



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: SEP 17 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg", written over a circular stamp or mark.

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

CC: Gibbs, Houston, Pauw
1000 Second Avenue, Suite 1600
Seattle, WA 98104

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 The director's decision to dismiss the Form I-687 application will be withdrawn and the application will be approved.

On May 4, 1988, the applicant filed a Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status, pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1225a. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant's October 23, 1985 departure pursuant to a deportation order meant he 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 15, 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. June 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

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."

CIS does not produce such evidence from the prior deportation or exclusion file, then the prior deportation or exclusion cannot be used as evidence to support a denial of legalization benefits.

The record reflects that the applicant has not responded to the certified denial. However, the record evidence indicates that the applicant requested previously a copy of his A-file and immigration court records pursuant to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) file requests. On July 5, 1996, legacy INS released 46 pages of record material to the applicant. Also, documentation in the record suggests that on September 23, 2008, the applicant's USCIS immigration file was loaned to the EOIR to fulfill a previously-filed FOIA request. However, from the documentary evidence in the record, it does not appear that the applicant ever received a tape recording and/or transcript of the deportation hearing. The applicant's physical file (currently in the possession of the AAO) does not contain a tape recording or hearing transcript. As a result, USCIS has complied with the District Court's order to the extent that it has provided the applicant with a copy of his legalization file as it currently exists. As a result of the missing tape and/or transcript, 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 previously filed Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility. However, in a decision dated April 15, 2013, the director denied the applicant's Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status, finding that the applicant failed to satisfy the continuous residence requirement of section 245A(a)(2)(A) of the Act due to the applicant's October 23, 1985 departure from the United States pursuant to a deportation order. The director, therefore, denied the application and certified the matter to the AAO for a ruling. The AAO notes that in rendering a decision, the director did not address whether the applicant was provided with a complete copy of his deportation file; nor did the director discuss whether the applicant submitted *prima facie* evidence that his 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).

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 (3d Cir. 2004) (same).

In relevant part, under the terms of the *Proyecto* amended order, the applicant has requested a copy of his complete deportation file, including the tape recording and/or transcript 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 except for statements made off the record with the permission of the special inquiry officer." It is likely that the hearing was recorded, and possible that it was included among other hearings on one tape (as we understand was frequently the case); however, EOIR and USCIS searches have not produced a copy of the recording. On July 5, 1996, legacy INS released 46 pages of record material to the applicant. Also, documentation in the record suggests that on September 23, 2008, the applicant's USCIS immigration file was loaned to the EOIR to fulfill a previously-filed FOIA request.

However, the current entire USCIS record, which is before the AAO, does not contain a tape recording or transcript. Therefore, it appears that USCIS and EOIR have fully complied with the court's order to provide the applicant with all records relating to his deportation proceeding. While the applicant does not appear to be statutorily eligible for legalization without the special rules of construction set out by the court in the *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.

We therefore find the evidence sufficient to determine that the applicant has made a *prima facie* showing that the proceedings which resulted in his deportation were not in compliance with the governing regulations because there is no evidence that the immigration court maintained a recording of the applicant's October 23, 1985 deportation hearing. 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).

In support of his Form I-687 legalization application, the applicant submitted documentary evidence in the form of a California identification card issued on April 12, 1982, a driver's license issued by the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on June 7, 1984, an employment reference letter, W-2 wage and tax statements, copy of an interim driver's license issued by the California DMV in July 1984, and a witness affidavit, 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 establishing his continuous unlawful residence in the United States for the requisite period.

The AAO finds that the applicant has met his burden of proof of establishing his eligibility for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act. The applicant established his continuous unlawful residence throughout the requisite period. His Form I-690, Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility, was approved on humanitarian grounds. He has established his eligibility for temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act.² 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.

² The record reflects that on October 17, 1985, the applicant was convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1325, a misdemeanor offense, for knowingly and unlawfully entering the United States at a time or place not designated by an immigration officer. The applicant was sentenced to time served and was ordered to pay a \$325 fine. A single misdemeanor conviction does not affect the applicant's eligibility for temporary resident status. See section 245A (a)(4)(B) of the Act.