

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

L1

DATE: **JUN 29 2011**

Office: MIAMI

FILE: [REDACTED]

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. 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, Miami. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record indicates that the applicant filed a Form I-687 Application for Temporary Resident Status on August 2, 2004. On August 17, 2006, the director denied the application noting that the applicant failed to appear for a scheduled interview on August 17, 2006. Thus, the director indicated that the application was abandoned.

On September 29, 2010, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) informed the applicant that, pursuant to a recent court order, applications for temporary resident status may not be denied based on abandonment. The applicant was informed that he was entitled to file an appeal with the AAO which must be adjudicated on the merits.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). Following *de novo* review, the AAO found that that the director's basis for denial of the Form I-687 was in error. However, by letter dated May 4, 2011 the AAO identified alternative grounds for denial of the application. Specifically, the AAO noted that the applicant failed to submit sufficient evidence in support of his application.

In an attempt to establish continuous unlawful residence since before January 1, 1982 through the end of the relevant period, the applicant provided an employment letter from [REDACTED] signed by [REDACTED] on June 16, 2004. [REDACTED] states that the applicant picked apples at his farm in the "nineteen seventies" and worked for him for about "ten harvest seasons." 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 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 letter from [REDACTED] does not include much of the required information and can only be accorded minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. [REDACTED] states that his employment records burned in a fire but he does not state how he remembers the applicant's employment information. Furthermore, the AAO notes that the applicant lists [REDACTED] as an employer on the Form I-687 from 1979 to 1988. However, [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for him in the nineteen seventies and not in the nineteen eighties.

It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the applicant submits competent 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. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

On May 4, 2011, the AAO issued a notice of intent to deny (NOID) informing the applicant of the deficiencies in the record and providing him with an opportunity to respond. No response has been received.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal which is filed that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed. Given the paucity of credible evidence contained in the record and the applicant's failure to respond to the NOID, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

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