


**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

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**

PUBLIC COPY



L1

DATE: NOV 18 2011


OFFICE: NEW YORK

FILE: 

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

On October 29, 2005, the applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act). On August 10, 2006, the director of the New York office erroneously denied the I-687 application, finding that the applicant abandoned the application, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13), by failing to appear for a scheduled interview on April 24, 2006.¹ Because the director erred in denying the application based on abandonment, on September 30, 2010, the director of the National Benefits Center issued a notice advising the applicant of the right to appeal the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO).

On November 19, 2010, the applicant submitted a Form I-694, Notice of Appeal of Decision Under Section 210 or 245A. On September 20, 2011, the AAO issued the applicant a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) and provided the applicant 21 days in which to respond or to provide additional evidence in support of his claim. The applicant submitted his own declaration in response to the AAO's NOID. The director's decision will be withdrawn and the AAO will consider the applicant's claim *de novo*, evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence in the record according to its probative value and credibility as required by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).²

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 –

¹ On December 14, 2009, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ruled that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may not apply its abandonment regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(13), in adjudicating legalization applications filed by CSS class members. *See, CSS v. Michael Chertoff*, Case 2:86-cv-01343-LKK-JFM.

² 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).

(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, U.S. 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 NWIRP 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 had violated his nonimmigrant status and was in unlawful status in a manner that was known to the government prior to January 1, 1982. *See* NWIRP 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 contains the applicant's own affidavit claiming that he first entered the United States on March 15, 1980 with a B-2 visa. The record contains a second affidavit from him that states he first entered the United States on May 16, 1980. The applicant failed to mention any visa and indicated that he was in unlawful status since his date of entry. The applicant's sworn statements are inconsistent and cast doubt on the veracity of his claim that he entered the United States in nonimmigrant status. There is nothing in the record to reconcile this inconsistency; therefore, he failed to establish his eligibility for NWIRP class membership.

The record also contains the applicant's Form G-325A, Biographic Information, signed by him under severe penalties for knowingly and willfully falsifying or concealing a material fact. On his Form G-325A, he indicated that his last address outside of the United States for more than one year was in Pakistan, where he resided from May 1955 to 1992. This evidence indicates that

he did not begin residing in the United States until 1992. This information directly contradicts his claim to have resided in the United States throughout the requisite period.

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, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). In response to the AAO's NOID, the applicant submitted his own declaration. In his declaration, he stated that the discrepancy was due to a typo due to his lack of understanding with the English language. The AAO does not find his claim to be persuasive. Moreover, the applicant failed to submit objective, independent evidence to reconcile the inconsistencies.

Given this, the AAO finds that the record does not establish that the applicant entered the United States before January 1, 1982. Therefore, the applicant has not established that his presence in the United States was unlawful in a manner known to the government prior to January 1, 1982 and that he remained in unlawful status throughout the requisite period.

Under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, USCIS shall adjudicate each Form I-687 under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, regulations and administrative and judicial precedents which the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), now USCIS, followed in adjudicating the Forms I-687 timely filed during the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) application period. *See* CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements.

For purposes of establishing residence and presence as defined at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(b), the term "until the date of filing" shall mean until the date the alien was "front-desked" or discouraged from filing the Form I-687 consistent with the definition of the CSS/Newman class membership. *See id.*

An applicant who files for temporary resident status pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements 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 through the date of filing the Form I-687 during the original application period or through the date that the applicant attempted to file but was dissuaded from doing so by an agent of the INS. *See id.* and § 245A(a)(2)(A) of the Act.

An alien who applies for temporary resident status under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements has the burden to establish 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. *See* CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements and § 245A(a) of the Act.

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).

Failure to provide evidence other than affidavits shall not be USCIS' sole basis for finding that an applicant failed to meet the continuous residence requirement. *See* CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements. In evaluating the sufficiency of the applicant's proof of residence, [USCIS] shall take into account the passage of time and other related difficulties in obtaining documents that corroborate unlawful residence during the requisite periods. *See id.*

Although the regulations provide an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit, the list also permits the submission of affidavits and any other relevant document. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The application and other statements of the applicant, both oral and written, are evidence to be considered. *See Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 at 79. The applicant's statements must not be the applicant's only evidence used to establish eligibility, but they should be viewed as valid evidence. *Id.*

The absence of contemporaneous evidence is not necessarily fatal to the applicant's claim of continuous residence in the United States during the statutory period. *See id.* at 82-83. Affidavits that are consistent and verifiable may be sufficient to demonstrate continuous residence. *See id.*

Documentary evidence may be in the format prescribed by USCIS regulations. *See id.* at 80. For example, 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that a letter from an employer should be signed by the employer under penalty of perjury and "state the employer's willingness to come forward and give testimony if requested." *Id.* Letters from employers that do not comply with such requirements do not have to be accorded as much weight as letters that do comply. *Id.* However, even if not in compliance with this regulation, a letter from an employer should be considered as a "relevant document" under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(iv)(L). *Id.* Also, affidavits that have been properly attested to may be given more weight than a letter or statement. *Id.* Nonetheless in determining the weight of a statement, it should be examined first to determine upon what basis it was made and whether the statement is internally consistent, plausible and credible. *Id.* What is most important is whether the statement is consistent with the other evidence in the record. *Id.*

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 petitioner or 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, 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, to deny the application or petition.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period, whether he has established that he is admissible, and whether he has established that he is otherwise eligible to adjust to temporary resident status. As the record currently stands, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

As previously stated, based on the applicant’s own two affidavits and his Form G-325A, he has failed to establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuously resided in the United States throughout the requisite period. In support of his claim, the record contains attestations from several individuals³ that are general in nature. The witnesses claim to have personal knowledge of his residence for all, or a portion, of the requisite period. However, the witness statements do not provide concrete information, specific to you and generated by the asserted associations with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of those associations, and demonstrate that they have a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about his residence in the United States during the requisite period. The witnesses do not provide sufficient details that would lend credence to their claimed knowledge of his residence in the United States during the requisite period. For these reasons the AAO finds that the witness statements have minimal probative value as evidence in support of the applicant’s claim.

The record also contains the applicant’s Form I-589, Request for Asylum in the United States, dated January 17, 1992. In his Form I-589, at Question #28, where asked the date of departure from his country of nationality, the applicant stated November 4, 1991. At Question #34 through #37, he described his life in his country of nationality during the same period that he claims to have resided in the United States. This inconsistency casts further doubt on the veracity of the applicant’s claim.

³ [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED].

The applicant was given an opportunity to attempt to reconcile the above issues and submit additional evidence in response to the AAO's NOID. As previously stated, the applicant submitted his own declaration; however, he failed to submit any independent, objective evidence to reconcile the inconsistency. Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO finds that the applicant has not established that he is eligible for the benefit sought.

Based upon the foregoing, the AAO finds that 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 from such date through 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.