




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services


*Information deleted to  
prevent identity theft and  
invasion of personal privacy*

**PUBLIC COPY**

*LA*

MAY 27 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 he had applied for class membership in any of the requisite legalization class-action lawsuits prior [REDACTED] and, therefore, denied the application.

On appeal, the applicant reiterates his claim that he previously filed for class membership. The applicant submits 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. [REDACTED] 993) (CSS), [REDACTED] vacated sub nom. *Reno v. [REDACTED]* 509 U.S. 43 (1993) (*LULAC*), or [REDACTED] sub nom. [REDACTED] 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 [REDACTED]. 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 his LIFE Act application, the applicant indicated that he attempted to file an application for temporary residence (legalization) under section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), but was turned away by an employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, or the Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Service, or CIS). In support of this assertion, the applicant submitted photocopies of the following documents:

- an appointment notice that is dated [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the applicant's name, date of birth, and address, which scheduled him for an interview between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 12:00 P.M. on November 12, [REDACTED] regarding the late filing of a legalization application under either the [REDACTED]
- the first page of a two page "Form for Determination of Class Membership in [REDACTED] and;
- the third and fourth pages of the four page Form I-687 legalization application that is signed by the applicant and dated [REDACTED]

In denying the application, the director noted that a review of the relevant records failed to demonstrate any evidence that the appointment notice had been issued to the applicant or that he had appeared for such an interview and made a claim to class membership. However, the director did not establish that the information in the appointment notice 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 [REDACTED]* when [REDACTED]

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 between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 12:00 P.M. on November 12, 1990, at the Service's Manhattan 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.