

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

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

41



FILE:

MSC-05-166-12286

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

MAR 01 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:



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 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, the applicant asserts that the director's decision is erroneous because the evidence which he previously submitted establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite time period. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence on appeal. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision.

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).

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 shall be regarded as having resided continuously in the United States if at the time the application for temporary resident status is filed no single absence from the United States has exceeded 45 days, and the aggregate of all absences has not exceeded 180 days during the requisite period unless the applicant can establish that due to emergent reasons the return to the United States could not be accomplished within the time period allowed, the applicant was maintaining a residence in the United States, and the departure was not based on an order of deportation. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(c)(1).

Continuous unlawful residence is broken if an absence from the United States is more than 45 days on any one trip unless return could not be accomplished due to an "emergent reason". 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(h)(1)(i). "Emergent reasons" has been defined as "coming unexpectedly into being." *Matter of C*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988).

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 his eligibility for temporary resident status. As stated, the applicant must establish 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 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of three 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 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The statements are general in nature and state that the witnesses have knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States for the duration 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 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 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 state how they date their initial meeting with the applicant in the United States or specify social gatherings, other special occasions or social events when they saw and communicated with the applicant during the requisite period. The witnesses also do not state how frequently they had contact 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.

Further, the witnesses state that they have knowledge of the applicant's physical presence in the United States since April 1980. However, the testimony of the witnesses is inconsistent with the testimony of the applicant at the time of his interview on January 18, 2008, at which time the applicant stated that he first entered the United States in 1981. In addition, [REDACTED] states that the applicant lived with him from April 1980 to 1982 at [REDACTED] in El Centro, California. Further, [REDACTED] states that the applicant resided with him from 1982 to 1986 at [REDACTED] in Fairfield, California, and from 1986 for the duration of the requisite statutory period at [REDACTED] in Suisan, California. The testimony of the witnesses is inconsistent with the testimony of the applicant in the instant I-687, in which he states that from April 1980 for the duration of the requisite statutory period he resided at [REDACTED] in Dinuba, California. Due to these inconsistencies, the statements of the witnesses have minimal probative value.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of copies of the applicant's statements, the instant I-687 application, an 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, and a Form I-698, application to adjust status from temporary to permanent resident.¹

¹ The applicant's I-698 application has been rejected and administratively closed, based upon the termination of the applicant's temporary resident status.

In a class member worksheet, filed with the initial I-687 application, the applicant stated that he was absent from the United States from August 10, 1987 until October 1987, a period of at least 52 days. As stated above, continuous unlawful residence is broken if an absence from the United States is more than 45 days on any one trip unless return could not be accomplished due to an "emergent reason". 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(h)(1)(i). "Emergent reasons" has been defined as "coming unexpectedly into being." *Matter of C*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988).

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, regarding his admitted absence from the United States from August 10, 1987 until October 1987, the applicant asserted that his wife's illness was an emergent reason why he could not return sooner. However, as stated previously, 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 the evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The applicant did not submit any additional evidence in response to the NOIT, other than his own attestation that it was his wife's unexpected and sudden poor health that was the "emergent reason" for his failure to return to the United States in a timely manner. The applicant's admitted absence from the United States from August 10, 1987 to October 1987, a period of more than 45 days, is clearly a break in any period of continuous residence he may have established. As he has not provided any evidence other than his own attestation that it was his wife's unexpected and sudden poor health that was the "emergent reason" for his failure to return to the United States in a timely manner, he 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.

In addition, in rebuttal to the NOIT, the applicant has otherwise failed to provide probative and credible evidence of his continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. The inconsistencies regarding the dates the applicant resided at a particular location in the United States are material to the applicant's 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 he 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 he maintained continuous residence in the United States throughout the statutory period, and thus are not probative.

It is noted that the record reveals that on March 22, 1994, the applicant was charged with one count of violating section 148(A) of the California Penal Code (PC), *Resisting Arrest/Public Officer*. On May 12, 1994, the court added the charge of violating PC § 415, *Disturbing the Peace*. Also on that date, the applicant pled guilty to the charge of *Disturbing the Peace*, an infraction, and the court dismissed the *Resisting Arrest/Public Officer* charge. (Municipal Court of Van Nuys Judicial District, Los Angeles County, [REDACTED]). In addition, the record reveals that on December 6, 1992, the applicant was charged with one count of violating section 211 of the California Penal Code (PC), *Attempted Robbery*. Because the application will be denied on other grounds, the AAO will not request a court disposition for the attempted robbery charge.

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 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 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.