


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
Office of Administrative Appeals (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



L1

FILE: [REDACTED]
SRC 01 119 52598


Office: HOUSTON

Date: APR 05 2011

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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, 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.

Elizabeth McCormack

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for temporary resident status was terminated by the Director, Houston. 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 (Act). The application was approved on June 29, 2005. On November 16, 2009 the director issued a notice of intent to terminate (NOIT). The director terminated the application on May 12, 2010, finding that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she has established her unlawful residence for the requisite time period. Counsel argues that the director's decision was unfair and that the applicant's affidavits are sufficient evidence of continuous residence in the United States.

The status of an alien lawfully admitted for temporary residence under section 245A(a)(1) of the Act may be terminated at any time if it is determined that the alien was ineligible for temporary residence under section 245A of the Act. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(u)(1)(i).

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).

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). 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).

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).

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.

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.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of her claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by family, friends, and employers.

The affidavits from

all contain statements that the affiants have known the applicant for years and that they attest to the applicant being physically present in the United States during the requisite period. These affidavits fail, however, to establish the applicant’s continuous unlawful residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality; 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.

The affidavits in the record of proceeding provide information regarding the applicant’s absences from the United States since entry that is inconsistent with other evidence in the record. The record contains two Forms I-687 signed by the applicant and a sworn statement from the applicant dated July 23, 2004 listing two absences from the United States. In the Form I-687 filed in 1990, the applicant stated that she traveled to El Salvador from December 2, 1984 to January 15, 1985 and from May 1987 to June 1987. In the Form I-687 in 2005, the applicant stated that she traveled to El Salvador from December 2, 1984 to January 15, 1985 and from May 1987 to May 1987. In her 2004 sworn statement, the applicant stated that she traveled to El

Salvador from December 4, 1984 to January 15, 1985, and from May 1987 to June 1987. The affidavits from [REDACTED] state that the applicant visited El Salvador one time from January 1988 to February 1988.

It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent 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. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

The AAO notes that the affidavits from [REDACTED] simply state that they have known the applicant since about 1988. However, neither state whether they met the applicant in the United States or how they remember meeting the applicant in 1988. The fact that none of the affiants are familiar with the applicant's absences from the United States is material in that it reflects poorly on their knowledge of the applicant's continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

None of the witness statements provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with her, 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 during the time addressed in the affidavits. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant 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 the relationship probably did exist and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

The record also contains a notarized employment letter dated December 6, 1990 and signed by [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for her as a babysitter from 1981 to 1986. [REDACTED] also states that to the best of her knowledge, the applicant has always lived with her sister, [REDACTED]. The record also contains a notarized employment letter dated December 11, 1990 and signed by [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for her at the [REDACTED] as a waitress three days a week and was paid in cash. Neither letter provides the applicant's hourly wages. The letters both fail to meet certain regulatory standards set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i), which provides that letters from employers must include the applicant's address at the time of employment; exact period of employment; whether the information was taken from official company records and where records are located and whether USCIS may have access to the records; if records are unavailable, an affidavit form-letter stating that the employment records are unavailable may be accepted which shall be signed, attested to by the employer under penalty of perjury and shall

state the employer's willingness to come forward and give testimony if requested. The letters from [REDACTED] do not include much of the required information and can only be accorded minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period.

The director issued a notice of intent to terminate (NOIT) on November 16, 2009. The director terminated the application for temporary residence on May 12, 2010, finding that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, the applicant has not submitted any evidence that establishes that she was physically present or had continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period or that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982.

Counsel suggests that the director's adjudication of the petition was unfair. The applicant has not demonstrated any error by the director in conducting its review of the petition. Nor has the applicant demonstrated any resultant prejudice such as would constitute a due process violation. *See Vides-Vides v. INS*, 783 F.2d 1463, 1469-70 (9th Cir. 1986); *Nicholas v. INS*, 590 F.2d 802, 809-10 (9th Cir. 1979); *Martin-Mendoza v. INS*, 499 F.2d 918, 922 (9th Cir. 1974), *cert. denied*, 419 U.S. 1113 (1975).

Counsel argues that *Matter of Ho* does not apply to the applicant because her application was previously approved. Upon review, the director found that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period and that the record contained inconsistencies. U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is not required to approve petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. *See, e.g., Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm. 1988). Neither USCIS nor any other agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery* 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), *cert denied*, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988). The Administrative Appeals Office is never bound by a decision of a service center or district director. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), *aff'd* 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), *cert. denied*, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

There are inconsistencies in the record of proceeding. These inconsistencies 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. As stated previously, 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. *See Matter of Ho, supra.*

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she 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. The director's decision terminating the applicant's temporary status is affirmed.

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