

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



L2

FILE:



MSC 02 043 63234

Office: NEW YORK CITY

Date: DEC 01 2008

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. If your appeal was dismissed or rejected, all documents have been returned to the National Benefits Center. 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. If your appeal was sustained or remanded for further action, you will be contacted.

*John H. Vaughan*  
for

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The director denied the application on the ground that the applicant failed to establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

On appeal counsel asserts that the director did not give proper weight to the evidence submitted by the applicant. In counsel's opinion, the evidence in the record is sufficient to establish the applicant's continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

To be eligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under the LIFE Act applicants must establish their continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as well as their continuous physical presence in the United States from November 6, 1986 through May 4, 1988. See section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) and (C)(i) of the LIFE Act, 8 U.S.C. § 245A(a)(2)(A) and (3)(A).

"Continuous unlawful residence" is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(c)(1), as follows: "An alien shall be regarded as having resided continuously in the United States if *no single absence* from the United States has *exceeded forty-five (45) days*, and the aggregate of all absences has not exceeded one hundred and eighty (180) days between January 1, 1982, and May 4, 1988, unless the alien can establish that due to *emergent reasons*, his or her return to the United States could not be accomplished within the time period allowed." (Emphases added.)

"Continuous physical presence" is described in section 1104(c)(2)(C)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act, 8 U.S.C. § 245A(a)(3)(B), and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.16(b), in the following terms: "An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States by virtue of *brief, casual, and innocent absences* from the United States." (Emphasis added.) The regulation further explains that "[b]rief, casual, and innocent absence(s) as used in this paragraph means *temporary, occasional trips abroad* as long as the purpose of the absence from the United States was consistent with the policies reflected in the immigration laws of the United States." (Emphasis added.) 8 C.F.R. § 245a.16(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 its amenability to verification. See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e).

The "preponderance of the evidence" standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant's claim is "probably true," where the determination of "truth" is made based on the

factual circumstances of each individual case. *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). In evaluating the evidence, *Matter of E-M-* also stated that “[t]ruth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality.” *Id.* Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true.

Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the applicant submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is “probably true” or “more likely than not,” the applicant has satisfied the standard of proof. *See U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421 (1987) (defining “more likely than not” as a greater than 50 percent probability of something occurring). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application.

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).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that letters from employers attesting to an applicant’s employment must: provide the applicant’s address at the time of employment; identify the exact period of employment; show periods of layoff; state the applicant’s duties; declare whether the information was taken from company records; and identify the location of such company records and state whether such records are accessible or in the alternative state the reason why such records are unavailable.

The applicant, a native of Bangladesh who claims to have lived in the United States since January 1981, filed his application for legal permanent resident status under the LIFE Act (Form I-485) on November 12, 2001.

On May 11, 2007, the director issued a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) in which the applicant was advised that he had not provided sufficient credible evidence to establish that he resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The applicant was granted 30 days to submit additional evidence.

The applicant submitted a timely response to the NOID and submitted additional documentation as evidence of his residence in the United States. On August 6, 2007, the director issued a Notice of Decision denying the application on the ground that the response to the NOID was insufficient to overcome the grounds for denial.

On appeal counsel asserts that the director did not give proper weight to the evidence submitted by the applicant. In counsel’s view, the evidence in the record is sufficient to establish the applicant’s continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. Counsel did not submit any additional documentation with the appeal.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The AAO determines that he has not.

The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim that he arrived in the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided continuously in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of the following:

- A copy of a residential lease agreement between the applicant and the landlord, [REDACTED], dated December 30, 1980, for [REDACTED], Brooklyn, New York, from January 1, 1981 through December 30, 1982.  
A photograph of the applicant with a handwritten notation on the back "Deli Masters Resturent [sic]."
- An affidavit of employment from a delicatessen in New York.  
Several affidavits of residence from friends and acquaintances, dated in 1991 and 2007, attesting to the applicant's residence in the United States during the 1980s.

The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The residential lease agreement dated December 30, 1980, bearing signatures of the applicant and the landlord, [REDACTED], appears to be fraudulent. For one thing, it was notarized by the landlord, [REDACTED] on February 18, 1991 – more than ten years after the contract date. For another, the lease agreement was dated and signed by the applicant and the landlord on December 30, 1980, but the applicant does not claim to have entered the United States until January 10, 1981. Furthermore, the residential lease agreement is not supplemented by copies of rental receipts, utility bills, or other documentation to show that the applicant actually resided at the Brooklyn, New York, address during the period indicated. The fraudulent lease agreement submitted by the applicant undermines the credibility of the applicant's claim that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided continuously in the country in an unlawful status through May 4, 1988. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's evidence also reflects on the reliability of other evidence in the record. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

The affidavit of employment from [REDACTED] president of The Deli Master in Fresh Meadows, New York, dated March 20, 1991, attesting that the applicant was employed from 1981 to 1986 as a “dishporter,” does not comport with the regulatory requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) because it did not identify the applicant’s address during the period of employment, did not indicate whether the information was taken from company records, and did not indicate whether such records are available for review. Nor was the affidavit supplemented by any earnings statements, pay stubs, or tax records demonstrating that the applicant was actually employed during any of the years claimed. Thus, the letter is not persuasive evidence that the applicant resided continuously in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required for legalization under the LIFE Act.

The affidavits from [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] – all of whom claim to have worked with, resided with, or otherwise known the applicant during the 1980s – have minimalist or fill-in-the-blank formats with little personal input by the affiants. Considering the length of time they claim to have known the applicant, the affiants provide remarkably little information about the applicant’s life in the United States and their interaction with him over the years. Nor are the affidavits accompanied by any documentary evidence – such as photographs, letters, and the like – of the affiants’ personal relationship with the applicant in the United States during the 1980s. In view of these substantive shortcomings, the affidavits have little probative value. They are not persuasive evidence of the applicant’s continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

The photograph with a handwritten notation on the back “Deli Masters Resturent” does not bear a date stamp or any indicator as to when it was taken. Thus, the photograph has no probative value as evidence of the applicant’s continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

Based on the foregoing analysis of the evidence, the AAO concludes that the applicant has failed to establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act, 8 U.S.C. § 245A(a)(2)(A). Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for permanent resident status under the LIFE Act.

The appeal will be dismissed, and the application denied.

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