

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Retaining data does
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



[Handwritten signature]
JUL 20 2004

FILE:

Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER

Date:

IN RE: Applicant:

PETITION: 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. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. 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.

[Handwritten signature]

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, National Benefits Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office 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 claims to have sent a request for class membership to the Washington, D.C. office of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service or INS (now Citizenship and Immigration Services, or CIS.)

The applicant appears to be represented; however, the individual identified as representing the applicant is not authorized to do so under 8 C.F.R. § 292.1 or § 292.2. Therefore, the notice of decision will be furnished only to the applicant.

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), *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.

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. The regulations also permit the submission of "[a]ny other relevant document(s)." See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.14.

Along with his LIFE application, the applicant included a Form I-687, Application for Status as Temporary Resident under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, dated August 24, 1987. He also provided a Legalization Questionnaire dated December 15, 1999, and an undated affidavit that described his purported attempts to apply for legalization during the actual filing period of May 5, 1987 to May 4, 1988. In addition, the applicant submitted a photocopy of a one-page "CSS v. Reno" fact sheet. This document was issued by INS in order to provide information and guidance regarding the ramifications of the CSS legalization class-action lawsuit. The submission of this instructional leaflet does *not* establish that the applicant has filed a timely claim for class membership.

The Form I-687 and the affidavit were completed and signed in ink, and the Legalization Questionnaire bears a "live" signature in ink. Thus, these are original documents, rather than photocopies of what the applicant is claiming he had submitted in the past. If the applicant had actually submitted any of these documents prior to October 1, 2000, they would be in the possession of CIS, and the applicant would only have photocopies to furnish now in this LIFE proceeding. An examination of CIS records fails to disclose any evidence of this applicant having previously filed such forms. In fact, no CIS file was ever created in the name of the applicant until he filed this LIFE application on March 10, 2003.

It must be noted that the applicant is one of many aliens whose LIFE applications were prepared by [REDACTED] an immigration consultant in Chicago. Although he has also signed the appeals, [REDACTED] is not an accredited representative or otherwise authorized to represent aliens in proceedings before CIS.

Furthermore, all of his cases reviewed by this office thus far are the same in that all of the aliens claim to have requested class membership in the *Catholic Social Services* (CSS) lawsuit, rather than *Zambrano* or LULAC. They all claim to have been absent from the United States in 1987 or 1988, which could qualify them for CSS consideration, and they all claim to have returned within 45 days, which would allow them to be considered to have still maintained continuous residence for legalization purposes. Importantly, virtually none of the aliens had a pre-existing file with CIS prior to the filing of his or her LIFE application, and none had a file prior to the October 1, 2000 deadline for having applied for class membership. None of them has provided any type of individual receipt or letter that was issued to him or her by the Immigration and Naturalization Service prior to October 1, 2000. These factors and commonalities raise additional questions as to the eligibility of the applicants for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act.

Given his failure to credibly establish having filed a timely written claim for class membership, and the dubious nature of his documentation, 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.