsel argues that such an error was based upon the fact that the Pakistani Postal Service was and is very primitive and rudimentary and such errors were and remained commonplace today. Counsel asserts that it is impossible for the applicant to contest any finding by the AAO regarding the postmarked envelope cited above because he does not possess the original envelope. However, the record does not contain any original postmarked envelopes as it has been the applicant and his attorneys who have continuously submitted photocopies of postmarked envelopes throughout these proceedings. In addition, counsel fails to provide any evidence to corroborate the claim that the Pakistani Postal Service was and is very primitive and rudimentary and such errors were and remained commonplace today. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998)(citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter Of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

Counsel contends that the applicant has provided a letter in which an official of the Pakistani Post Office verified the authenticity of stamps and postmarks contained on ten different envelopes mailed from Pakistan to the applicant and his family in the United States from October 15, 1981 through June 20, 1988. Nevertheless, the letter does not contain any official letterhead but instead contains the seals, marks, and signatures of two different "advocates" in Pakistan, a Senior Postmaster (Treasury) in the General Post Office in Karachi, Pakistan, a protocol officer in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Camp Office) in Karachi, Pakistan, and a consular attaché at the Consulate General of Pakistan in Los Angeles, California. The letter also contains two specific disclaimers stating that the Consulate General and Ministry of Foreign Affairs bear no responsibility for the contents of this document. Moreover, the letter does not attest to authenticity of the photocopied envelope postmarked on indeterminate month and day in 1984 that is in question. Rather, this letter may be viewed as evidence that the remainder of photocopied envelopes submitted by the applicant in support of his claim of residence do not contain any conflict between the date of the postmark on such envelopes and the date of issue for stamps contained on these envelopes.

The existence of derogatory information that establishes the applicant used the postmarked envelope cited above in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations seriously undermines the credibility of the applicant's claim of residence in this country for the requisite period, as well as the credibility of the documents submitted in support of such 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. The applicant has failed to submit sufficient credible documentation to meet his burden of proof in establishing that he has resided in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 by a preponderance of the evidence as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) and *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989).

Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal or no 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 time he attempted to file for temporary resident status as required under section 245A(a)(2) of the Act. Because the applicant has failed to provide independent and objective evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, our finding that he submitted falsified documents, we affirm our finding of fraud. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act.

A finding of fraud is entered into the record, and the matter will be referred to the United States Attorney for possible prosecution as provided in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(t)(4).

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