



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

L1



FILE: MSC-05-041-10130

Office: DETROIT

Date: MAR 16 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.

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, Detroit. 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 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 noted that based upon the applicant's own statement and evidence of record, the applicant was not in unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period. The director questioned the credibility of the affidavits submitted, and noted that much of the evidence submitted was not verifiable. 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, counsel asserts that the director's decision was in error. Counsel also asserts that the applicant's statement and testimony are consistent with his evidence and that it is sufficient to establish the applicant's continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period. The applicant requested a copy of the record of proceedings through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and the request was satisfied on November 19, 2009 (NRC2009042011). Counsel subsequently submitted a brief in support of the appeal.

Although the director determined that the applicant had not established that he was eligible for class membership pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the district director treated the applicant as a class member by adjudicating the Form I-687 application. Consequently, the applicant has neither been prejudiced by nor suffered harm as a result of the director's finding that the applicant had not established that he was eligible for class membership. Therefore, the AAO will adjudicate the applicant's appeal as it relates to his admissibility and his claim of continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982.

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).

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) 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. See 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).

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 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 applicant submitted the following evidence:

- An affidavit from the president of the Bangladesh Association of Michigan who stated that according to the association records, the applicant has been a member of the association since November 1981 and prior to relocating to Detroit, Michigan resided at [REDACTED] in Brooklyn, New York. This statement is contradictory and inconsistent with the statements made by the applicant on his current Form I-687 at part #30 where he did not list a residence in Detroit, Michigan until January 1995. It is further noted that on his previous Form I-687 at part #34, when asked to list all affiliations and associations with religious groups and organizations, the applicant stated "N/A." The inconsistencies and contradictions cast doubt on the applicant's proof. 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. 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 lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).
- Affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who stated that they have known the applicant since 1981 and that the applicant formerly resided at [REDACTED] in Brooklyn, New York.
- An affidavit from [REDACTED] who stated that the applicant was his roommate at [REDACTED] in Brooklyn, New York from October 1981 through July 1990.

The affiants fail to establish the applicant's continuous unlawful residence in the United States since before January 1, 1982. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality; 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.

None of the affiants' statements 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 affidavits. 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. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and collectively, the affiants' statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

The applicant submitted the following evidence:

- A letter from the manager-owner of [REDACTED] who stated that he employed the applicant as a dishwasher from November 1981 through October 1983.
- An affidavit from the owner of [REDACTED] who stated that he employed the applicant as a delivery man from August 8, 1985 through April 25, 1990.

The employment letters do not conform to regulatory standards for attestations by employers. Specifically, the letters do not specify the address(es) where the applicant resided throughout the claimed employment period, or the exact dates of layoffs. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). Here, the witnesses fail to indicate whether the employment information was taken from company records. Neither has the availability of the records for inspection been clarified. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i).

The applicant submitted a photocopy of his Social Security Statement listing his earnings from 1991 through 2003. The statement does not list any earnings for the applicant during the requisite period and is therefore, insufficient to demonstrate the applicant's residence in the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period.

In the instant case, the applicant has failed to provide sufficient credible and probative evidence to establish his continuous unlawful residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, and throughout the requisite period. He has failed to overcome the director's basis for denial.

The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period and the inconsistencies and contradictions found in the record detract from the credibility of this 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 on evidence that is lacking in detail and which has little probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period 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.