

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent disclosure of information
pertaining to national security

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



SEP 20 2009

FILE: 

Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER

Date:

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).

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

Attached is the decision rendered on your appeal. The file has been returned to the Service Center that processed your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case was remanded for further action, the Service Center will contact you. 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.

For
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 she 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 she is providing correspondence regarding her class membership. According to the applicant, she has derivative benefits and she requests that the denial of her application be reconsidered.

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of 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 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), *League of United Latin American Citizens v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 43 (1993), or *Zambrano v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Zambrano*, 509 U.S. 918 (1993). See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.10. That same regulation provides that, in the alternative, an applicant may demonstrate that his or her spouse or parent filed a written claim for class membership before October 1, 2000. However, the applicant must establish that the family relationship existed at the time the spouse or parent initially attempted to apply for temporary residence (legalization) in the period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988.

The applicant has not provided evidence of having applied for class membership in support of her application. On rebuttal to the notice of intent to deny and on appeal the applicant claimed that she was providing copies of correspondence regarding her classification as a CSS class member. However, on rebuttal the applicant only provided photocopies of correspondence regarding traffic violations.

The applicant bases her claim for benefits under the LIFE Act on her husband's supposed application for class membership. However, as the applicant married her husband on May 26, 2002, the requisite relationship to her husband did not exist when he may have attempted to apply for legalization in the 1987-88 period. Moreover, a check of Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) records and indices establishes that the applicant's husband's application for permanent resident status under the LIFE Act was denied and the appeal was dismissed. Therefore, the applicant



cannot derive status from her spouse under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

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