

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**



L1

FILE:



Office: NEWARK

Date:

OCT 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 forwarded 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 if the matter was remanded for further action, the record of proceedings was returned to the office that originally issued a decision in your case, and you will be contacted.

*Elizabeth McCormack*

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Newark, denied the Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident Under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, filed 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, or *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). The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) initially rejected the appeal, then reopened *sua sponte*. The appeal will be dismissed.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

The director determined that the applicant had not demonstrated that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status, which was known to the government, since before January 1, 1982 throughout the requisite period. Therefore, the director determined that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to temporary resident status, and denied the application.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that while attending school in the United States, she worked without authorization, and that her unlawful status was known to the government before January 1, 1982.

As a preliminary matter, the AAO notes that on September 9, 2008 the court approved a final Stipulation of Settlement in the class-action *Northwest Immigrant Rights Project, et al. vs. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, et al.*, 88-CV-00379 JLR (W.D. Was.) (NWIRP). Class members are defined, in relevant part, as:

1. Class Members [include] all persons who entered the United States in a nonimmigrant status prior to January 1, 1982, who are otherwise *prima facie* eligible for legalization under § 245A of the INA [Immigration & Nationality Act], 8 U.S.C. § 1255a, who are within one or more of the Enumerated Categories described below in paragraph 2, and who –

(A) between May 5, 1987 and May 4, 1988, attempted to file a complete application for legalization under § 245A of the INA and fees to an Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officer or agent acting on behalf of the INS, including a Qualified Designated Agency (QDE), and whose applications were rejected for filing (hereinafter referred to as 'Subclass A members'); or

(B) between May 5, 1987 and May 4, 1988, attempted to apply for legalization with an INS officer, or agent acting on behalf of the INS, including a QDE, under § 245A of the INA, but were advised that they were ineligible for legalization, or were refused legalization application forms, and for whom such information, or inability to obtain the required application forms, was a substantial cause of their failure to file or complete a timely written application (hereinafter referred to as 'Sub-class B' members); or

.....

2. Enumerated Categories

- (1) Persons who violated the terms of their nonimmigrant status prior to January 1, 1982 in a manner known to the government because documentation or the absence thereof (including, but not limited to, the absence of quarterly or annual address reports required on or before December 31, 1981) existed in the records of one or more government agencies which, taken as a whole, warrants a finding that the applicant was in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982, in a manner known to the government.
- (2) Persons who violated the terms of their nonimmigrant visas before January 1, 1982, for whom INS/DHS records for the relevant period (including required school and employer reports of status violations) are not contained in the alien's A-file, and who are unable to meet the requirements of 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.1(d) and 245a.2(d) without such records.
- (3) Persons whose facially valid 'lawful status' on or after January 1, 1982 was obtained by fraud or mistake, whether such 'lawful status' was the result of
  - a. reinstatement to nonimmigrant status;
  - b. change of nonimmigrant status pursuant to INA § 248;
  - c. adjustment of status pursuant to INA § 245; or
  - d. grant of some other immigration benefit deemed to interrupt the continuous unlawful residence or continuous physical presence requirements of INA § 245A.

NWIRP further provides that CSS/Newman Settlement Agreement legalization applications pending as of the date of the agreement shall be adjudicated in accordance with the adjudications standards described in paragraph 8B of the settlement agreement. Under those standards, the applicant must make a *prima facie* showing that after his lawful entry and prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant violated the terms of his nonimmigrant status in a manner known to the government in that, for example, documents and/or the absence of required documents (including, but not limited to, the absence of quarterly or annual address reports required on or before December 31, 1981) within the records of one or more government agencies, when taken as a whole, warrant a finding that the applicant was in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982 in a manner known to the government. Once the applicant makes such a showing, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) then has the burden of coming forward with proof to rebut the evidence that the applicant violated his or her status. If USCIS fails to carry this burden, the settlement agreement stipulates at paragraph 8B that it will be found that the applicant's unlawful status was known to the government as of January 1, 1982.

The settlement agreement states further that once USCIS finds that the applicant is a class member, USCIS shall follow the general adjudicatory standards set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.18(d)[the regulation relating to whether an applicant is at risk of becoming a public charge as analyzed under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act of 2000] or at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(k)(4)[the regulation relating to whether an applicant is at risk of becoming a public charge as analyzed under

the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986], whichever is more favorable to the applicant.

Thus, when an [REDACTED] class member demonstrates that he was present in the United States in nonimmigrant status prior to 1982, the absence from his record of a required address update due prior to January 1, 1982 is sufficient to demonstrate that he violated his nonimmigrant status and was in unlawful status in a manner that was known to the government prior to January 1, 1982. See [REDACTED] settlement agreement, paragraph 8B. See also: section 265(a) of the Act as in place through December 29, 1981 (which indicates that nonimmigrants must notify the U.S. government in writing of a change of address within 10 days of the address change and must report their addresses at the end of each three-month period after entering, regardless of whether there is any address change.)

The record establishes that the applicant obtained a nonimmigrant F-1 student visa on July 27, 1981 and entered the United States as an F-1 student in September, 1981. The record does not contain the required quarterly address update in December, 1981. Thus, under the terms of the [REDACTED] Settlement Agreement, the applicant violated her nonimmigrant status and was in unlawful status in a manner that was known to the government prior to January 1, 1982. Accordingly, the application for temporary residence will be adjudicated in accordance with the standards set forth in the [REDACTED] Settlement Agreement.

As the director did not adjudicate the application on the merits, the AAO gave the applicant an opportunity to respond to deficiencies in the evidence before issuing a decision on the appeal. The AAO advised the applicant, *inter alia*, that the evidence does not establish that she resided continuously in the United States throughout the requisite period.

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). The applicant shall be regarded as having resided continuously in the United States if at the time the initial application for temporary resident status is considered 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.2(h).

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, 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. 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.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant established she (1) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period; and (2) is admissible. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of her claim to have continuously lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of school records, copies of two F-1 nonimmigrant student visas issued to the applicant in Lagos on July 27, 1981 and November 6, 1986, entry and exit stamps marked in her passport, bank records, a lease agreement, a letter verifying residence and letters from three former employers.

The applicant's testimony regarding the reason she left the United States and remained outside the United States for more than 45 days is inconsistent. In a notice of intent to deny (NOID), the AAO advised the applicant that she stated in her current Form I-687 application that she left the United States to visit Nigeria due to a death in the family in February 1986 and returned to the United States in November 1986. The AAO further advised her that her previous Form I-687 indicates that she left the United States on February 22, 1986 and returned to the United States on November 23, 1986 to visit Nigeria due to an illness in the family. In response to the NOID, the applicant submits evidence that her brother in Nigeria was injured on February 7, 1986, and her return to the United States was delayed to his injury.

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 visa petition. 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, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

In the NOID, the AAO advised the applicant that her testimony regarding her residences was inconsistent and that her evidence of continuous residence was insufficient. The applicant did not respond to these issues in her rebuttal.

Evidence in the record, i.e., stamps in the applicant's passport indicates that she entered Nigeria on February 16, 1986 and reentered the United States on November 23, 1986.

This absence from the United States was for more than 45 days for a single absence and more than 180 days in the aggregate during the requisite period and thus disrupted her period of continuous residence. The record does not establish that her delayed return was due to an emergent reason. As noted above, although "emergent" is not defined in the regulations, *Matter of C-*, 19 I&N Dec. 808 (Comm. 1988), holds that "emergent" means "coming unexpectedly into being." In response to the AAO's request for evidence to show her return to the United States was delayed due to an emergent reason, the applicant submitted evidence of a new reason for the delay. Even if the evidence was deemed credible, it shows that the applicant's brother was injured on February 7, 1986 so she would have known that her brother was injured when she left the United States, so it cannot be considered an emergent reason for a delay in her return.

Beyond the decision of the director, the applicant has not established that she is admissible to the United States. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b) provides in pertinent part:

(b) Eligibility. The following categories of aliens, who are otherwise eligible to apply for legalization, may file for adjustment to temporary residence status:

(9) An alien who would be otherwise eligible for legalization and who was present in the United States in an unlawful status prior to January 1, 1982, and

reentered the United States as a nonimmigrant, such entry being documented on Service Form I-94, Arrival-Departure Record, in order to return to an unrelinquished unlawful residence.

(10) An alien described in paragraph (b)(9) of this section must receive a waiver of the excludable charge 212(a)(19) as an alien who entered the United States by fraud.

The ground of excludability at section 212(a)(19) of the Act has been replaced by the ground of inadmissibility listed at section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act, as amended.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides in pertinent part:

Misrepresentation. – (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

The applicant's testimony indicates that she willfully misrepresented herself as a lawful nonimmigrant student at the consular office in November 1986 and upon entry in November 1986, even though by her own admission she had already worked without authorization in violation of her student status. Thus, she is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act. The applicant has not submitted to the director the Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability, which is the form she must file to request a waiver of this ground of inadmissibility. As the record now stands, the applicant has not established that she is admissible to the United States.

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