


**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 MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529 - 2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



41

FILE:



Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **AUG 17 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. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, 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.

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status 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) on February 16, 1988. On October 9, 2007, the director issued a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) indicating that the applicant had not submitted sufficient evidence of his continuous residence in the United States during the relevant period. Specifically, the director noted several inconsistencies which cast doubt on the reliability of the evidence submitted.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he has submitted sufficient evidence of his eligibility and that the director's decision failed to adequately address the affidavits submitted. He requests oral arguments with an United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) officer. He also requests a copy of the record of proceedings. This request was fulfilled on March 29, 2010.¹

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)(1).

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).

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. 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, "[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 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 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.

In support of his assertion that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status throughout the relevant period, the applicant submits the following:

- Copies of a paycheck stubs issued to the applicant by [REDACTED] in 1986. The applicant does not list this employment on his Form I-687 for the year 1986. The applicant was notified of this inconsistency in the record and has failed to respond. 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 applicant submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the application. *Id.* at 591.
- A copy of a Form W-2 wage and tax statement for the year 1988 indicating that the applicant was employed by [REDACTED]. This document provides evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States for the year 1988.
- A letter from [REDACTED] who indicates that the applicant was a tenant in his house at [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] from 1980 until 1985. The applicant indicates on his Form I-687 that he lived at [REDACTED] California from 1980 until 1985. This inconsistency was noted by the director in the NOID and has not been addressed by the applicant on appeal.
- [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] indicate that they lived with the applicant at [REDACTED], California from 1985 until 1988.
- Affidavits from [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Although the affiants state that they met the applicant during the relevant

period, their statements do not supply enough details to be considered probative. Specifically, most of the affiants fail to indicate how they date their initial acquaintance with the applicant, how frequently they saw the applicant during the relevant period or where the applicant resided during the relevant period.

Finally, the applicant requests oral arguments on appeal. The regulations provide that the requesting party must explain in writing why oral argument is necessary. Furthermore, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has the sole authority to grant or deny a request for oral argument and will grant argument only in cases involving unique factors or issues of law that cannot be adequately addressed in writing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(b). In this instance, the applicant identified no unique factors or issues of law to be resolved. In fact, the applicant set forth no specific reasons why oral argument should be held. Moreover, the written record of proceedings fully represents the facts and issues in this case. Consequently, the request for oral argument is denied.

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 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 on this basis.

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