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

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

L1

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: NEWARK Date: JAN 29 2010
MSC 05 273 10362

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. 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.

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, Newark, New Jersey, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(iii) states, in pertinent part:

> (B) *Meaning of affected party.* For purposes of this section and §§ 103.4 and 103.5 of this part, *affected party* (in addition to the Service) means the person or entity with legal standing in a proceeding. It does not include the beneficiary of a visa petition.

Although the record contains a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, authorizing [redacted] to act on behalf of the applicant, [redacted] is no longer authorized to represent the applicant pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 292.1(a).[1] As such, the decision will be furnished only to the applicant.

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 he 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 his 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 submits notarized affidavits in support of his 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

[1] *See* http://www.usdoj.gov/eoir/profcond/chart.htm

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.

At the time the applicant filed his Form I-687 application, he provided no documentation to establish continuous residence and physical presence in the United States during the requisite period. In response to a Notice of Intent to Deny dated May 16, 2006, the applicant, in an attempt to establish continuous unlawful residence since prior to January 1, 1982 through the date he attempted to file his application, submitted:

- An affidavit from [redacted], who indicated that he met the applicant in 1981 at his place of business on Thanksgiving Day. The affiant indicated that the applicant was in his employ from 1992 to 1999.

- An affidavit from who indicated that he first met the applicant in October 1985 through a friend in Woodside, Queens, New York. The affiant attested to the applicant's moral character and indicated that he has remained a friend of the applicant since that time.
- An affidavit from , who indicated that he met the applicant in December 1981 at a party. The affiant attested to the applicant's moral character.

The director determined that the affidavits submitted contained no evidence demonstrating that the affiants had direct personal knowledge of the events testified to in their respective affidavits. The director also noted that the affidavits were not notarized. The director concluded that the applicant had failed to submit sufficient credible evidence establishing his continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, and denied the application on July 25, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant submits the same affidavits from the above mentioned affiants that are now notarized.

The evidence of record submitted does not establish with reasonable probability that the applicant was already in the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he resided in a continuous unlawful status during the requisite period.

While an application should not be denied solely because the applicant has only submitted affidavits to establish continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period, the submission of affidavits alone will not always be sufficient to support the applicant's claim. 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). Casting doubt to the applicant's claim that he resided in the United States continuously during the entire requisite period is the fact that the affidavits from the affiants 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 his 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 he 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.