

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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

PUBLIC COPY



41

FILE: [Redacted]
MSC 06 005 10260

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: FEB 23 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

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.

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, the applicant states that he provided evidence to prove his continuous residence in the United States since 1981.

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 affidavits of relationship written by friends and family members 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 English translation of the applicant's sworn statement taken during the Form I-687 interview, the applicant's class determination form, the applicant's initial Form I-687 application and the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) adjudicating officer's notes reveal that the applicant first entered the United States without inspection through San Ysidro, California, in March, 1981.

To establish his initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period, the applicant submitted declarations from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], and [REDACTED]

The declarations all contain statements that the declarants either have personally known or been acquainted with the applicant or know that the applicant resided in the United States

since the 1980's. The declarants generally attest to being friends, working, communicating and socializing with the applicant. [REDACTED] claimed that the applicant began working for the [REDACTED] in 1985; however, the applicant claimed on his initial and current Form I-687 application, that he began working for the [REDACTED] in November, 1986. The declarants attest to the applicant's good moral character but provide no other information about the applicant.

The declarations from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] contain statements that the declarants have known or met the applicant in the 1970's. These declarants did not live in the United States, but resided in Mexico when they first met the applicant and when the applicant moved to the United States. The exceptions are [REDACTED], who lived in the United States when the applicant moved there and [REDACTED] who claimed to have resided in the United States from 1987. The declarants did not provide any other information about the applicant.

The declarations submitted do not contain sufficiently detailed descriptions to establish the reliability of their assertions. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. The absence of sufficiently detailed declarations to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of his claim. For instance, none of the declarants supplies any details about the applicant's life, such as, knowledge about his education, hobbies, employment and shared activities with the applicant.

The witnesses do not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, 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 declarations. 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. Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the requisite period. Therefore, the declarations have little probative value.

The letter signed by [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]; states that the applicant was hired on April 22, 1981 as a landscaper until March 13, 1983. The letter signed by [REDACTED] restaurant manager of [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for the restaurant as a cook from January, 1983, to December, 1985. Another letter signed by the owner, [REDACTED] states that the applicant has been employed as a busboy at [REDACTED] from January 18, 1986 to November 1, 1986. The letter signed by the owner, [REDACTED], states that the applicant was employed as the assistant manager of [REDACTED] from November, 1986 to August, 1990. The employers provide no other information about the applicant or any evidence to verify the applicant's employment. 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 letters do not meet most of the requirements stipulated in the aforementioned regulation, they will be given nominal weight.

The remaining evidence consists of a monthly rental agreement entered into on January 1, 1988, commencing on February 1, 1988, between [REDACTED] and the applicant, [REDACTED] for the premises located at [REDACTED]. On the applicant's initial Form I-687 application, he claimed that he resided at [REDACTED], from January, 1988, to August, 1993. The inconsistency lessens the probative value of the letter. The applicant also submitted copies of photographs but the photos are not dated and the persons in the photos have not been identified. This evidence does not establish continuous residence 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 of 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.