

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



L2

FILE:



Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: JUN 07 2005

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. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

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, Los Angeles, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The district director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she has submitted sufficient documentation establishing continuous residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The applicant provides copies of previously submitted documentation along with additional evidence in support of the appeal.

It is noted that the director, in denying the application, did not address the evidence furnished initially, and in response to the Notice of Intent to Deny, and did not set forth the specific reasons for the denial pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3. As such, the documentation submitted throughout the application process will be considered on appeal.

An applicant for permanent resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act has the burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods, is admissible to the United States and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under this section. The inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e).

When something is to be established by a preponderance of the evidence it is sufficient that the proof establish that it is probably true. *See Matter of E-- M--*, 20 I. & N. Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989).

Although the regulations provide an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit, the list also permits the submission of affidavits and any other relevant document. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

In an attempt to establish continuous unlawful residence since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, the applicant provided the following evidence throughout the application process:

- Several original envelopes postmarked to the applicant's address in the United States during 1981 through 1987.
- Several earnings statements issued to the applicant during 1982 from Whitey's Equipment Rental, Inc.
- Several original earnings statements issued to the applicant during 1983 through 1985 from El Cholo.

- Several earnings statements issued to the applicant during 1986.
- An earnings statement issued on March 11, 1984.
- Receipts dated during 1986 and 1989.
- Several PS Form 3806s, receipts for registered mail from the United States Postal Service postmarked during 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1987.
- Several money order receipts issued in 1982, 1987 and 1988.
- An affidavit dated June 18, 1988 from [REDACTED] who indicated that she had known the applicant since 1986, and that the applicant was in her employ as a housekeeper.
- A letter from [REDACTED] sewing contractor who indicated that the applicant was in her employ from March 23, 1985 to May 9, 1986.
- A letter dated November 22, 1984 from [REDACTED] who indicated that the applicant was in her employ as a housekeeper and babysitter from November 12, 1981.
- An affidavit from [REDACTED] who indicated that the applicant resided in his home in Sun Valley, California from November 1981 to June 1985.
- Affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] who indicated respectively, that they have known the applicant since November and December 1981.

In this instance, the applicant submitted evidence, including contemporaneous documents, which tends to corroborate her claim of residence in the United States during the requisite period. The district director has not established that the information in this evidence was inconsistent with the claims made on the application, or that it was false information. As stated on *Matter of E--M--*, *supra*, when something is to be established by a preponderance of evidence, the applicant only has to establish that the proof is probably true. That decision also points out that, under the preponderance of evidence standard, an application may be granted even though some doubt remains regarding the evidence. The documents that have been furnished may be accorded substantial evidentiary weight and are sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof of residence in the United States for the requisite period.

The documentation provided by the applicant supports by a preponderance of the evidence that the applicant satisfies the statutory and regulatory criteria of entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, as well as continuous unlawful residence in the country during the ensuing time frame of January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for legalization under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act.

Accordingly, the applicant's appeal will be sustained. The district director shall continue the adjudication of the application for permanent resident status.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.