




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



41

FILE:



Office: NEW YORK

Date:

SEP 10 2009

MSC 05 348 12889

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:

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.

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, New York. 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 appeared for her Form I-687 application interview or provided a valid reason for her nonappearance. A subsequent motion to reconsider was rejected by the director. The case was later reopened on Service motion. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not provided credible evidence to establish that she 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 requests that the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) make the necessary calls to verify the evidence submitted in her case.

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 her burden of establishing that she (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 her claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1, 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of declarations of relationship written by friends and other evidence. The AAO will consider all of the evidence relevant to the requisite period to determine the applicant’s eligibility.

During the Form I-687 application interview, the applicant claimed that she first entered the United States without inspection by crossing the Canadian border in August 1981.

The applicant submitted five letters to establish her initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period. [REDACTED] states in his letter that the applicant and her mother stayed at his home in Toronto, Canada, before crossing the border into the United States in 1981. Mr. [REDACTED] states that he knows the applicant very well and is a close friend of the family but provides no other information about the applicant.

[REDACTED] states in a letter that he has known the applicant and her mother, [REDACTED] since 1981. He claims that they used to live at [REDACTED] Brooklyn, New York, with him and his ex-girlfriend, [REDACTED]. Mr. [REDACTED] states that [REDACTED] received a phone call informing her that the applicant and her mother were coming to New York and would like to stay with her. Mr. [REDACTED] claims that he used to socialize with the applicant but provides no other pertinent information. He does not state how long the applicant lived at this address.

The applicant's mother, [REDACTED] states that in January 1981 she ran away to Canada with her child, [REDACTED] in search of a better way of life. Ms. [REDACTED] states that they crossed the Canadian border into New York by car in July 1981 and her friend, [REDACTED] took her to his home at [REDACTED] Brooklyn, New York, where they lived until 1988. Ms. [REDACTED] explains that in December 1988, she returned home to take care of her parents who were ill but her daughter remained behind in the care of friends. The letter gives no other information about the applicant.

[REDACTED] states that he has known the applicant and her mother since August, 1981. Mr. [REDACTED] states that they became friends after meeting and visited each other's homes. Mr. [REDACTED] states that the applicant's mother returned home to Trinidad in 1988 to take care of her ill father. Mr. [REDACTED] gives no other information about the applicant.

[REDACTED] states in his letter that the applicant has been a patient since 1981. [REDACTED] does not refer to medical records or identify the source of information and has not included any evidence to substantiate his statement regarding the applicant's medical care.

The letters do not include sufficient detailed information about the claimed relationship spanning over 27 years 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 other family members, education, hobbies, and shared activities. The letters fail to indicate any other details that would lend credence to the claimed acquaintance with the applicant and the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

The letters do not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with her, 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 statements. 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.

On appeal, the applicant requests that the USCIS verify the information given in the letters. However, USCIS is not required to contact affiants to verify or supplement the testimony. 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). Considering the evidence individually and together, the applicant has not established her continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 and throughout the requisite period.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she 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.