

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529 - 2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



L2

FILE:



Office: SAN FRANCISCO

Date:

NOV 22 2010

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION: Application for Status as a Permanent Resident pursuant to Section 1104 of the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act of 2000, Pub. L. 106-553, 114 Stat. 2762 (2000), amended by Life Act Amendments, Pub. L. 106-554, 114 Stat. 2763 (2000).

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 permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was previously denied by the director of the San Francisco office, and the appeal was remanded by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), for issuance of a notice of intent to deny (NOID) the application. The director denied the application, and the decision is now before the AAO on appeal.¹ The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988. In addition, although the director also determined that the applicant had not established that he was eligible for class membership pursuant to the CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements, the director treated the applicant as a class member in adjudicating the Form I-687 application on the basis of his admissibility, as well as whether the applicant had established continuous residence in the United States for the requisite period.² Consequently, the applicant has neither been prejudiced by nor suffered harm as a result of the director's finding that the applicant had not established that he was eligible for class membership. The adjudication of the applicant's appeal as it relates to his admissibility and his claim of continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 shall continue.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the evidence which the applicant previously submitted establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence on appeal.³ The AAO has considered counsel's assertions, 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.⁴

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act must establish that he or she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in continuous unlawful status since that date through May 4, 1988. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(a).

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act has the burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for

¹ The AAO notes that the director erroneously instructed the applicant to submit a Form I-694, Notice of Appeal, instead of a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal. The AAO accepts the applicant's appeal on Form I-694.

² On November 19, 1993, the officer in charge of the Fresno office issued a notice of intent to rescind (NOIR) class membership. The notice was issued based on a legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service investigation. The notice advised the applicant that he had been identified as procuring his Form I-688A, employment authorization card through the payment of a bribe to an undercover agent. The applicant was informed that his application, with bribe payment, was earmarked and segregated and he was issued a Form I-688A in conjunction with the filing of his Form I-687 application. However, the issuance of the employment card was not indicative of the CSS class membership. The applicant was given 15 days to submit a rebuttal. Although the correspondence was signed-for as delivered to the applicant's residence at the time, on appeal the applicant has denied ever having received the correspondence.

³ The record reveals that the applicant's FOIA request [REDACTED] was processed on August 29, 2010.

⁴ 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).

the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under this section. 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.12(e).

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).

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).

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. 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 furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. The

documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of witness statements. The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote the witness statements in this decision. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed.

The record contains witness statements from [REDACTED] (the applicant's brother-in-law), [REDACTED]. The statements are general in nature and state that the witnesses have knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States for all, or a portion of, the requisite period.

Although the witnesses claim to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period, their witness statements fail to provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of those associations, and demonstrate that they were a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits 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 time 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. For instance, the witnesses do not state how frequently they had contact with the applicant during the requisite period. The witnesses do not provide sufficient details that would lend credence to their claimed knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. For these reasons the AAO finds that the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true.

In addition, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] state that they first entered the United States in 1982; [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] state that they first entered the United States in 1984; and, [REDACTED] states that he first entered the United States in 1987. Therefore, these witnesses do not have first-hand knowledge of the applicant's continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

The applicant has submitted employment verification letters from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of [REDACTED], California.

[REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for his ranch as a farm laborer from July 1, 1981 through October 1984, and from October 1987 through the end of the requisite period, although he does not state the location at which the applicant worked.

In an undated letter, [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for [REDACTED], as a gas station attendant from June 6, 1985 to September 1987.

The employment verification letters of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] do not meet the requirements set forth in the regulations, which provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) provides that letters from employers must include: (A) Alien's address at the time of employment; (B) Exact period of employment; (C) Periods of layoff; (D) Duties with the company; (E) Whether or not the information was taken from official company records; and (F) Where records are located and whether the Service may have access to the records. If the records are unavailable, an affidavit-form letter stating that the alien's employment records are unavailable and why such records are unavailable may be accepted in lieu of subsections (E) and (F). The employment verification letters fail to comply with the above cited regulation because they lack considerable detail regarding the applicant's employment. For instance, the witnesses do not state the applicant's daily work duties or the applicant's address at the time of employment. Furthermore, the witnesses do not state how they were able to date the applicant's employment. It is unclear whether they referred to their own recollection or any records they may have maintained. For these reasons, the employment verification letters will be given no weight.

In addition, the record contains three witness statements from [REDACTED], Imam of the [REDACTED], California. In two of his statements, both dated November 22, 1990, the witness states that he has known the applicant from 1980 through the end of the requisite period, during which time the witness states the applicant kept in contact with the [REDACTED]. In addition, in one of the November 22, 1990 statements, the witness states that the applicant lived at [REDACTED] from July 1980 to October 1984. However, the testimony of the witness is inconsistent with the testimony of the applicant in a Form I-687, application for status as a temporary resident filed in 1990, in which the applicant listed this address as a residence beginning in July 1981. Further, applicant failed to list his association with the [REDACTED] of Sacramento, or any other religious organization, in the I-687 application. At part 34 of the application, where applicants are asked to list their involvement with any religious organizations, the applicant did not list any organizations. This is an inconsistency which is material to the applicant's claim in that it has a direct bearing on the applicant's residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. As stated above, 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, supra*. These inconsistencies undermine the credibility of the applicant's claim of entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

More importantly, the witness's statements do not meet the requirements set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v), which provides requirements for attestations made on behalf of an applicant by churches, unions, or other organizations. Attestations must: (1) identify applicant by name; (2) be signed by an official (whose title is shown); (3) show inclusive dates of membership; (4) state the address where the applicant resided during membership period; (5) include the seal of the organization impressed on the letter or the letterhead of the organization, if the organization has letterhead stationery; (6) establish how the author knows the applicant; and (7) establish the origin

of the information being attested to. These attestations fail to comply with the cited regulation. Therefore, these attestations are of little probative value.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of copies of the applicant's statements, the I-485 application, a Form I-687, application for status as a temporary resident, filed in 1990 to establish the applicant's CSS class membership, and an additional I-485 application, based on an underlying Form I-130, petition for alien relative, filed on behalf of the applicant's spouse. However, as stated previously, 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 the evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

Here, the applicant has failed to provide probative and credible evidence of his continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. The inconsistencies regarding the dates the applicant resided at a particular location in the United States are material to the applicant's claim in that they have a direct bearing on the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. No evidence of record resolves these inconsistencies. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. 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). These contradictions undermine the credibility of the applicant's claim of entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO agrees with the director that the evidence submitted by the applicant has not established that he is eligible for the benefit sought. The various statements currently in the record which attempt to substantiate the applicant's residence in the United States during the statutory period are not objective, independent evidence such that they might overcome the inconsistencies in the record regarding the applicant's claim that he maintained continuous residence in the United States throughout the statutory period, and thus are not probative.

Based upon the foregoing, 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 for 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.