

**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, D.C. 20529-2090



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

PUBLIC COPY

L1



FILE:

MSC 06 102 16717

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **JAN 06 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: Self-represented

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 the matter 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.

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

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 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 determined that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not met her burden of proof and was, therefore, not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status pursuant to the terms of the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she first arrived in the United States in 1981, and at the time of her interview she was very nervous and confused regarding the dates and employment. The applicant apologizes for any misunderstanding this information may have caused and requests that her application be reconsidered. The applicant submits copies of documents that were previously provided in support of her appeal.

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).

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. *See* 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 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.

In an attempt to establish continuous unlawful residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted:

- A statement dated December 20, 2005, from [REDACTED] who indicated that he met the applicant through her husband in the early 1980s. The affiant attested to the applicant's moral character.
- An affidavit from [REDACTED] who indicated that he had known the applicant since 1983 as he employed the applicant as a babysitter from 1983 to 1986. The affiant indicated that he has maintained a good friendship with the applicant since that time.
- A declaration from [REDACTED] who indicated that he has known the applicant since 1984 and has remained friends since that time.
- An affidavit from [REDACTED] who indicated that he met the applicant through her husband in 1983 and has maintained a good friendship with the applicant since that time.
- A statement from [REDACTED] who indicated that he has known of the applicant's arrival in the United States since 1981. The affiant indicated that he would regularly speak on the telephone with the applicant.

The director determined that there were inconsistencies between her testimony and her supporting documentation from [REDACTED]. Specially, at the time of her interview, the applicant indicated that she met [REDACTED] in 1983 or 1984; however, the affiant, in his affidavit, attested to knowing the applicant in 1981. The director also determined that [REDACTED], in his affidavit, did not specify what year he met the applicant in the 1980's, and that no evidence was submitted demonstrating that the affiants had direct personal knowledge of the events testified to in their respective affidavits. The director concluded that the applicant had failed to submit sufficient credible evidence establishing her continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, and, therefore, denied the application on March 6, 2007.

The applicant claimed on her Form I-687 application that she was self-employed as a babysitter throughout the requisite period. However, except for the affidavit from [REDACTED], the applicant provided no evidence from other individuals to support her claim.

The evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. The affiants failed to state the applicant's place of residence during the requisite period. The affiants' statements do not provide detailed accounts of an ongoing association establishing a relationship under which the affiants could be reasonably expected to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence, activities and whereabouts during the requisite period. To be considered probative, an affiant's affidavit 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. The affidavit must contain sufficient detail, generated by the asserted contact with the applicant, to establish that a relationship does in fact exist, how the relationship was established and sustained, and that the affiant does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts asserted. The affidavits from the affiants do not provide sufficient detail to establish that they had an ongoing relationship with the applicant that would permit them to know of the applicant's whereabouts and activities throughout the requisite period.

The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of her 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. Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that the evidence submitted fails to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States during the requisite period.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she has 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.