

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20536

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: National Benefits Center

Date: APR 13 2004

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).

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter 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.

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. It is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The director concluded that the record did not establish that the applicant or her husband had (1) applied for class membership in any of the requisite legalization class-action lawsuits prior to October 1, 2000, or (2) resided unlawfully in the United States for the requisite time period of January 1, 1982 to May 4, 1988, and therefore denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant reasserts that she has "derivative benefits" (through her husband), but provides no new documentation or information.

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 one 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 section 1104(b) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.10.

In the alternative, an applicant may demonstrate that his or her spouse or parent filed a written claim for class membership in a legalization class-action lawsuit 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 legalization during the original filing period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. 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 asserts that her husband, [REDACTED] filed a claim for class membership in *LULAC*, and that she has derivative rights to class membership through him. The LIFE application of [REDACTED] was denied, however, for failure to establish that he filed a claim for class membership in *LULAC* before October 1, 2000. The appeal filed by the applicant's husband is also being dismissed (by the AAO). Nor is there any record at Citizenship and Immigration Services (successor to the Immigration and Naturalization Service) that the applicant filed a claim in her own right for class membership in *LULAC*, or either of the other two legalization lawsuits, *CSS* or *Zambrano*.

Even if there were evidence that the applicant's husband had filed a timely claim for class membership in *LULAC*, the applicant could not claim derivative class membership through her husband because they were not married until April 20, 1995. Thus, the marital relationship did not exist during the requisite time period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988 set forth in the regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 245a.10.

For the reasons discussed above, the applicant is ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

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