

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



41

FILE:



MSC 06 096 11483

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

APR 01 2010

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.

Elizabeth McCormack

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. 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, counsel states that the applicant established that he has been continuously unlawfully present for the requisite period. Counsel requested a copy of the record of proceedings under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The record reflects that the FOIA request was processed on September 14, 2009. (NRC2009042289). No additional evidence or explanation has been submitted by counsel.

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 school records, an affidavit written by a friend, a letter from a previous employer and other evidence. The AAO will consider all of the evidence relevant to the requisite period to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) adjudication officer's notes of the applicant's Form I-687 interview reveal that the applicant claimed to have first entered the United States without inspection in November, 1981. The director states that the applicant listed different dates of entry on each of his Form I-817 applications. As the Form I-817 application does not instruct the applicant to list his initial date of arrival into the United States, the different dates of entry on these applications will not be viewed as inconsistent with the applicant's testimony given during the Form I-687 interview.

The applicant submitted affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to establish his initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period. The affiants attest to having personal knowledge that the applicant resided in Ontario, California, from 1981. Mr. [REDACTED] states that the applicant lived with him at [REDACTED]

from November 23, 1981 to September 18, 1989. This information conflicts with other evidence of record, specifically, the applicant's identification card that shows the applicant's address as [REDACTED] [REDACTED], issued on April 28, 1988. 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).

The affidavits that are contained in the record do not include sufficient detailed information about the claimed relationship and the applicant's continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. For instance, the affiants do not supply any details about the applicant's life, such as, knowledge about his family members, education, hobbies, employment or other particulars about his life in the United States. The affiants 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 affidavits do not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted association with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of this association and demonstrate that the affiants had a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant during the time addressed in their 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. Therefore, the affidavits have little probative value.

The letter signed by [REDACTED] states that the applicant was employed by him from January, 1984 through December, 1985. [REDACTED] states that they worked in the landscaping business and that he paid the applicant cash. The employer provides no other information about the applicant or any evidence to verify the applicant's employment. The applicant did not claim on his Form I-687 application to have been employed by [REDACTED]. 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 the letter does not meet most of the requirements stipulated in the aforementioned regulation, it will be given nominal weight.

The applicant submitted evidence of attending Chino Valley Adult School (Chino), Chino, California, and Ontario High School (OHS), Ontario, California. The evidence consists of a copy of a letter from [REDACTED] at Chino verifying that the applicant was registered at the school for the 1982-1983 school year; a letter from [REDACTED]

stating that the applicant attended OHS from February 8, 1983 through June 9, 1983; a copy of the applicant's OHS permanent record showing that the applicant attended the school from February 8, 1983 to June 15, 1983; the applicant's OHS and Chino student identification cards issued in the 1980's; a letter dated March 18, 1983 from [REDACTED] at OHS, verifying that the applicant attended her Freshman English and Bilingual English class and an OHS grade report for the period ending April 8, 1983.

The remaining evidence consists of the applicant's California identification card issued on October 4, 1982 and California driver's license issued November 10, 1986; immunization record showing that vaccines for measles, rubella and mumps were given on January 17, 1983; 1986 and 1988 Form W-2 Wage and Tax Statements; California Interim Driver's license dated November 10, 1986; a pay stub dated November 28, 1986; three pay stubs dated in 1987 and seven pay stubs dated in 1988 from [REDACTED] and an x-ray report dated April 20, 1988.

The evidence establishes that the applicant continuously resided in the United States from 1982 – June 1983 and from 1986-1988. Nevertheless, the AAO finds that the evidence provided does not establish that the applicant resided continuous in the United States throughout the requisite period.

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). 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 to have entered the United States illegally prior to January 1, 1982 and his 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.