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

[redacted]

DATE: MAR 2 6 2012 Office: LOS ANGELES 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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, Los Angeles, 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. The director denied the application on July 27, 2011, finding that the applicant had not submitted sufficient evidence to establish that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since such date for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant submits declarations and other evidence for consideration.

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 under the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, 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. 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).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).

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. 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 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. 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA).

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 throughout the requisite period. Evidence of residence and/or affiants that claim they met the applicant after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, and shall not be discussed.

The applicant claims on her Form I-687 application that she resided in Los Angeles, California, for the requisite period. The applicant lists no employment on her Form I-687 during the requisite period.

The applicant submitted, as proof of her asserted date of entry into the United States and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period, declarations from [redacted]

[redacted] that are fill-in-the-blanks declarations. The declarants, with the exception of [redacted] who met the applicant in 1967, state in their declarations that they met the applicant in the 1980s.

In their declarations, [redacted] state that they saw the applicant weekly at church and other community services. [redacted] state in their declarations that the applicant babysat their son. In his declaration, [redacted] states that the applicant used to visit him during special occasions. [redacted] states that their children went to school together and that she attended the same church as the applicant. [redacted] states in her declaration that the applicant used to sell sodas and chips in the park and that they socialized. The declarants claim they kept in touch with the applicant through social events but do not give the frequency of these social events and details about the events they attended with the applicant. The declarations give little information about the applicant and the events surrounding their association with her during the requisite period. [redacted] state in their declarations that relatives told them the applicant came to the United States before 1982.

In their affidavits, [redacted] state that they know the applicant resided in the United States from September 1981 and throughout the requisite period. They attest to the applicant's good moral character.

The declarations/affidavits submitted by the applicant are judged according to their probative value and credibility and not the quantity of declarations/affidavits submitted by the applicant. To be considered probative and credible, witness statements must do more than simply state that a witness knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that it probably did exist and that the witness, by virtue of that relationship, does have knowledge of the facts alleged. The AAO finds that the witness statements do not provide sufficient detail. In many of the affidavits which are noted, the affiants did not sufficiently explain the facts stated in their affidavits/declarations and in some instances, the affiants did not explain how they gained the information about the stated facts. For the aforementioned reasons, the AAO finds that the witness statements can only be given nominal weight.

While an applicant's failure to provide evidence other than affidavits shall not be the sole basis for finding that she/he failed to meet the continuous residency requirements, an application which is lacking in contemporaneous documents cannot be deemed approvable if considerable periods of claimed continuous residency rely entirely on affidavits which are considerably lacking in certain basic and necessary information. The affiants statements are significantly lacking in detail and do not establish that the affiants actually had personal knowledge of the events and circumstances of the applicant's initial entry and residence in the United States. The affidavits do not provide much relevant information beyond acknowledging that they knew the applicant for all or part of the

requisite period. Overall, the affidavits provided are so deficient in detail that they can only be given nominal probative value. USCIS is not required to contact affiants to verify the veracity of the testimony and to obtain additional evidence from the affiants. An applicant applying for adjustment of status under this part has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he or she is eligible for adjustment of status under section 245a of the Act. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5).

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). The applicant has been given the opportunity to satisfy his burden of proof with a broad range of evidence pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3). The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts 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 evidence of record, it is concluded that the applicant failed to establish that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the date she attempted to file a Form I-687 application 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.

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