

L2

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Citizenship and Immigration Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent [redacted] and to
invasion of personal privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 I Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536



177-18-003

FILE [redacted]

Office: National Benefits Center

Date:

IN RE: Applicant: [redacted]

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).

PUBLIC COPY

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

Attached is the decision rendered on your appeal. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the Director, Missouri Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director concluded the applicant had not established that he had applied for class membership in any of the requisite legalization class-action lawsuits prior to October 1, 2000 and, therefore, denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant states that he has submitted sufficient evidence to establish that he had requested class membership. The applicant declares that he has not received any specifics on why he is being denied or what part of his documentation is not acceptable. The applicant requests that his case be given further consideration.

An applicant for permanent resident status under the LIFE Act must establish that before October 1, 2000, he or she filed a written claim with the Attorney General for class membership in any of the following legalization class-action lawsuits: *Catholic Social Services, Inc. v. Meese*, vacated sub nom. *Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 43 (1993) (*CSS*), *League of United Latin American Citizens v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 43 (1993) (*LULAC*), or *Zambrano v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Zambrano*, 509 U.S. 918 (1993) (*Zambrano*). See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.10.

The regulations provide an illustrative list of documents that an applicant may submit to establish that he or she filed a written claim for class membership before October 1, 2000. Those regulations also permit the submission of "[a]ny other relevant document(s)." See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.14.

The applicant failed to submit any documentation addressing this requirement when he filed his LIFE Act application. On rebuttal to a notice of intent to deny, the applicant included a photocopy of an earnings statement reflecting hours worked and wages paid to him for work performed from September 11, 2000 to September 24, 2000 at Pacific West Labor Service, Inc., in Santa Maria, California. However, the photocopied earnings statement does not establish that the applicant filed a written claim for class membership in any of the requisite legalization class action lawsuits.

The applicant also provided a photocopy of a letter dated September 18, 2000, supposedly sent to Attorney General Reno, requesting that the applicant be registered in the *CSS* case. A *written claim for class membership* means a filing, in writing, in one of the forms listed in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.14 that provides the Attorney General with notice that the applicant meets the class definition in the cases of *CSS*, *LULAC* or *Zambrano*. See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.10. The letter

does not constitute a "form" and does not equate to the actual forms listed in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.14, although that regulation also states other "relevant documents" may be considered. However, the very brief letter does not even begin to imply that the applicant could qualify for membership in a legalization class action lawsuit because it does not provide any relevant information upon which a determination could be made.

Moreover, the applicant offers no explanation as to why, if this letter were truly in his possession the entire time, he did not submit it initially with his LIFE Act application, as applicants were advised to provide evidence with such applications. In addition, it must be noted that the applicant is one of numerous aliens who did not furnish such letters (virtually all dated from September 15th to September 25th, 2000) with their LIFE applications and yet provided them only upon receiving letters of intent to deny.

It should also be noted that the statements on appeal submitted by these aliens, all of whom assert that they are not represented by counsel, are identical. These factors raise questions about the authenticity of the letter that the applicant purportedly sent to the Attorney General.

Doubt cast on any aspect of an applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence. It is incumbent upon an applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

On appeal, the applicant claims that he provided information showing his request for classification but has not been given any specifics as to why his application was denied. Contrary to the applicant's claim, there is nothing in the record to indicate that he filed an actual claim for class membership. Furthermore, he was sent, and apparently received, a Notice of Decision, which described in detail why the application was being denied. The center director pointed out that the photocopy of the letter does not establish that the original was ever received by the office of the Attorney General or Citizenship and Immigration Services. The director also stated a review of all relevant records failed to disclose any indication of the applicant having made a written claim for class membership. Therefore, the applicant's claim on appeal is not compelling.

The applicant timely filed an application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker under section 210 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) on October 14, 1988, and this application was subsequently denied on October 4, 1991. The

applicant appealed the denial of his application and this appeal was dismissed by the AAO on May 6, 1996. Section 1104 of the LIFE Act contains no provision allowing for the reopening and reconsideration of a timely filed and previously denied application for temporary resident status as a special agricultural worker under section 210 of the INA.

Given his failure to document that he filed a written claim for class membership, the applicant is ineligible for permanent residence under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

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