



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

41

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: LOS ANGELES  
MSC 05 285 10355

Date: FEB 19 2010

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.

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, 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 representative reiterated the applicant's claim of residence in this country for the required period and asserted that the applicant submitted sufficient documentation in support of such claim.

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 July 12, 2005.

In support of his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period, the applicant submitted photocopied receipts for money orders, photocopied paycheck stubs, a photocopied receipt for a money wire, a photocopied receipt from the State of California Department of Motor Vehicles, and photocopied postmarked envelopes.

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 August 13, 2007.

The remarks of the applicant’s representative on appeal relating to the sufficiency of the evidence he submitted in support of his 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 December 8, 1981, March 8, 1982, and February 11, 1986, respectively. These envelopes all contain Mexican postage stamps and were represented as having been mailed from Mexico to the applicant at the address in this country he claimed to have resided as of the date of these respective postmarks. A review of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue Volume 4* (Scott Publishing Company 2008) reveals the following:

- The photocopied envelope postmarked December 8, 1981 contains a Mexican stamp with a value of six pesos. This stamp contains a stylized illustration of steel pipes, the Spanish words for steel pipes "tuberia de acero," and the notation "Mexico Exporta" encircling an eagle's head in the right hand corner. This stamp is listed in two different versions at page 908 of Volume 4 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue numbers 1121 A320 and 1121C A320. The difference in these two versions is that the steel pipes in 1121 A320 are colored orange and white, while the steel pipes in 1121C A320 are colored gray and white. The catalogue lists 1983 as the issue date for 1121 A320 and 1984 as the issue date for 1121C A320.
- The photocopied envelope postmarked February 11, 1986 contains a stamp with a value of twenty pesos. The stamp contains a stylized illustration of a bicycle, the Spanish word for bicycles "bicicletas," and the notation "Mexico Exporta" encircling an eagle's head in the right hand corner. This stamp is listed at page 918 of Volume 4 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number 1492 A320. The envelope also bears a Mexican stamp with a value of fifty pesos. This stamp contains a stylized illustration of a sliced tomato, the Spanish word for tomato "tomate," and the notation "Mexico Exporta" encircling an eagle's head in the right hand corner. This stamp is listed at page 918 of Volume 4 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number 1493 A320. The catalogue lists both of these stamps' date of issue as 1987.

The fact that photocopied envelopes postmarked December 18, 1981 and February 11, 1985 both bear stamps that were not issued until well after the date of these respective postmarks establishes that the applicant utilized these documents 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 his representative on December 8, 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 envelopes 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 substantial evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, these findings.

In response, the applicant's representative submits a statement in which he declares that the postage stamps in the "Exporta" series were issued between the years 1975 and 1993. The applicant's representative requests additional time to secure original official documents from the Mexican government to rebut the derogatory information contained in the AAO's notice. The applicant's representative provides copies of an online article relating to the "Exporta" series at <http://www.seriousseats.com/2008/11/rafael-davidsons-mexico-mexicans-exporta-exports-series-stamps.html>.

A review of Volume 4 of the 2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue reveals that domestic stamps comprising the "Exporta" series were first issued in 1975 and continued to be issued through 1992, and airmail stamps comprising the "Exporta" series were first issued in 1975 up through 1982. The domestic stamps comprising the "Exporta" series are listed in Volume 4 of the 2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue on the following pages: page 908 with catalog numbers 1109 A320 through 1138 A320; page 909 with catalog numbers 1166 A320 through 1176 A320; page 917 with catalog numbers 1465 A320 through 1470A A320; page 918 with catalog numbers 1491 A320 through 1505 A320; page 920 with catalog numbers 1583 through 1603; and, page 926 with catalog numbers 1763 A320 through 1770 A320. The airmail stamps comprising the "Exporta" series are listed in Volume 4 of the 2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue on the following pages: page 953 with catalog numbers C486 AP214 through C508 AP214; and, page 956 with catalog numbers C594 AP214 through C603 AP214.

Once again, it must be reiterated that the "tuberia de acero" stamp with a value of six pesos and the stylized illustration of steel pipes on the envelope postmarked December 8, 1981 is listed in two different versions at page 908 of Volume 4 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue numbers 1121 A320 and 1121C A320. The difference in these two versions is that the steel pipes in 1121 A320 are colored orange and white, while the steel pipes

in 1121C A320 are colored gray and white. The catalogue lists 1983 as the issue date for 1121 A320 and 1984 as the issue date for 1121C A320. Furthermore, it must be reiterated that the “bicicletas” stamp with a value of twenty pesos and on the envelope postmarked February 11, 1986 is listed at page 918 of Volume 4 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number 1492 A320 with an issue date of 1987. In addition, the “tomate,” stamp valued at fifty pesos on the envelope postmarked February 11, 1986 is listed at page 918 of Volume 4 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number 1493 A320 with an issue date of 1987. As of the date of this decision, neither the applicant nor his representative has submitted any evidence to rebut this derogatory information. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

The existence of derogatory information that establishes the applicant used the postmarked envelopes 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.