

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "L. J. Johnson".

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: Philadelphia

Date: JUL 14 2005

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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:



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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Robert P. Wiemann".

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 District Director, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. This matter will be remanded for further action and consideration.

The district director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. In addition, the district director determined that the applicant was not eligible to adjust to permanent resident status under the LIFE Act because he was not a member 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant submitted sufficient evidence to support his claim of residence for the requisite period, as well as his claim to membership in one of the requisite legalization class-action lawsuits.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.20(a)(2) state, in pertinent part:

Denials. The alien shall be notified in writing of the decision of denial and of the reason(s) therefore. When an adverse decision is proposed, CIS shall notify the applicant of its intent to deny the application and the basis for the proposed denial. The applicant will be granted a period of 30 days from the date of the notice in which to respond to the notice of intent to deny. All relevant material will be considered in making a final decision.

A review of both the electronic and administrative record reveals that a notice of intent to deny was never issued to either counsel or the applicant. Accordingly, the decision of the district director is withdrawn. The case will be remanded for the purpose of the issuance of a notice of intent to deny as well as a new decision to both counsel and the applicant. The new decision, if adverse, shall be certified to this office for review.

ORDER: This matter is remanded for further action and consideration pursuant to the above.