

# Lesson Plan Overview

<b>Course</b>	Asylum Officer Basic Training
<b>Lesson</b>	<i>One-Year Filing Deadline</i>
<b>Field Performance Objective</b>	Given an asylum application to adjudicate in which the one-year filing deadline or a previous denial is at issue, the asylum officer will be able to properly apply the rules and reach a decision.
<b>Interim (Training) Performance Objectives</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Identify whether the one-year filing rule applies.</li><li>2. Correctly use the clear and convincing evidentiary standard.</li><li>3. Explain the exceptions to the one-year filing rule.</li><li>4. Identify facts material to the filing rule in evaluating credibility.</li></ol>
<b>Student References / Materials</b>	INA §§ 208(a); 101(a)(42); 8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a).

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>II. OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>III. APPLICABILITY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>IV. DETERMINING WHETHER THE APPLICATION WAS FILED WITHIN THE ONE-YEAR PERIOD</b> .....	<b>4</b>
A. Calculating the One-Year Period .....	4
B. Burden and Standard of Proof.....	5
<b>V. EXCEPTIONS TO THE ONE-YEAR RULE</b> .....	<b>7</b>
A. Changed Circumstances .....	7
B. Extraordinary Circumstances .....	10
C. Burden and Standard of Proof.....	15
<b>VI. FILING WITHIN A REASONABLE PERIOD OF TIME</b> .....	<b>16</b>
A. Overview .....	16
B. Delayed awareness.....	16
C. Evaluation of the “reasonable period of time” .....	16
<b>VII. CREDIBILITY</b> .....	<b>18</b>
A. Overview .....	18
B. Materiality.....	18
<b>VIII. SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>24</b>

## Presentation

### I. INTRODUCTION

Prior to the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), eligibility for asylum was not linked to how long an applicant had been in the United States. IIRIRA introduced a new eligibility requirement: an asylum applicant filing after April 1, 1998, must apply within one year of his or her last arrival, unless there are changed circumstances which materially affect his or her eligibility for asylum, or extraordinary circumstances relating to the delay in filing. This lesson provides guidance on determining whether an applicant has applied for asylum within one year from date of arrival in the United States and, if not, whether an exception exempting the applicant from this requirement applies.

### II. OVERVIEW

Any asylum applicant who applied for asylum on or after April 1, 1998 (or April 16, 1998, for those applying with the INS), must establish that he or she filed for asylum within one year from the date of last arrival or establish that he or she is eligible for an exception to the one-year filing requirement. If an applicant fails to establish timely filing of the application or that an exception applies, the application must be referred to the Immigration Court. Only an asylum officer, immigration judge or the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) is authorized to make this determination. The determination may be made only after an interview with an asylum officer or hearing before an Immigration Judge.

An asylum interview is the method asylum officers use to determine an applicant’s last arrival date, basis for asylum claim, and whether any exceptions to the filing deadline apply. No applicant is to be denied a full asylum interview based solely on one-year filing deadline issues. A full and thorough asylum interview includes a pre-interview check of country conditions and post-interview research where necessary.

Decisions by an asylum officer must be supported by the officer’s written assessment of the case. Because changed conditions may provide an exception to the one-year filing requirement (as discussed below), all referrals on the basis of the one-year filing deadline must address pertinent country conditions, and must analyze whether there has been any change in country conditions.

## References

### OH #1&2: Objectives

Pub. L. No. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3546 (September 30, 1996).

Authority for this requirements is contained in INA § 208(a)(2)(B) and 8 C.F.R. § 208.4 (a). Exceptions to the rule are provided in INA § 208(a)(2)(D) and 8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a).

### OH #3: Basic Rule

8 CFR 208.4(a)

See discussion of 14-day grace period in Section III below for April 16, 1998 date.

Note: An applicant who is not eligible to apply for asylum for failure to meet the one-year filing requirement is still eligible to apply for withholding of removal before an immigration judge.

### III. APPLICABILITY

Only applications with a filing date on or after April 16, 1998, are subject to the one-year rule. Applications with a filing date on or before April 15, 1998, are not subject to the one-year filing deadline as implemented by the Asylum Division. Although April 1, 1998, is the effective date provided by regulation for those who arrived before April 1, 1997, the INS extended an administrative 14-day grace period for applications filed with the INS. This 14-day period only applies to those applications filed in the first 15 days of April, 1998.

### IV. DETERMINING WHETHER THE APPLICATION WAS FILED WITHIN THE ONE-YEAR PERIOD

#### A. Calculating the One-Year Period

#### OH #4: Calculating One-Year Period

##### 1. Date one-year period begins

The one-year period begins running from the date of the applicant's last arrival in the United States. For example, if an applicant enters the United States on February 2, 2000, leaves the United States on February 25, 2000, and returns to the United States on March 1, 2000, the one-year period begins on March 1, 2000.

##### 2. Date one-year period ends

The one-year period is calculated from the last arrival date up to the previous calendar day the following year. For example, an applicant who arrives on February 23, 2000, and files on February 22, 2001, will have timely filed; an applicant who arrives on February 23, 2000, and files on (or after) February 23, 2001, will not have timely filed.

If the last day for timely filing falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, filing on the next business day will be considered timely. For example, an applicant who last arrives on June 24, 2000, can timely file on June 25, 2001, because June 23, 2001, is a Saturday.

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(2)(ii)

##### 3. Filing date

The filing date is found on the Service's date/time stamp on the I-589 and on the RAPS 'I589' and 'CSTA' screens. If any of these dates are different, the earliest date is to be used.

#### OH #5: Determining filing Date

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(2)(ii)

An affirmative asylum application is considered filed when *received* by the INS Service Center. However, the application can be considered timely if “clear and convincing” documentary evidence demonstrates that the application was *mailed* within the statutory one-year period. The “clear and convincing” standard is explained in Section IV.B.

### Instructor Note 1

## B. Burden and Standard of Proof

There are two different standards of proof that are operative in making determinations related to the one-year filing requirement: a) the standard of proof to establish that an applicant applied within one year and b) the standard of proof to establish that an exception to the requirement applies, if the applicant failed to meet the one-year requirement. This section focuses on the standard of proof required to establishing filing within one year.

### 1. Applicant’s burden

The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish that he or she applied for asylum within one year from the date of last arrival in the United States.

### OH #6: Burden of Proof

### 2. Standard of proof

Pursuant to INA section 208(a)(2), the standard of proof required to establish that an applicant filed within one year from last arrival is the ***clear and convincing*** standard.

“Clear and convincing” is that degree of proof that will produce a “firm belief or conviction,” and “where the truth of the facts asserted is highly probable.”

The proof need not be “conclusive” or “unequivocal”; if put on a scale, the clear and convincing standard would be somewhere between the “preponderance of evidence” standard (greater than 50% standard, or “more likely than not”) and that of the “beyond a reasonable doubt” standard used in criminal trials.

Asylum officers should avoid trying to place the clear and convincing standard on a particular point on a percentage scale. Clear and convincing evidence does not fall precisely on any point between the “preponderance of evidence” standard and the “beyond a reasonable doubt standard.” Instead, it is the degree of evidence necessary to

### OH #7: Standard of Proof

*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Editions; *Woodby v. INS*, 385 U.S. 276 (1966); *Matter of Carrubba*, 11 I&N Dec. 914 (BIA 1966); *Matter of Patel*, 19 I&N Dec. 774 (BIA 1988)

create a firm belief that the asserted fact is true.

**Instructor Note 2**

3. Establishing timely filing

An applicant may establish that an application was filed within one year from the date of last arrival by providing either

- a. clear and convincing evidence of a date of last arrival within the applicable one-year period, or
- b. clear and convincing evidence that the applicant was outside of the United States during the previous year immediately before the date of filing.

4. Evidence

The evidence provided may be testimony, documentation, or a combination of both.

**OH #8: Evidence**

- a. testimony

Testimony is evidence. Standing alone without witness corroboration or documentary evidence, when credible, testimony can be sufficiently clear and convincing to lead an asylum officer to a “firm belief” that the applicant arrived within one year before the filing date.

8 C.F.R. § 208.13(a); *Matter of S-M-J-*, 21 I&N Dec. 722 (BIA 1997); *See*, lesson, *Eligibility Part IV: Burden of Proof and Evidence*.

- b. documents

Documentary evidence such as passport entries, boarding passes, leases, etc., are probative as to when an applicant entered the United States, when presence outside the United States ended, and when presence in the United States began.

**Instructor Note 3**

Caselaw that addresses an asylum applicant’s responsibility to provide reasonably available corroborating evidence to establish eligibility for asylum does not specifically address requirements for establishing that the one-year filing requirement has been met. However, consistent with the reasoning of that case law is the premise that corroboration should not be required when there are reasonable explanations for the inability to provide corroborating evidence. Due to circumstances that give rise to a refugee’s flight, it generally would be unreasonable to

*See*, lesson, *Eligibility Part IV: Burden of Proof and Evidence*.

expect a refugee to have documentary proof of presence outside the United States within a year from last arrival.

**Note:** There may be instances in which the asserted arrival date is uncertain or not believable. These credibility issues are explored in Section VII.

## V. EXCEPTIONS TO THE ONE-YEAR RULE

If an applicant did not apply for asylum within one year from last arrival in the United States, he or she may still be eligible to apply for asylum if the applicant establishes that there are changed circumstances materially affecting the applicant's eligibility for asylum or extraordinary circumstances related to the delay in filing. Once an applicant establishes the existence of such a changed or extraordinary circumstance, the applicant must demonstrate that the application was filed within a reasonable amount of time given those circumstances.

### **Keep in Mind:**

The ultimate decision on whether an applicant qualifies for asylum is irrelevant to analyzing one-year filing deadline issues; rather, the task at this initial stage is to determine whether an exception to the one-year filing deadline applies. If an exception to the one-year filing deadline applies, then the applicant is entitled to a full adjudication of the asylum application.

### A. Changed Circumstances

#### 1. General considerations

The statute allows for exceptions due to changed circumstances that materially affect an applicant's eligibility for asylum. To show that the exception applies, the applicant must establish the following:

- a. the existence of a changed circumstance that occurred on or after April 1, 1997, the effective date of the statute;
- b. that the changed circumstance is material to the applicant's eligibility for asylum; and

### **OH #9: Examining Exceptions**

INA § 208(a)(2)(D); 8  
C.F.R. § 208.4(a)

### **OH #10: Changed Circumstances**

INA § 208(a)(2)(D)

- c. that the application was filed within a reasonable period of time after the changed circumstance. 8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(ii). This is discussed further in Section VI, *Filing Within a Reasonable Period of Time*, below.
- In evaluating whether the delay was reasonable, the asylum officer must take into account any delayed awareness the applicant may have had of the changed circumstance.

## 2. Types of changed circumstances

Regulations provide a non-exhaustive list of the types of changed circumstances that may provide an exception to the one-year filing rule, as long as they materially affect the applicant's eligibility for asylum. These include:

### **OH #11: Changed Circumstances, Materiality**

- a. changed conditions in applicant's country of nationality or, if stateless, applicant's country of last habitual residence 8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(4)(i)(A)
- b. changes in applicable U.S. law 8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(4)(i)(B)
- c. changes in applicant's personal circumstances, such as recent political activism, conversion from one religion to another, etc. 8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(2)(i)(B)
- d. the ending of applicant's dependent relationship to the principal applicant in a previous application. 8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(2)(i)(C)

### **Examples**

- 1) Applicant was forced by her government to undergo an abortion. She arrives in the U.S. in 1992. The 1996 change to the refugee definition related to harm pursuant to a coercive population control program materially affects her asylum eligibility. She files for asylum on April 18, 1998. This applicant is not entitled to the changed circumstance exception because the change did not occur on or after April 1, 1997. If no other exceptions apply, her application will be referred.
- 2) Applicant is a member of the XYZ party in his country. He is briefly jailed in September 1999. He arrives in the U.S. in November 1999 and files for asylum in December 2000. On the day of the interview, XYZ members are still routinely being jailed. Because there has been no change of country

conditions, the application will be referred provided no other exceptions apply. **Note:** If conditions for XYZ members worsened after applicant departed his country, he may be eligible for the changed circumstance exception.

- 3) Applicant arrived in the U.S. in 1989 and has never left. She was included as a dependent on her mother's I-589, which was filed in September 1998. Applicant's mother died in May 1999 before receiving her asylum interview. In June 2000 applicant files her own I-589. Due to the change in applicant's dependent relationship an exception to the filing deadline would apply provided the asylum officer considered the delay in filing from May 1999 to June 2000 to be a reasonable period of time.
- 4) Applicant was a dependent on his father's I-589, which was filed in January 1999. In July 2000 applicant turned 21 years of age. His father still had not received an asylum interview. An exception to the filing deadline would apply in the son's case, provided the asylum officer considered the delay in filing from the attainment of 21 years of age to the I-589 filing date to be a reasonable period of time.

**Note:** The fact that minors customarily leave immigration and other legal paperwork to older family members should be taken into account when evaluating the reasonableness of the delay in filing.

#### Instructor Note 4

### 3. Refugees *sur place*

The changed circumstance exception to the one-year filing deadline reflects the principle that some individuals become refugees after they have left their countries and even after they may have been residing in another country for several years.

Changes occurring in an applicant's country or place of last habitual residence, and/or activities by an applicant outside his or her country may make the applicant a refugee *sur place*. Examples include but are not limited to:

- a. a change of government which is now hostile to applicant's profession, such as journalists

#### OH #12: Changed Circumstances, Materiality

8 C.F.R. § 208.4 (a)(4)(i)(A); UNHCR *Handbook*, Paragraphs 94-95; *Matter of Mogharrabi*, 19 I&N Dec. 439 (BIA 1987); See, lesson, *Asylum Eligibility Part II: Well-Founded Fear*, Sec. X, *Refugee Sur Place*

- b. applicant's involvement in political organizing or other activities in the U.S. that are critical of applicant's government
- c. applicant's conversion from one religion to another, or abandonment of religion altogether
- d. recent antagonism in applicant's country toward applicant's race or nationality
- e. threats against an applicant's family member living abroad

### Example

A Russian citizen of West African ancestry has lived in the United States since 1989. She filed a Request for Asylum in June 2000. Country conditions information shows that since the 1991 breakup of the former Soviet Union, individuals with West African ancestry have been targeted by ordinary citizens in Russia. The police have tolerated this abuse. Depending on the particular circumstances of the case, this applicant could be considered a refugee *sur place*. Provided there are no additional exceptions, because the change in country conditions occurred before April 1997, the applicant's failure to file for asylum within one year of arrival would result in his application being referred. **Note:** If there had been an escalation of violence between ethnic Russians and West Africans after April 1, 1997, the applicant would be eligible for an exception, provided the delay in filing is a reasonable period of time.

## B. Extraordinary Circumstances

### 1. General considerations

Events or factors in an applicant's life that caused the applicant to miss the filing deadline may except the applicant from the requirement to file within one year of the last arrival. To be eligible for this exception, the applicant must:

- a. establish the existence of an extraordinary circumstance;
- b. establish that the extraordinary circumstance was directly related to the failure to timely file;

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(5)

### OH #13: Extraordinary Circumstances

- c. not have intentionally created the extraordinary circumstance, through his or her action or inaction, for the purpose of establishing a filing-deadline exception; and
- d. file the application within a reasonable period given the circumstances that related to the failure to timely file.

Although an extraordinary circumstance can occur before or after an applicant's arrival in the U.S., and before or after the April 1, 1997, effective date of the statutory provision, the circumstance must directly relate to an applicant's failure to file within one year of his or her last arrival.

2. Types of circumstances that may be "extraordinary"

**OH #14: Extraordinary Circumstances, Examples**

Regulations describe several situations that could fall under the extraordinary circumstances exception. This list is not all-inclusive. There are other circumstances that might apply if the applicant is able to show that those circumstances were extraordinary and directly related to the failure to timely file. Extraordinary circumstances include but are not limited to:

- a. serious illness or mental or physical disability, including any effects of persecution or violent harm suffered in the past

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(5)(i)

The illness or disability must have been present, although not necessarily incurred, during at least part of the one-year period after arrival.

If the alien has suffered torture or other severe trauma in the past, the asylum officer should elicit information about any continuing effects from that torture or trauma, which may be related to a delay in filing. Torture may result in serious illness or mental or physical disability.

Effects of persecution can include inability to recall details, severe lack of focus, problems with eating and sleeping, and other post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms. *See, lesson, Interviewing Part V: Interviewing Survivors*

- b. the death or serious illness or incapacity of the applicant's legal representative or a member of the applicant's immediate family.

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(5)(vi)

Applicant's legal guardian, or holder of power of

attorney, is also considered a family member.

The degree of interaction between the family members, as well as the blood relationship between applicant and the family member must be considered. For example, an estranged brother with whom the applicant has never had much contact would not qualify, but a grandparent or uncle for whom the applicant has sole physical responsibility would qualify.

c. legal disability

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(5)(ii)  
**OH #15: Extraordinary Circumstances, Examples**

This is best described as an incapacity for the full enjoyment of ordinary legal rights; it includes unaccompanied minors and mental impairment.

*Black's Law Dictionary*, 5<sup>th</sup> Ed.

The legal disability must have been during the one-year period after arrival.

d. ineffective assistance of counsel (limited to attorneys or accredited representatives)

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(5)(iii)

The following are required for this exception:

- (i) the applicant must file a written affidavit explaining the agreement in detail and listing what promises the attorney made or did not make, and
- (ii) testimony or documentary evidence that the accused counsel was informed of the allegation and was given an opportunity to respond, and
- (iii) testimony or documentary evidence that indicates whether there has been a complaint filed with the appropriate disciplinary authorities, and if not, an explanation why there has been no complaint.

**Note:** regulations and caselaw that address whether counsel's assistance was ineffective are not relevant here. The asylum officer is not evaluating whether applicant was given poor counsel; rather, the responsibility of the asylum officer is to decide whether the above elements have been fulfilled and that the counsel's actions were related to the delay in

8 C.F.R. § 292.3(a); *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988); *Matter of B-B-*, Int. Dec. #3367 (BIA 1998)

filing.

- e. maintaining of TPS, lawful status, or parole

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(5)(iv)  
**OH #16: Extraordinary  
 Circumstances, Examples**

Applicant had Temporary Protected Status (TPS), lawful immigrant/non-immigrant status, or was given parole during the one-year period after the last arrival, and filed the asylum application within a reasonable period of time after expiration of that status. Guidance on how to determine whether it was reasonable for the applicant to delay the filing is provide in Section VI.

The Department of Justice included this on the list of possible extraordinary circumstances to avoid forcing a premature application for asylum in cases in which an individual believes circumstances in his country may improve. For example, an individual admitted as a student who expects that the political situation in her country may soon change for the better as a result of recent elections may wish to refrain from applying for asylum until absolutely necessary. *See* 65 Fed. Reg. 76121, 76123 (December 6, 2000).

An application is considered timely if the applicant maintains a lawful status through the one-year required filing period and continues to maintain lawful status up to the I-589 filing date.

Should an applicant violate the terms of his or her visa (for example, by working without authorization while on a B-2 visitor's visa), the extraordinary circumstances exception ceases. Then officer must then determine whether the delay in filing and the expiration of the extraordinary circumstance is reasonable.

Note: The applicant is not precluded from establishing an extraordinary circumstance beyond legal status. Consider if the case involves a "delayed awareness" of the violation of status. *See*, section VI.B., *Delayed Awareness*, below.

*See*, section VI., *Filing Within a Reasonable Period of Time*, below  
**Instructor Note 5**

Applicants who receive a one-year humanitarian parole for the purpose of submitting an asylum application are on notice that the one-year period runs from the time the parole is given. They therefore are not eligible for the lawful status exception to a timely filing. Applicants who receive other types of parole during the required filing period are eligible for this exception.

An applicant who upon the last arrival is inspected and admitted with fraudulent documents does not satisfy a "maintaining of lawful status" extraordinary exception to the one-year filing deadline because that

status was not lawful.

- f. initial submission of application was timely

**OH #17: Extraordinary Circumstances, Examples**

- (i) defect in first submission

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(5)(v)

The I-589 was mailed within one year of the last arrival, but the INS Service Center returned it as improperly filed. It was subsequently re-filed more than one year after the arrival. In cases such as this, the applicant is presumed to have made the request for protection known to the INS in a timely way. The application will not be referred on the basis of the one-year filing deadline, provided the applicant refiles within a reasonable period of time from the date the application was returned by the Service Center. **Note:** The file must always be thoroughly checked to ensure that correspondence to an applicant from the Service Center is not overlooked.

- (ii) administrative closure

Case was initially filed before April 16, 1998, then closed and subsequently reopened by the Service. In this situation, there is no filing deadline issue because the application was timely filed. **Note:** This situation can occur when an interview no-show results in the administrative closure, and a subsequent employment authorization renewal causes the case to reopened and rescheduled for interview.

- (iii) previous asylum case was terminated by an immigration judge

Provided the first filing was before April 16, 1998, the period of time for re-filing that must be reasonable runs from the termination date to the second filing date.

- g. other circumstances

Other circumstances that are not specifically listed in the non-exclusive list in the regulations, but which may constitute extraordinary circumstances,

depending on the facts of the case, include severe family or spousal opposition, extreme isolation within a refugee community, profound language barriers, or profound difficulties in cultural acclimatization. Any such factor or group of factors must have had a severe enough impact on the alien's functioning to have produced a significant barrier to timely filing.

### C. Burden and Standard of Proof

#### OH #18: Burden and Standard of Proof

#### 1. Applicant's burden

The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish the existence of a changed circumstance materially affecting eligibility for asylum or of an extraordinary circumstance related to the applicant's failure to apply for asylum within one year from the last arrival.

#### 2. Standard of proof

The standard of proof to establish changed or extraordinary circumstances is proof to *the satisfaction of the Attorney General*. This is a reasonableness test, i.e., it must be reasonable for the asylum officer, immigration judge, or BIA to conclude that a changed or extraordinary circumstance exists. This is a lower standard of proof than the "clear and convincing" standard that is required to establish that the applicant timely filed.

INA § 208(a)(2)(D); *See*, lesson, *Eligibility Part IV: Burden of Proof and Evidence*.

#### 3. Evidence

Generally, asylum officers must consult country conditions information relevant to the applicant's claim to determine whether there are changed country conditions material to the applicant's eligibility for asylum.

This, of course, would not apply to the changed condition based on a dependent reaching 21 years of age.

While the burden of proof is on the applicant to show that there are changed circumstances that now materially affect his or her eligibility for asylum, many applicants affected by changed circumstances may not be able to articulate this. The unique nature of assessing an applicant's need of protection places the officer in a "cooperative" role with the applicant. It is an asylum officer's affirmative duty "to elicit all relevant and useful information bearing on the applicant's eligibility for asylum."

*See*, lesson, *Country Conditions Research and the Resource Information Center ("RIC")*

UNHCR *Handbook*, para. 196; *Matter of S-M-J*, 21 I&N Dec. 722 (BIA 1997); 8 C.F.R. § 208.9(b)

Asylum officers must be flexible and inclusive in examining changed or extraordinary circumstances, if

Fed. Reg. comments on proposed rule, 3/6/97;

credible testimony or documentary evidence relating to an exception exists. Documentary evidence includes country conditions and legal information that the asylum officer researches and uses.

comments by Senators Hatch and Abraham shortly before passage of IIRIRA that indicate legislative intent for exceptions to cover a broad range of circumstances. 142 Cong. Rec. S11840, 9/30/96.

## VI. FILING WITHIN A REASONABLE PERIOD OF TIME

### A. Overview

If there are changed or extraordinary circumstances that except an applicant from the one-year filing rule, the I-589 must be filed within a reasonable period of time from the occurrence of the changed or extraordinary circumstance.

#### OH #19: Reasonableness of Delay

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(4)(ii)

### B. Delayed awareness

If the applicant can establish that he or she did not become aware of the changed circumstances until after they occurred, such delayed awareness must be taken into account in determining what constitutes a “reasonable period of time.”

#### OH #20: Reasonableness of Delay

8 C.F.R. § 208.4(a)(4)(C)(ii)

### C. Evaluation of the “reasonable period of time”

What constitutes a reasonable period of time to file following a changed or extraordinary circumstance depends upon the facts of the case. Asylum officers must ask themselves if a reasonable person under the same or similar circumstances as the applicant would have filed sooner. Asylum Officers are encouraged to give applicants the benefit of the doubt in evaluating what constitutes a reasonable time in which to file. An applicant’s education and level of sophistication, the amount of time it takes to obtain legal assistance, any effects of persecution and/or illness, when the applicant became aware of the changed circumstance, and any other relevant factors should be considered.

#### Instructor Note 6

#### Examples

- 1) An educated human rights lawyer arrived in the U.S. in 1985. She demonstrates that country conditions changed in 1997, placing her at risk. She files for asylum in January 2001. Due to this particular applicant’s knowledge of the law and human rights conditions, an explanation for waiting so long to file would have to be very convincing to be considered reasonable.

- 2) In 1987 a Polish citizen was jailed by the Polish Government for one year for expressing a pro-democracy political opinion. He arrived in the U.S. in 1988. He filed for asylum in September 2000. His attorney states that an I-589 was not filed for many years because she did not believe he was eligible. She believes that a BIA case decided in May 2000 affects his eligibility. A changed circumstance exception to the filing deadline rule – change in applicable U.S. law – applies, provided that the four-month period from May to September is considered a reasonable delay.
- 3) Applicant was seriously ill during a one-year period after her last arrival, but was in very good health for 18 months prior to filing her asylum application. When asked why she waited so long, she replied that she was too busy repairing her home. While this applicant’s illness constituted an extraordinary circumstance for not timely filing the I-589, delaying the filing as long as she did was not reasonable. Such a delay might be considered reasonable for an applicant who continued to require intensive therapy and other treatment as a result of the illness, depending on the circumstances.

**Examples related to permission to remain in the U.S. (“status cases”)**

Once it is determined that the application was untimely filed and that during the one-year period the applicant had TPS, parole, or a lawful status, the inquiry is whether the applicant filed for asylum within a reasonable period of time after the TPS, parole, or lawful status ended. These determinations are made on a case-by-case basis. Although the totality of circumstances in the case determines what is considered a reasonable period of time, guidance offered by the Department of Justice suggests that more than a six-month delay would usually be considered unreasonable.

65 Fed. Reg. 76121, 76124 (2000)

- 6) In February 1999, the applicant was admitted on a B-2 visa until August 1999. She applied for asylum untimely in June 2000. An extraordinary circumstance exception applies because the applicant was in lawful status during the one-year filing period. The issue before the asylum officer is whether 10 months between the expiration of lawful status (August 1999) and the time of filing (June 2000) is “a reasonable period of time to file.” The asylum officer does NOT look to period of time between when the application should have been filed (February 2000) and

See the Supplemental Information to the Final Rule: “The Department would expect a person in that situation to apply for asylum, should conditions not improve, within a very short period of time after the expiration of her status. Failure to apply within a reasonable time after expiration of the status

when it was actually filed (June 2000).

would foreclose the person from meeting the statutory filing requirements.” 65 Federal Register 76121, 76123 (Dec. 6, 2000).

- 7) In September 1998, the applicant entered the U.S. on a student visa. Her status lapsed in June 2000. She filed for asylum in August 2000. Because the I-589 was filed more than one year after the last arrival, the issue for the asylum officer is whether it was reasonable to delay filing for two months after the applicant’s lawful status lapsed. **Note:** Barring facts to the contrary, in this situation a two-month delay would ordinarily be considered a reasonable period of time. A longer period of time may also be reasonable, depending on the circumstances.
- 8) In March 1999, applicant was admitted to the U.S. on a B-1 visa that expired in June 1999. She applied for asylum in February 2000. This applicant timely filed the application within one year of her last arrival, so there is no filing deadline issue to adjudicate; whether it was reasonable to delay filing for eight months from the visa expiration is irrelevant. The applicant has met the one-year filing requirement.

**Instructor Note 7**

## VII. CREDIBILITY

### A. Overview

As explained in this lesson, an applicant must demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he or she applied for asylum within one year after the date of last arrival. This may be demonstrated either by establishing the date of last arrival or by establishing that the applicant was outside the United States less than one year prior to the date the application was filed. If the applicant fails to file within one year from the date of last arrival, the applicant may still be eligible to apply for asylum if the applicant establishes to the satisfaction of the asylum officer that an exception applies. To determine whether the applicant met the filing deadline or an exception applies, the asylum officer will have to evaluate the credibility of the applicant’s testimony regarding these issues.

**OH #21: Credibility:  
General Rule**

### B. Materiality

In litigation, "a material fact is one upon which the outcome of the litigation depends." Although an affirmative asylum application is not "litigation" the same principle applies.

**OH #22: Credibility:  
Materiality**

West Publishing Company, *Black's Law Dictionary Abridged 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*, p. 674 (St. Paul, MN 1991); See *lesson, Credibility*.

A material fact has a direct bearing on either eligibility or ineligibility. Facts that prove or disprove either asylum eligibility or a timely filing are therefore material. Material facts used in making a decision on whether the application was timely filed are usually different than material facts used in making a decision on the merits of the asylum claim.

1. Facts material to asylum eligibility

In asylum, a fact that is necessary for the claim to succeed generally is a fact that is connected either to an element in the refugee definition or to a mandatory bar to asylum. For instance, if an applicant's claim regarding the extent of her injuries as a result of a beating from government soldiers is not credible, that falsehood is material to whether she suffered persecution and could form the basis for the case being denied or referred to an immigration judge.

2. Facts material to the filing deadline

Facts that have a direct bearing on the filing deadline adjudication may include the specifics of the arrival, the applicant's whereabouts before the filing date, the existence of changed or extraordinary circumstances, and the reason presented for any delay in filing if a changed or extraordinary circumstance is established. Asserted material facts relating to asylum eligibility are often not material to the filing deadline adjudication.

**Example**

Applicant credibly testifies that she is a member of a minority religious group. She cannot credibly establish her last arrival date or when she was last outside the United States. She claimed that she was jailed because of her religion, but presents inconsistent testimony concerning important details about her arrest and prolonged jail sentence. Country conditions information establishes that there recently has been a significant escalation of violence against the applicant's religious group in her country. Although this applicant's claims regarding her last arrival and prior religious persecution are found not credible, she does credibly establish she is a member of a religious minority that recently has been targeted.

The material facts related to an exception to the one-year filing deadline – the applicant's membership in the targeted religious minority and the recent change in conditions in

the applicant's country – are found credible. Therefore, the applicant may establish that an exception to the one-year filing deadline applies and she is eligible to apply for asylum, assuming she filed within a reasonable period of time from the changed circumstance. The asylum officer would then analyze and make a decision on the merits of the asylum claim.

a. last arrival

**OH #22: Credibility: Last Arrival**

**Instructor Note 8**

There should always be an inquiry concerning an applicant's manner, place and time of last arrival. If satisfactory arrival documents are not available, follow-up questions should be asked and the credibility of the applicant's responses evaluated.

If the applicant cannot credibly establish the date of last arrival or cannot remember the date of last arrival, the asylum officer should inquire into whether the applicant was outside the United States at any time during the 12 months before the filing date. In such cases, the applicant's whereabouts during the 12 months before the filing date becomes material.

**Examples**

- 1) Applicant does not provide credible testimony on her manner, place, or time of last arrival. Applicant does, however, provide credible documentary and/or credible testimonial evidence of being in Taiwan seven months before the filing date. Because applicant credibly testified that she was in Taiwan seven months before filing for asylum and therefore must have last entered the United States less than 12 months before the filing date, she has satisfied her evidentiary burden of proving with clear and convincing evidence that the application was filed within one year of her last arrival.

**Note #1:** Asylum officers should not assume that the absence of detailed and consistent testimony regarding the specifics of an applicant's arrival indicate an attempt to circumvent the filing deadline requirements. There may be other reasons an applicant fails to provide details about his or her arrival, such as the desire to protect the identity of the person whose passport an

applicant used, language confusion, fear of smugglers, or the natural fading of memory over time. The asylum officer should inquire into the reasons an applicant fails to provide detailed information about his or her arrival and carefully consider the response in light of the applicant's experiences and circumstances. If an applicant presents vague or inconsistent testimony about the date, manner, and place of last entry, the applicant may nonetheless be able to establish by clear and convincing evidence that he or she was outside the United States less than one year prior to the filing date and thus meet the one-year filing requirement.

**Note #2:** Facts pertaining to an applicant's whereabouts prior to 12 months before the filing date may be material to the last arrival date, but only if they indicate the applicant was present in the United States. To illustrate, if the I-589 is filed in December 2000, facts indicating that the applicant was in the United States before December 1999 could be material, because they may be probative of whether the applicant was in the United States for more than a year before applying for asylum. If there is no evidence that the applicant left the United States and returned, the applicant could not establish by clear and convincing evidence that he or she applied within one year from last arrival. Facts relating to an applicant's presence outside the United States before December 1999 generally would not be material.

- 2) Applicant files an I-589 in December 2000. He testifies that in February 2000 he moved from New York to Detroit. Three months later he moved to Miami, and four months after that he moved to Los Angeles. He testifies that during these months he installed billboards for a living. Upon further questioning, the asylum officer concludes that the applicant's testimony about the different places he claims to have resided during those months is not credible. The applicant also does not know anything about the billboard business. This testimony is not material to the filing deadline issue because it does not identify or cast doubt on a last arrival

date, and is not related to whether applicant was in the United States for more than 12 months before the filing date.

- 3) Applicant files an I-589 in September 2000. His testimonial and documentary evidence on being in a refugee camp from 1993 to 1998 is not credible. The evidence concerning 1993 to 1998 is not related to whether the applicant was in the United States for more than 12 months before the filing date, and does not cast doubt on a last arrival date. Therefore, it is not material and cannot be the basis upon which the application is referred. For this 1995-1998 period, facts relating to a United States residence would be material.

- b. changed circumstances

Whenever a filing is untimely, the asylum officer must explore reasons that may have caused a late filing, such as changes in the law, country conditions, applicant's personal circumstances, or other areas that materially affect the applicant's asylum eligibility. Information directly related to the existence of a changed circumstance is material to the determination of whether the applicant is eligible for an exception to the filing requirement.

**Example:** Applicant claims that her sister recently published an article in a newspaper in the applicant's country that was highly critical of the government. Family members remaining in her country have been threatened by the government as a result. Facts related to whether the article was published by the applicant's sister and whether publication of such an article could affect the applicant's eligibility for asylum are material to whether the applicant is eligible for an exception to the filing requirement.

**Reminder:** In evaluating the credibility of the presented exception, the asylum officer should not be making a determination on whether the applicant is eligible for asylum, only whether the applicant is eligible to apply for asylum.

- c. extraordinary circumstances

Whenever a filing is untimely, the asylum officer

must explore events or factors in the applicant's life that may have caused a late filing. Information directly related to the existence of an extraordinary circumstance is material to the determination of whether the applicant is eligible for an exception to the filing requirement.

**Example:** Applicant claimed that she was in a serious car accident, which caused her to miss the one-year filing deadline. Facts relating to whether the accident occurred and the extent of the applicant's injuries are material to whether the applicant is eligible for an exception to the filing requirement.

d. delay in filing

An applicant's explanation for a delay in filing is material to the issue of whether the applicant is eligible for an exception to the filing requirement. Asylum officers should inquire into the reason for the delay when the delay appears unreasonable on its face.

For example, if an applicant filed for asylum within a few months after recovering from a serious illness that directly related to the failure to timely file, the delay would appear reasonable on its face. The asylum officer would not need to inquire into why it took the applicant two months to apply. However, if the applicant waited 8 months after recovering from the illness, the asylum officer should inquire into the reason for the delay and evaluate the credibility of the explanation provided.

**Example:** A citizen of Bulgaria arrives in the U.S. in 1989 and files for asylum in January 2001. She is very well-educated, fluent in English and not represented by an attorney. The asylum officer knows that a widely-publicized change in U.S. law in 1998 may help applicant's asylum case. When asked why the application was not filed sooner, the applicant testified that until late in 2000, she did not know about the change in the law or even that asylum existed. This change in law, which affects the applicant's eligibility, is a changed circumstance. The officer would need to evaluate the credibility of the applicant's explanation of delayed awareness of the change in the law to determine whether the delay in filing was reasonable.

Instructor Note 9

---

**VIII. SUMMARY**

Instructor Note 10

**A. Filing Deadline Requirement**

OH #24: Summary A, C

Any asylum applicant who applied for asylum on or after April 1, 1998 (or April 16, 1998, for those applying with the INS), must establish that he or she filed for asylum within one year from the date of last arrival or that he or she is eligible for an exception to the one-year filing requirement.

**B. Calculating the One-Year Period**

The one-year period is calculated from the last arrival date up to the previous calendar day the following year. If the last day for timely filing falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, filing on the next business day will be considered timely.

**C. Burden and Standard of Proof for One-Year Period**

The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the application was filed within one year from the date of the applicant's last arrival in the United States. The burden may be met by presentation of credible testimony, documentation, or a combination of both.

**D. Exceptions**

OH #25: Summary D, E

If an applicant did not apply for asylum within one year from last arrival in the United States, he or she may still be eligible to apply for asylum if the applicant establishes either the existence of changed circumstances that materially affect the applicant's eligibility for asylum or that extraordinary circumstances related to the delay in filing.

**E. Standard and Burden of Proof for Exceptions**

The burden of proof is on the applicant to establish to the satisfaction of the asylum officer that an exception applies.

**F. Reasonable Period of Delay**

Once an applicant establishes the existence of a changed or extraordinary circumstance, the applicant must demonstrate that the application was filed within a reasonable amount of time given those circumstances. If the applicant can establish that he or she did not become aware of a changed circumstance until after it occurred, such delayed awareness must be taken into

account in determining what constitutes a “reasonable period.”

**G. Credibility**

**OH #26 Summary G**

To determine whether the applicant met the filing deadline or an exception applies, the asylum officer will have to evaluate the credibility of the applicant’s testimony regarding these issues. Facts that are material to the filing deadline adjudication may include specifics of the arrival, the applicant’s whereabouts before the filing date, the existence of changed or extraordinary circumstances, and the reason presented for any delay in filing if a changed or extraordinary circumstance is established. Material facts relating to the filing requirement (eligibility to apply for asylum) are often distinct from those material to the asylum claim.

## Instructor Guide

<b>Instructional Methods</b>	Lecture, Practice Exercise
<b>Training Aids</b>	<p>Microsoft PowerPoint</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Field Performance Objective</li> <li>2. Interim Performance Objectives</li> <li>3. One-Year Filing Deadline: Basic Rule</li> <li>4. Calculating the One-Year Period</li> <li>5. Determining the Filing Date</li> <li>6. Burden of Proof</li> <li>7. Standard of Proof</li> <li>8. Evidence</li> <li>9. Affirmative Duty to Examine Exceptions</li> <li>10. Changed Circumstances: General Considerations</li> <li>11. Changed Circumstances: Examples of Materiality</li> <li>12. Changed Circumstances: Examples of Materiality</li> <li>13. Extraordinary Circumstances</li> <li>14. Extraordinary Circumstances (events/factors that cause a filing delay)</li> <li>15. Extraordinary Circumstances (events/factors that cause a filing delay)</li> <li>16. Extraordinary Circumstances (events/factors that cause a filing delay)</li> <li>17. Extraordinary Circumstances (events/factors that cause a filing delay)</li> <li>18. Burden and Standard of Proof for Exceptions</li> <li>19. Reasonableness of the Delay</li> <li>20. Reasonableness of the Delay</li> <li>21. One-Year Credibility: General Rule</li> <li>22. One-Year Credibility: Materiality</li> <li>23. One-Year Credibility</li> <li>24. Summary A, C</li> <li>25. Summary D, E</li> <li>26. Summary G</li> </ol>
<b>Instructional Equipment</b>	PowerPoint projector, laptop with connecting cords, screen
<b>Instructor Notes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To review with students the basics of the one-year rule, ask the following review questions of the students:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. An applicant files on April 12, 1998. Is there a one-year issue?  <b>No, persons filing on or before April 15, 1998 are not subject to the one-year rule.</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>

- b. In the context of the one-year filing deadline, to what does “clear and convincing” refer? **“Clear and convincing” refers to the level of evidence needed to establish that an applicant filed within one year of his or her last arrival.**
  - c. What kind of evidence can satisfy the clear and convincing standard? **ANY evidence that produces a “firm belief” in the AO that the application was filed within one year of the applicant’s last arrival.**
2. **Practical Exercise 1** – Students read the excerpt from an assessment to refer and discuss whether the officer adequately explored and analyzed whether the applicant established either a) his date of arrival, or b) that he was out of the country less than one year prior to the filing date.

In examining the applicant’s testimony, ask the students to point out what line of questioning is inappropriate (e.g. asking the applicant if he remembers the address he wrote on the I-94) and what lines of questioning are missing (i.e. that the AO did not ask the applicant whether he could establish that he was out of the country less than one-year before he filed).

Emphasize the point that the officer who wrote the assessment did not simply summarize the applicant’s testimony regarding entry and find that it was not credible. The officer went on to explain how in the absence of credible testimony the applicant was unable to meet his burden of proof that he timely filed.

Make clear that the analysis of the one-year filing deadline is incomplete without consideration of whether the applicant established that he was out of the country less than one year prior to filing when entry date is not established.

3. **Practical Exercise 2** – Students read the excerpt from the assessment to refer. Discuss whether the use of the case cite is appropriate with regard to establishing that an applicant timely filed.

In this instance the statement from Y-B- is not appropriate. Caselaw on evidence in general states that while supporting evidence can be expected when reasonably available, corroboration should not be required when there are reasonable explanations for the inability to provide corroborating evidence. In most instances the circumstances of refugee flight make the requirement to obtain documentary evidence unreasonable.

4. Review with the students the following hypotheticals before going

into the practical exercise:

- a. If a repressive regime replaces a democracy in Country X in 1992, is this a changed circumstance? **No, the change of circumstances must occur April 1, 1997 or later.**
- b. If a repressive regime replaces a democracy in Country Y in 1992 and the situation then gets progressively worse for years, can this be a changed circumstance? **Yes, “Got worse” scenarios satisfy the statute and regulation. Keep in mind that country conditions in unstable countries are rarely static, but instead are fluid and dynamic.**
- c. Applicant files for asylum in 1998 but is not aware that his government recently changed and that now persons similarly situated to him are targeted. Can this be a changed circumstance? **Yes, there is no requirement that an applicant be aware of the changed circumstance. Delayed awareness will be taken into consideration when evaluating the reasonableness of the delay in filing.**

**Practical Exercise 3** – Students read the excerpt from the assessment to refer. Is the country conditions information cited by the officer used appropriately, and does the information support the AO’s finding that there are no changed circumstances that would create an exception to the one-year filing rule for this applicant?

The country conditions information cited is used inappropriately, as it does not speak to the specific situation of individuals similarly situated to the applicant. Because the information deals only with the general situation in Somalia and not with the conditions in which the Tunni tribe lives, it does not support the AO’s finding that there were no changed circumstances that would lead to an exception to the one-year filing rule.

5. Explain the premise behind the valid status exception, that it is meant to avoid forcing premature filings. Also explain that there may be circumstances that an applicant did not know that he or she had violated his or her immigration status. We should be sensitive to these issues, because we don’t want to be encouraging applicants to file earlier than necessary on the basis that they are not sure whether they violated their status. However, there are situations when an applicant can be expected to know that he or she violated the status.
6. **Practical Exercise 4** – Use these general examples of filing timelines to discuss whether the gap in time between the expiration of legal status and the filing of the I-589 can be called “reasonable.” Because this aspect of the adjudication relies heavily on the

judgement of the AO, there are no hard and fast answers. Remind students that the determination must ALWAYS take into consideration all the particulars of the case at hand.

The exercises can be used for discussion either before or after discussing the examples in the lesson.

Suggested answers:

- 1) Probably not reasonable
- 2) Probably reasonable
- 3) Not reasonable, barring VERY unusual fact pattern
- 4) Applicant met the one-year filing deadline

7. **Practical Exercise 5a** – This practical exercise again on extraordinary circumstances. The scenarios are a little more thought-provoking.

1) An F-1 student visa holder who does not go to school, is not doing what he or she must do to maintain student status, and is therefore not entitled to an exception. By his or her actions, the applicant does not meet the definition of an F-1 student.

2) Employment may violate the terms of a B-2 visa and end the valid status. The exception for maintaining lawful immigration status would have ceased at the time that the applicant began working without authorization. However, this finding does not preclude a finding of another extraordinary circumstance. For example, the applicant might not have been aware that by working she violated the terms of her stay. She might have assumed that she was still in lawful status and waited until the status was to expire before filing in hopes that the situation in her country would improve. Each case must be considered on a case-by-case basis.

**Practical Exercise 5b** – This example is meant to encourage discussion on multiple exceptions. Each exception needs to be examined individually and the applicant's actions with regard to his or her immigration status in reaction to each incident. Considering that the applicant in this example filed an application for asylum within four month of the expiration of her legal status, she will usually be considered to have filed in a reasonable amount of time.

8. **Practical Exercise 6** – This example raises issues of credibility in the one-year filing context.
9. **Practical Exercise 7** – Either before or during the summary, have students look over sample referral assessments and discuss their strengths and weaknesses. Because this gets into how to write a full

assessment to refer on the basis of the one-year filing deadline, this practical exercise could be held until Decision Writing II is presented, or when the Decision Writing Module discusses writing a one-year filing deadline referral. Refer to lesson *Decision Writing Part II: Legal Analysis*, section IV.B, One-Year Filing Deadline.

Make sure that the students recognize the following:

- The third paragraph is inappropriate. It covers issues of the claim of well-founded fear and seems to hint that the applicant was not credible with regard to the claim of WFF
- There must be a discussion of country conditions in China pertinent to his claim, with citations to sources, and then a discussion as to whether there was a change in those conditions such that the applicant would be eligible for a changed circumstances exception.
- The fourth paragraph requires a discussion of what exceptions the applicant might have claimed and **why** they cannot be considered to be exceptions, including any extraordinary circumstances.

10. **Review Sheet** – This review sheet can be completed by the students before going over the summary (either individually or as a group), after the summary, or as homework. Whenever used, the students must be provided with the correct answers and an opportunity to request clarification.

1. Which cases are subject to the one-year filing rule? *Affirmative applications filed on or after April 1, 1998.*
2. What is the standard of proof required to establish that an applicant filed within one year of the last arrival? *Clear and convincing*
3. What are the two ways by which an applicant can establish that an application was filed timely?
  - a) *clear and convincing evidence of date of last arrival within one-year period*
  - b) *clear and convincing evidence that the applicant was outside the United States during the previous year immediately before the date of filing.*
4. What are the two types of exceptions to the one-year filing rule? *Changed circumstances; Extraordinary circumstances*
5. What type of situations would be considered a **changed** circumstance?
 

*Non-exhaustive list:*

  - Changed country conditions in country of nationality*
  - Changes in applicable US law*
  - Changes in applicant's personal circumstances*
  - Cessation of an applicant's dependent relationship to the PA in a previous application*
6. When must a changed circumstance have occurred to be considered an exception? *On or after April 1, 1997*
7. What type of situation would be considered an **extraordinary** circumstance?
 

*Non-exhaustive list:*

*Serious mental illness or disability*  
*Death or serious illness or incapacity of the applicant's legal rep. or member of the applicant's immediate family*  
*Legal disability*  
*Ineffective assistance of counsel*  
*Maintaining lawful status*  
*Initial submission was timely*

8. Who has the burden of proof to establish that an exception exists? *The applicant*
9. What is the standard of proof to establish that an exception exists? *To the satisfaction of the Attorney General*
10. To what do we refer when we talk of the reasonableness of the delay in filing? What dates we use to calculate that period of time? What is, in generally, a reasonable period of time to file?  
*The period of time from occurrence of the changed or extraordinary circumstance and the time of filing. Reasonable time period is a matter of judgement by the AO. Regulations state that filing more than six months after the expiration of legal status is not a reasonable period of time. The time period analyzed under the "reasonable period of time" question is the period from the end of the legal status to the time of filing, regardless of whether the legal status ended within the first year of arrival.*