

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, D.C. 20529




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



L2

FILE:



Office: DALLAS

Date:

OCT 02 2007

MSC 03 175 61991

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, Dallas, Texas, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO affirms the director's decision denying the LIFE Act application, and remands the case for further action and consideration.

The 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, counsel states that the applicant submitted evidence that she was attending a state recognized and accredited institution in response to the director's Notice of Intent to Deny (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 43 years old at the time she took the basic citizenship skills test and provided no evidence to establish that she 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 she 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)(1) 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 twice in connection with her LIFE application, first on September 15, 2003 and again on April 12, 2004. On both 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).

In response to the director's Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) issued on April 19, 2004, the applicant submitted a May 22, 2004 letter from Mountain View College advising that the applicant was enrolled in the college's English classes that were scheduled to begin on May 24, 2004, and would consist of 50 classroom hours. The letter further advised that the applicant had completed six hours of "citizenship basic classes that started on May 15, 2004." The applicant also submitted copy of a May 15, 2004 certificate from Mountain View College, certifying that she had completed the requirements for citizenship basics course.

The documentation from Mountain View College does not provide any confirmation that the course content of the class in which the applicant enrolled is for a period of one academic year (or the equivalent thereof according to the standards of Mountain View College), as required by 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3). 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 (CIS) prior to or at the time of the applicant's second interview on April 12, 2004. The documentation from Mountain View College was submitted subsequent to the applicant's second interview. Therefore, 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts, "The time frame for submission [of documentation from a state recognized, accredited institution] is not mandatory and due to the uniqueness and compassionate legislative intent of the LIFE Act, the Service could accept the certificate prior to making a final decision on the appeal." Counsel's reading of the regulation is clearly in error. By regulation, the applicant is given three opportunities to submit documentation: at the time of filing the Form I-485, prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview. Further, CIS permits additional time for submission of the required documentation, as it will accept qualifying documentation at the time of the second interview. Nonetheless, the regulation is clear that the interview is the last time the applicant at which the applicant may submit the documentation. In this instance, the applicant failed to submit documentation at the time of her second interview on April 12, 2004. Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

Although the director found the applicant ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act, the director failed to consider the applicant's eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6 provides, in pertinent part:

If the district director finds that an eligible alien as defined at § 245a.10 has not established eligibility under section 1104 of the LIFE Act (part 245a, Subpart B), the district director *shall* consider whether the eligible alien has established eligibility 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).

(Emphasis added).

Accordingly, this case is remanded for a determination as to the applicant's eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6.

ORDER: The director's decision denying the LIFE Act application is affirmed. The application is remanded to the director for further action in accordance with the foregoing and entry of a new decision that, if adverse to the applicant, is to be certified to the AAO for review.