

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

L1

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: LOS ANGELES Date: DEC 10 2013

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Temporary Resident Status under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a

ON 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Perry Rhew".

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director of the Los Angeles office terminated the temporary resident status of the applicant, pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, finding the applicant to be ineligible for temporary resident status based on both a lack of documentation and inconsistent documentation in the record of proceedings.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the director's decision is erroneous because the evidence which the applicant previously submitted establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite time period. The applicant also asserts that inconsistencies in the record, contained in a Form I-589 asylum application, were due to ineffective assistance of prior counsel. On appeal, the applicant submits an affidavit from her son who asserts ineffective assistance of the same counsel. It is noted that any appeal based upon a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel requires: (1) that the claim be supported by an affidavit of the allegedly aggrieved respondent setting forth in detail the agreement that was entered into with counsel with respect to the actions to be taken and what representations counsel did or did not make to the respondent in this regard, (2) that counsel whose integrity or competence is being impugned be informed of the allegations leveled against him or her and be given an opportunity to respond, and (3) that the appeal or motion reflect whether a complaint has been filed with appropriate disciplinary authorities with respect to any violation of counsel's ethical or legal responsibilities, and if not, why not. *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), *aff'd*, 857 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1988). The applicant has not submitted any of the required documentation to support an appeal based on ineffective assistance of counsel. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence on appeal.<sup>1</sup> The AAO has considered counsel's assertions, reviewed all of the evidence, and has made a *de novo* decision based on the record and the AAO's assessment of the credibility, relevance and probative value of the evidence.<sup>2</sup>

The temporary resident status of an alien may be terminated upon the determination that the alien was ineligible for temporary residence. Section 245A(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(b)(2)(A), and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(u)(i).

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).

---

<sup>1</sup> On appeal, counsel states that the applicant's FOIA request was processed on March 31, 2010.

<sup>2</sup>The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

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. 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has overcome the inconsistencies in the record and established her eligibility for temporary resident status. As stated, the applicant must establish

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 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of witness statements. The AAO has reviewed the documents in their entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each statement in this decision. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed.

The record contains witness statements from the following witnesses:

[REDACTED] (the applicant's brother),  
[REDACTED] (the applicant's half-sister), [REDACTED] (the applicant's uncle),  
[REDACTED] (the applicant's aunt), [REDACTED] (the applicant's cousin),  
[REDACTED]

The statements are general in nature and state that the witnesses have knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States for all, or a portion of, the requisite period.

Although the witnesses claim to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period, the witness statements 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 in the United States during the requisite period. To be considered probative and credible, witness statements must do more than simply state that a witness 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 it probably did exist and that the witness, by virtue of that relationship, does have knowledge of the facts alleged. For instance, the witnesses do not specify social gatherings, other special occasions or social events when they saw and communicated with the applicant during the requisite period. The witnesses do not provide sufficient details that would lend credence to their claimed knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. For these reasons the AAO finds that the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true.

[REDACTED] were living in Mexico during the requisite period and, therefore, did not have first-hand knowledge of the

applicant's continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period. For this reason, the testimony of these witnesses will be given no weight.

The applicant has submitted employment verification letters from [REDACTED] of Canoga Park, California and [REDACTED] of Woodland Hills, California. [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for him as a housekeeper from November 1981 to March 1984, although he does not state the location of the applicant's employment. However, the applicant did not list [REDACTED] as an employer in the instant I-687 application, or in the initial I-687 application filed in 1990. [REDACTED] owner of [REDACTED] Co. / [REDACTED] Designs, states that the applicant worked for her as a finisher/quality control, both on a full time and part time basis, from 1984 to 1987. As evidence in support of her company conducting business during the requisite period, [REDACTED] submitted a lease agreement for the period July 1, 1984 to June 20, 1987, signed by her as lessee on June 20, 1984. However, the revision date of the form on which the lease agreement is written is October 2001. In addition, the applicant did not list [REDACTED] as an employer in the instant I-687 application, in the initial I-687 application filed in 1990, or at the time of her interview on October 27, 2009. For these reasons, the employment verification letters have minimal probative value.

Further, the employment verification letters from [REDACTED] do not meet the requirements set forth in the regulations, which provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) provides that letters from employers must include: (A) Alien's address at the time of employment; (B) Exact period of employment; (C) Periods of layoff; (D) Duties with the company; (E) Whether or not the information was taken from official company records; and (F) Where records are located and whether the Service may have access to the records. If the records are unavailable, an affidavit-form letter stating that the alien's employment records are unavailable and why such records are unavailable may be accepted in lieu of subsections (E) and (F). The employment verification letters fail to comply with the above cited regulation because they lack considerable detail regarding the applicant's employment. For instance, the witnesses do not state the applicant's daily duties, the location at which she was employed, or the applicant's address at the time of employment. Furthermore, the witnesses do not state how they were able to date the applicant's employment. It is unclear whether they referred to their own recollection or any records they may have maintained. For these additional reasons, the employment verification letters will be given no weight.

In addition, the record contains a witness statement from [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] Church in Sylmar, California. The witness states that the applicant has been a member of the church from February 1982 through the end of the requisite period. However, the applicant failed to list her membership in the Sylmar church or any other religious organization on the initial Form I-687 application filed in 1990.<sup>3</sup> At part 35 of the application, where applicants are asked to list their involvement with any religious organizations, the applicant did not list any organizations. This is an inconsistency which is material to the applicant's claim in that it has a direct bearing on

---

<sup>3</sup> The instant Form I-687 lists the applicant's membership in the Sylmar church.

the applicant's residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. As stated above, 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. *Matter of Ho, supra*. This contradiction undermines the credibility of the applicant's claim of entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

More importantly, the witness statement does not meet the requirements set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v), which provides requirements for attestations made on behalf of an applicant by churches, unions, or other organizations. Attestations must: (1) identify applicant by name; (2) be signed by an official (whose title is shown); (3) show inclusive dates of membership; (4) state the address where the applicant resided during membership period; (5) include the seal of the organization impressed on the letter or the letterhead of the organization, if the organization has letterhead stationery; (6) establish how the author knows the applicant; and (7) establish the origin of the information being attested to. This attestation fails to comply with the cited regulation. Therefore, this attestation is of little probative value.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of copies of the applicant's statements, the instant I-687 application, the initial I-687 application, filed in 1990 to establish the applicant's CSS class membership, a Form I-485, application to adjust to permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act, a Form I-698, application to adjust status from temporary to permanent resident,<sup>4</sup> and a Form I-589, application for asylum, filed in 1996. The AAO finds in its *de novo* review that the record of proceedings contains materially inconsistent statements from the applicant regarding the date of her initial entry into the United States.

In the instant I-687 application, the applicant lists residences in the United States since January 1981.

At the time of her interview on October 27, 2009, the applicant stated that she first entered the United States on April 15, 1981.

In a Form I-589, application for asylum, signed by the applicant on October 23, 1996, the applicant stated that she last arrived in the United States in June 1989. At part C of the application, the applicant stated that she was a member of a political party in Mexico for two years prior to her arrival in the United States, or since 1987.

The director of the Los Angeles office cited some of the aforementioned inconsistencies in a notice of intent to terminate (NOIT) the applicant's temporary residence. In rebuttal to the NOIT, the applicant asserted that the evidence which she previously submitted establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite time period.

---

<sup>4</sup> The applicant's I-698 application has been denied.

The applicant has failed to provide probative and credible evidence of her continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. The inconsistencies regarding the date the applicant first entered the United States are material to her claim in that they have a direct bearing on the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. No evidence of record resolves these inconsistencies. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA). These contradictions undermine the credibility of the applicant's claim of entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States during 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 she is eligible for the benefit sought. The various statements currently in the record which attempt to substantiate the applicant's residence and employment in the United States during the statutory period are not objective, independent evidence such that they might overcome the inconsistencies in the record regarding the applicant's claim that she maintained continuous residence in the United States throughout the statutory period, and thus are not probative.

The record reveals that on January 17, 1997, deportation proceedings were initiated against the applicant, pursuant to section 241(a)(1)(B) on the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), as amended, as an alien who entered the United States without inspection. On March 25, 1997, the Immigration Judge ordered the applicant deported in absentia. On May 24, 1997, a Form I-205, warrant of removal/deportation was issued, which remains outstanding.

Based on the foregoing, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to resolve the inconsistencies in the record with independent objective evidence. Furthermore, 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 on this basis. As the applicant has not overcome the basis for the termination of status, the appeal must be dismissed.

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