

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY



L2

FILE:



Office: Houston

Date: SEP 27 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:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided your case. 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 District Director, Houston, Texas, 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 failed to establish that she satisfied the “basic citizenship skills” required under section 1104(c)(2)(E) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she attempted to submit certification from Houston Community College to show her compliance with the basic citizenship skills requirement at her interview on December 9, 2003, but such certification was not considered sufficient. The applicant contends that she has fulfilled the basic citizenship skills requirement by satisfying the alternative listed at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3). The applicant submits documentation in support of the appeal.

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act (“Basic Citizenship Skills”), an applicant for permanent resident status must demonstrate that he or she:

- (I) meets the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)) (relating to minimal understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States); or
- (II) is satisfactorily pursuing a course of study (recognized by the Attorney General) to achieve such an understanding of English and such a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States.

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act, the Attorney General may waive all or part of the above requirements for aliens who are at least 65 years of age or developmentally disabled.

The applicant, who is neither 65 years old nor developmentally disabled, does not qualify for either of the exceptions in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act. Nor does he satisfy the “basic citizenship skills” requirement of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act because he does not meet the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). An applicant can demonstrate that he meets the requirements of section 312(a) by “[s]peaking and understanding English during the course of the interview for permanent resident status” and answering questions based on the subject matter of approved citizenship training materials, or “[b]y passing a standardized section 312 test . . . by the Legalization Assistance Board with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) or the California State Department of Education with the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS).” 8 C.F.R. § 245a.3(b)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2).

In the alternative, an applicant can satisfy the basic citizenship skills requirement by demonstrating compliance with section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(II) of the LIFE Act. The “citizenship skills” requirement of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(II) is defined by regulation in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3). As specified therein, an applicant for LIFE Legalization must establish that:

He or she has a high school diploma or general education development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States. . . . 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2), or

He or she has attended, or is attending, a state recognized, accredited learning institution in the United States, and that institution certifies such attendance. The course of study at such learning institution must be for a period of one academic year (or the equivalent thereof according to the

standards of the learning institution) and the curriculum must include at least 40 hours of instruction in English and United States history and government. . . . 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3).

Both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3) specify that applicants must submit evidence to show compliance with the basic citizenship skills requirement "...either at the time of filing Form I-485, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview...."

8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b) states that:

An applicant who fails to pass the English literacy and/or the United States history and government tests at the time of the interview, shall be afforded a second opportunity after 6 months (or earlier at the request of the applicant) to pass the tests or submit evidence as described in paragraphs [8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3)] (a)(2) and (a)(3) of this section. The second interview shall be conducted prior to the denial of the application for permanent residence and may be based solely on the failure to pass the basic citizenship skills requirements.

In the notice of intent to deny issued on February 17, 2004, the district director noted that the applicant had been interviewed in connection with her LIFE application on October 9, 2002. The district director stated in pertinent part, "During the interview, you were given the opportunity to demonstrate your understanding of English and your knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States. The interview was conducted, however you were unable to write a sentence in English." The district director further noted that the applicant appeared for her second interview on December 9, 2003, and that she once again was unable to write a sentence in English. While the record contains documentation, including the applicant's United States history and government test and her test of written English, that readily demonstrate the events that transpired during the applicant's interview on December 9, 2003, the record does not contain any evidence to support the district director's conclusions regarding events that occurred during her first interview on October 9, 2002. If a denial of an application is to be based upon what the applicant purportedly did or was unable to do at the time of the interview, the record must contain a contemporaneous first-hand account of such events.

In addition, the record contains a Certificate of Completion from Houston Community College dated November 3, 2002 that reflects the applicant's successful completion of a course in "ESL I-English Residency." The record shows that the applicant presented this certificate at the time of her second interview on December 9, 2003. However, the district director failed to acknowledge that such certification had been submitted by the applicant and did not determine whether the certificate was sufficient to establish her compliance with the basic citizenship skills requirement in either the notice of intent to deny or the notice of decision.

Accordingly, the decision of the district director is withdrawn. The case will be remanded for the purpose of reviewing the evidence provided by the applicant to demonstrate her compliance with the basic citizenship skills requirement. The district director shall review such evidence to determine whether it is sufficient to establish the applicant's compliance with the basic citizenship skills requirement. If the district director concludes that such evidence is not sufficient to fulfill this requirement, the deficiencies in the evidence must be specifically set forth in a notice of intent to deny prior to the issuing of a new decision. 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.