

~~When typing data deleted to~~
~~prevent clearly unwarranted~~
~~invasion of personal privacy~~

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

MAY 04 2004



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).

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 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 sustained.

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 reiterates her claim that she previously filed for class membership. The applicant includes photocopies of previously submitted documentation as well as new documentation in support of the appeal.

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 inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e). An alien applying for adjustment of status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act has the burden of proving his or her eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence.

On her LIFE Act application, the applicant indicated that she submitted a legalization application for temporary residence under section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, or the Service, (now Citizenship and Immigration Services, or CIS) in December 1990. In support of this contention, the applicant submitted photocopies of the following document with his LIFE Act application:

- a photocopy of an appointment notice dated August 18, 1991, from the Service's Houston Legalization office that contains the applicant's full name, date of birth, and address which scheduled him for an interview at 8:00 A.M. on April 20, 1992, regarding the late filing of a legalization application under either the *CSS* or *LULAC* case.

In response to the notice of intent to deny the applicant submitted another photocopy of the appointment notice discussed above. Additionally, the applicant included a photocopy of a Form I-72, Request for Additional Information that bears her name and is dated November 23, 1993. The Form I-72 requests that the applicant provide proof of financial responsibility and indicates that she is a "CSS Applicant."

In denying the application, the director noted that a review of the relevant records failed to demonstrate any evidence that either the Form I-72 or the appointment notice had been issued to the applicant or that she had appeared for such an interview and made a claim to class membership. However, the director did not establish that the information in the supporting document was inconsistent with the claims made on the application or that such information was false. If the director had questions regarding the credibility of the supporting

document provided by the applicant, he could have requested that the original of the photocopied document be submitted. The applicant's own testimony taken in context with supporting evidence in certain cases can logically meet the preponderance of evidence standard. As stated in *Matter of E--M--*, 20 I. & N. Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989), when something is to be established by a preponderance of evidence, the applicant only has to establish that the proof is probably true. Clearly, the supporting document is a relevant document under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.14. As such, the applicant's claim to class membership must be considered in light of such testimony and evidence.

The independent and contemporaneous evidence contained in the record supports the applicant's assertion that he put forth a claim to class membership and that he was scheduled to appear for an interview regarding either *CSS* or *LULAC* class membership at 8:00 A.M. on April 20, 1992, at the Service's Houston Legalization office. Therefore, it must be concluded that the applicant has demonstrated that he filed a written claim to class membership in one of the requisite legalization class-action lawsuits prior to October 1, 2000.

It must now be determined whether the applicant is otherwise eligible for permanent resident status under section 1140 of the LIFE Act. Accordingly, the matter will be forwarded to the appropriate district office for further processing and adjudication of the LIFE Act application.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The director shall forward this matter to the proper district office for the completion of adjudication of the application for permanent residence.