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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

(b)(6)

DATE: AUG 0 7 2013 OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

IN RE:

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

FILE:

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Nebraska Service Center Director (director) denied the Application for Temporary Resident Status (Form I-687). In a separate action, the director certified its decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The director's decision to dismiss the Form I-687 application will be withdrawn and the application will be approved.

The applicant filed an Application for Temporary Resident Status pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1225a. The director denied the application, finding the applicant's October 30, 1984 departure pursuant to a deportation order meant the applicant failed to maintain the required continuous residence. *See* Section 245A(g)(2)(b)(i) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(g)(2)(b)(i).[1]

On April 2, 2013, the director granted the applicant's motion and reopened the Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, and the Form I-687 application.

This matter has a complex procedural history. In *Proyecto San Pablo v. INS*, No. CIV 89-456-TUC-WDB (D. Ariz. Feb. 2, 2001), the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona held that the legacy Immigration and Nationalization Service (legacy INS) violated the due process rights of a class of applicants for legalization under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) when it denied those applicants access to their complete deportation or exclusion files and prevented them from seeking waivers to "cure" prior deportations or exclusions. On March 27, 2001, the court ordered the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to reopen legalization applications filed by class members and (1) accept waiver applications submitted by class members and adjudicate them in the same manner as waiver applications filed by other legalization applicants were adjudicated; and (2) prior to making a decision on a reopened legalization application, provide the applicant with complete copies of prior deportation files, including copies of tapes and/or transcripts of the hearings before the immigration court, to enable the applicant to bring a collateral challenge to the deportation order, if appropriate. Subsequently, in *Proyecto San Pablo v. Dept of Homeland Security*, No. CV 89-456-TUC-RCC (D. Ariz. May 4, 2007), the court reiterated its March 27, 2001 holding and ruled that, if the entire record cannot be located by the defendants, the following burden of proof will apply:

> A legalization applicant who may be denied on the basis of 8 U.S.C. 1225a(g)(2)(B)(i), or because of a prior deportation or exclusion order, must make a *prima facie* showing that the prior deportation or exclusion order was not in compliance with the governing statute or regulations, or occurred in violation of due process, or was otherwise unlawful or involved a gross miscarriage of justice. If the applicant makes such a showing, then CIS has the burden of coming forward with a copy of the tape and/or transcript of the prior deportation or exclusion hearing . . . If CIS does not produce such evidence from the prior deportation or exclusion file,

[1] The section provides that "an alien shall not be considered to have resided continuously in the United States, if, during any period for which continuous residence is required, the alien was outside the United States as a result of a departure under an order of deportation."

then the prior deportation or exclusion cannot be used as evidence to support a denial of legalization benefits.

In his April 30, 2013 legal brief, counsel for the applicant raises several bases to challenge the deportation order. Counsel states that although he has filed Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests on the applicant's behalf, legacy INS and USCIS have failed to provide the applicant with a copy of the tape recording and/or transcript of her deportation proceeding.[2] On October 12, 1989, legacy INS released 56 pages of record material to the applicant. On January 12, 1995, legacy INS released 203 pages of record material to the applicant. Additional record material related to the applicant's May 12, 2000 FOIA request was released to the applicant on August 24, 2000.

However, from the documentary evidence in the record it does not appear that that the applicant ever received a tape recording and/or transcript of the proceeding. The applicant's physical file (currently in the possession of the AAO) does not contain a tape recording or hearing transcript. As a result, CIS has complied with the District Court's order to the extent that it has provided the applicant with a copy of her legalization file as it currently exists. As a result of the missing transcript and tape recording, however, the applicant's complete file is unavailable.

To invoke a shift in the burden of proof from the applicant to USCIS, the applicant must make a *prima facie* showing that his deportation order was either: the result of proceedings not in compliance with the governing law or regulations; or occurred in violation of due process; or was otherwise unlawful or involved a gross miscarriage of justice.

In this case, the director granted the applicant's Motion to Reopen and approved the applicant's Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility. However, the director found the applicant failed to satisfy the continuous residence requirement of section 245A(a)(2)(A) of the Act. The director therefore denied the application and certified the matter to the AAO for a ruling. In rendering a decision, the director did not address whether the applicant was provided with a complete copy of her deportation file nor did the director discuss whether the applicant submitted *prima facie* evidence that her deportation order was not in compliance with the governing statute or regulations, or occurred in violation of due process, or resulted in a gross miscarriage of justice, as required by the amended *Proyecto* order.

The standard for establishing a *prima facie* case means the evidence reveals a reasonable likelihood that requirements have been satisfied. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, n.6 (9th Cir. 2006) (*citing Ordonez v. INS*, 345 F.3d 777, 785 (9th Cir.2003) (citations omitted)). A reasonable likelihood means showing a realistic chance that the petitioner can establish the issue in question at a later time. *Guo v. Ashcroft*, 386 F.3d 556, 564 (3rd Cir. 2004) (discussing the *prima facie* standard in the context of motions to reopen).

---

[2] A tape recording of the applicant's hearing was found in her husband's file but the tape was unintelligible.

In applying these standards, the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) and most Circuits employ a balancing test and weigh all evidence for and against in determining whether a *prima facie* case has been made. *See Zheng v. Mukasey*, 546 F.3d 70, 72 (1st Cir. 2008) (discussing the issue in the context of a motion to reopen); *Wang v. BIA*, 437 F.3d 270, 276 (2d Cir. 2006) (same); *Matter of J-W-S-*, 24 I&N Dec. 185, 191-92; *Matter of C-C*, 23 I&N Dec. 899, 902-03 (BIA 2006) (same); *Guo v. Ashcroft*, 386 F.3d 556, 564-66 (3rd Cir. 2004) (same).

Counsel for the applicant contends that the documentary evidence and the circumstances surrounding the applicant's October 30, 1984 departure pursuant to a deportation order shows it was defective and entered in violation of the governing statute and regulations.

Counsel firstly asserts that, under the terms of the *Proyecto* amended order, if USCIS intends to deny a legalization application on the basis of an alleged prior deportation, then the applicant must be provided a copy of her complete deportation file, including a copy of the tape or transcript of the alleged prior deportation hearing. Counsel indicates that the applicant has requested a copy of the tape and/or transcript of the prior deportation hearing but that neither the EOIR nor USCIS has complied with the request. Therefore, he states that under the terms of the *Proyecto* amended order, the deportation order occurred in violation of the governing regulations because there is no evidence that the immigration court maintained a recording of the applicant's deportation hearing. Counsel contends that, as there is no tape or transcript to establish that the immigration judge orally made the findings of deportability required by 8 C.F.R. § 242.14(a) (1984), the record does not show the findings of fact or conclusions of law relating to deportability.

Counsel asserts that the deportation order occurred in violation of the governing regulations because there is no evidence that the court maintained a recording of the deportation hearing. The relevant regulation in existence at the time of the applicant's deportation hearing, 8 C.F.R. § 242.15, indicated that "[t]he hearing shall be recorded verbatim. . . ." Counsel has repeatedly requested a copy of the tape recording of the hearing. In this case, it appears that the hearing was recorded, and that it was included in the applicant's husband's file; however, the recording is not intelligible. On October 12, 1989, legacy INS released 56 pages of record material to the applicant. On January 12, 1995, legacy INS released 203 pages of record material to the applicant. Legacy INS also released to the applicant documentation regarding her deportation on August 24, 2000. It appears that USCIS and EOIR have fully complied with the court's order to provide the applicant with all existing records relating to her deportation proceedings. While the applicant does not appear to be statutorily eligible for legalization without the special rules of construction set out by the court in *Proyecto* amended order and the outstanding deportation order appears valid under current ninth circuit case law (and has apparently never been challenged to EOIR or to the Court of Appeals), we are obliged to follow, to the letter, the 2007 amended *Proyecto* order.

In light of the foregoing, we find the evidence sufficient to determine that the applicant has made a *prima facie* showing that the proceedings which resulted in her deportation were not in compliance

with the governing regulations.[3] As a result, USCIS cannot use the prior deportation order as evidence to support a denial of legalization benefits. Consequently, pursuant to the terms of the 2007 amended *Proyecto* order the AAO is constrained to find that the applicant has overcome the particular basis of the denial cited by the director.

An applicant for temporary residence 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 245(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(2). An alien shall not be considered to have resided continuously in the United States if, during any period for which continuous residence is required, the alien was outside the United States under an order of deportation. Section 245A(g)(2)(B)(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(g)(2)(B)(i).

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 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).

An alien who applies for temporary resident status must also establish that he or she is admissible to the United States as an immigrant, and has not been convicted of any felony, or three or more misdemeanors. Section 245A(a)(4)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(4)(B). In addition, an applicant for temporary resident status must establish that he or she is not ineligible for admission under one or more of the categories listed in the Act. Section 245A(a)(4)(A), 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(4)(A).

In this case, documentation in the record indicates that the applicant has been residing in the United States unlawfully since July 1979. In support of her Form I-687 legalization application, the applicant submitted evidence in the form of employment reference letters, a California identification card, California DMV records, witness affidavits, W-2 wage and tax statements, pay stubs, verification of residence letters, and a San Diego School District Certificate, all dated during the requisite period. The contemporaneous documents submitted by the applicant are credible. Upon review, the AAO finds that the documents furnished in this case may be accorded sufficient evidentiary weight to meet the applicant's burden of proof of residence in the United States for the requisite period.

---

[3] As the applicant has met her burden to demonstrate a *prima facie* showing under the *Proyecto* amended order that her deportation proceeding was not in compliance with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 242.15 (1984), the AAO need not determine whether the record supports counsel's contention that the applicant departed the United States on September 1, 1984 pursuant to a grant of voluntary departure.

The AAO finds that the applicant has met her burden of proof of establishing her eligibility for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act. The applicant established her continuous unlawful residence throughout the requisite period. Her Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, was approved on humanitarian grounds. The applicant has established her eligibility for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act. Consequently, the applicant's Form I-687 application will be approved.

ORDER: The director's decision denying the applicant's Form I-687 application is withdrawn. The application is approved.