

(b)(6)

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



Date: FEB 07 2013 Office: HOUSTON

FILE:




IN RE: Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Temporary Resident Status under 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.


for
Ron Rosenberg
Acting 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, or *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 initially approved by the director of the Houston office. The director subsequently terminated the applicant's temporary resident status and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The applicant submitted a Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) and a Form I-687 Supplement, CSS/Newman (LULAC) Class Membership Worksheet. The director terminated the applicant's temporary resident status, finding that the applicant was ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status because he had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the evidence which the applicant previously submitted establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the applicant continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite time period. The AAO has considered the applicant's assertions, reviewed all of the evidence, and has made a *de novo* decision based on the record and the AAO's assessment of the credibility, relevance and probative value of the evidence.¹

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)(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) 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.

¹ The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

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 furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he entered before 1982 and resided in the United States for the requisite period. In this case, the submitted evidence is relevant, probative and credible.

In support of his application the applicant submitted witness statements and affidavits. The witness statements and affidavits provide concrete information, specific to the applicant, which demonstrate a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

The director issued a notice of intent to terminate temporary resident status (NOIT). Counsel for the applicant submitted a rebuttal. The director then issued a superseding NOIT.

The witness statements submitted by the applicant appear to be credible and amenable to verification in that they include contact telephone numbers and/or contact addresses. In the initial NOIT, the director determined that a witness with the same surname as the applicant must be a relative, and therefore his testimony was not credible. In the superseding NOIT, the director noted that the affiants all failed to submit tangible evidence in support of their claims. There is no legal requirement that affiants provide tangible evidence in support of their statements. The director also noted several inconsistencies in the statements of different affiants. The AAO notes that the inconsistencies are minor or nonexistent. The director found that [REDACTED] claim that the applicant resided with him in 1980 and 1981 was inconsistent with [REDACTED] testimony that the applicant began to live with her in 1982. The director determined that the six month gap between residing with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was significant. This gap is not apparent. The director states that there is a discrepancy between an employer's letter and information provided on the Form I-687, namely, that the employer asserted the applicant worked at [REDACTED] in 1983. The Form I-687 states that the applicant worked at [REDACTED] from 1982 to 1983. The director states that [REDACTED] affidavit contradicts the applicant's information on the Form I-687 regarding employment. [REDACTED] merely states he met the applicant while they were working at [REDACTED]. He did not say when they worked together. The applicant listed this employer on his Form I-687.

The director has not established that the information on the many supporting documents in the record was inconsistent with the applicant's testimony or with the claims made on his I-687 application. In addition, the director has not established that any inconsistencies exist *within* the claims made on the supporting documents, or that the documents contain false information. As stated in *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. at 80, when something is to be established by a preponderance of the evidence, the proof submitted by the applicant has to establish only that the asserted claim is probably true. That decision also states that, under the preponderance of evidence standard, an application may be granted even though some doubt remains regarding the evidence. *Id.* at 79. The documents that have been furnished in this case may be accorded substantial evidentiary weight and are sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof of residence in the United States for the requisite period.

The applicant has established by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and maintained continuous, unlawful residence for the duration of

(b)(6)

the requisite period. Consequently, the applicant has overcome the particular basis of denial cited by the director.²

The appeal will be sustained. The applicant's temporary resident status is restored. The director should reopen *sua sponte* the applicant's Form I-698.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.

² The AAO notes that the record reveals that the applicant has one misdemeanor conviction for driving while under the influence. A single misdemeanor conviction does not render the applicant ineligible for temporary or permanent resident status.