



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



42

FILE:



Office: NEW YORK

Date: MAY 29 2007

MSC 02 143 66912

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. 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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the District Director, New York, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant had failed to establish that he satisfied the “basic citizenship skills” required under section 1104(c)(2)(E) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant has no problems correctly responding in English to questions posed by his attorney and counsel, and posits that the applicant’s failure to pass the basic citizenship skills test, after three tries, was based on his “fear of unknown” and the accent of the adjudicating officer. Counsel submits no further documentation in support of the appeal.

Counsel alleges on appeal that neither the applicant nor counsel received the director’s Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) dated April 30, 2004. However, the record reflects that the NOID was mailed to both counsel and the applicant at their addresses of record. The record does not indicate that the letters were returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable. Further, the NOID informed the applicant that he would be retested on August 20, 2004, and that the applicant appeared for the interview and retest on that date. Therefore, the record does not support counsel’s assertion that neither he nor the applicant received the NOID.

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 was 49 years old at the time he last took the basic citizenship skills test and provided no evidence to establish that he was developmentally disabled, does not qualify for either of the exceptions in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act. Further the applicant does not 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 (the Act). An applicant can demonstrate that he or she meets the requirements of section 312(a) of the Act 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)(I) and (2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b) provides 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 six months (or earlier at the request of the applicant) to pass the tests or submit evidence as described in paragraphs (a)(2) or (a)(3) of this section.

The record reflects that the applicant was interviewed three times in connection with his LIFE application, first on April 30, 2004, again on August 20, 2004, and finally on March 4, 2005. On all three occasions, the applicant failed to demonstrate a minimal understanding of English and minimal knowledge of United States history and government. Furthermore, the applicant has not provided evidence of having passed a standardized citizenship test, as permitted by 8 C.F.R. § 312.3(a)(1).

The applicant, however, could still meet the basic citizenship skills requirement under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(II) of the LIFE Act, if he meets one of the criteria defined in 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.17(a)(2) and (3). In part, an applicant must establish that he meets the following under 8 C.F.R § 245a.17:

- (2) has a high school diploma or general educational development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States; or
- (3) 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.

The record does not reflect that the applicant has a high school diploma or a GED from a United States school, and therefore does not satisfy the regulatory requirement of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(2).

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant has taken English language classes from an “approved school” in an effort to pass the citizenship skills test. Counsel submits no documentation to support this statement. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner’s burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Furthermore, 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3) requires that the applicant submit certification on letterhead stationery from a state recognized, accredited learning institution either at the time of filing the Form I-485, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview. In the instant case, documentation from a state recognized, accredited learning institution should have been submitted to Citizenship and Immigration Services prior to, or at the time of, the applicant’s second interview on August 20, 2004.

Counsel also states that the applicant was nervous (his “fear of the unknown”) during his interviews, and suggested that the accent of the interviewing officer could have contributed to the applicant’s failure to pass the tests. Counsel submits no evidence to support his contentions. After the first interview, the applicant surely knew what to expect, and therefore cannot now successfully assert that he feared what he did not know or could not anticipate during his second interview. Furthermore, his dread of the “unknown” should have dissipated entirely by the time of his third interview. Counsel also suggests that the accent of the interviewer may have contributed to the applicant’s failure to pass the citizenship test. However, we note that two different adjudicating officers interviewed the applicant, and the applicant provided no evidence that the English and communication skills of these officers impacted his performance on his tests.

The applicant does not satisfy either alternative of the “basic citizenship skills” requirement set forth in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act. Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

The director also considered the applicant’s eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident pursuant to regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6, and determined that he was also ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act, as in effect before enactment of section 1104 of the LIFE Act (part 245a, Subpart A).

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.