

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

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **SEP 28 2010**

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:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case 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 was denied by the Director, San Diego, California. 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). The director denied the application, finding 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. Specifically, the director noted that the applicant submitted school and immunization records which established her residence in the United States beginning in 1984 until March 1987, however, the applicant submitted insufficient evidence of residence prior to 1984, nor did she address her absence after March 1987.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she has established her unlawful residence for the requisite time period. The applicant points to the transcripts of a Judicial Order dated January 11, 2000 in which the Immigration Judge noted that the applicant had been in the United States since 1981.

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. 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 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.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established that she (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. As noted by the director, the applicant has submitted immunization records and school records indicating that she resided in the United States from 1984 until March 1987. Specifically, the immunization records indicate that the applicant received immunizations in the United States in 1984 and 1985. The school records indicate that she attended [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] from July 1984 until March 3, 1987 when the records indicate that the applicant withdrew and returned to Mexico. As noted by the director, the applicant signed a Form I-687 in October 1990 in which she failed to list any residence in the United States prior to 1984.

The record also contains an affidavit from [REDACTED], dated August 30, 1990, indicating that the applicant was employed by the company since October 1987. The letter fails to meet certain regulatory standards set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i), which provides that letters from employers must include the applicant's address at the time of employment; exact period of employment; whether the information was taken from official company records and where records are located and whether United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may have access to the records; if records are unavailable, an affidavit form-letter stating that the employment records are unavailable may be accepted which shall be signed, attested to by the employer under penalty of perjury and shall state the employer's willingness to come forward and give testimony if requested. The statement noted does not include much of the required information and can be

afforded minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

The only evidence contained in the record pertaining to the period prior to 1984 is as follows:

- Affidavits from [REDACTED] applicant's parents. The applicant's parents indicate only that their daughter lived with them from the time of her birth in 1973 until 1990. They do not indicate where the family resided during the relevant period. Although the Bernabes indicate that they met the applicant in 1981, their statements do not include sufficient detailed information about the applicant's continuous residency in the United States since before January 1, 1982 and throughout the requisite period. They do not indicate how frequently they saw the applicant or how they date their acquaintance with the applicant.

The record also contains several inconsistencies. For example, in a Form I-687 filed by the applicant in 1990, she lists her address as [REDACTED] from February 1984 until July 1987. However, on her Form I-687 filed in 2003, she indicates that she lived on Albany Street from December 1981 until July 1987. The director noted this inconsistency in the NOID, however, the applicant failed to address it either in rebuttal or on appeal.

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 (BIA 1988). The multiple inconsistencies noted above cast doubt on the reliability of the applicant's testimony and the veracity of the evidence submitted. On appeal, the applicant did not address these inconsistencies nor did she provide any independent objective evidence to support her eligibility for the benefit sought.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant is ineligible for temporary residence because she failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she 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*.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.