



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

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

L2

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted] Office: HOUSTON Date: **JAN 11 2008**  
MSC 02 106 64037

IN RE: Applicant: [Redacted]

PETITION: 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 PETITIONER:  
[Redacted]

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, Houston, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The director's decision shall be withdrawn and the case remanded.

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).

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. Specifically, the district director noted that the applicant had failed to demonstrate a minimal understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States during his interviews on October 10, 2002 and November 29, 2004. Consequently, the district director denied the application on December 9, 2004.

On appeal, the applicant submits Form I-290B on which he states that a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request had been made in order to review his file, and that he would require thirty days from the receipt of the requested materials to file an appeal. Service records indicate that the request was satisfied on March 13, 2006.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.20(a)(2) state, in pertinent part:

*Denials.* The alien shall be notified in writing of the decision of denial and of the reason(s) therefore. When an adverse decision is proposed, CIS shall notify the applicant of its intent to deny the application and the basis for the proposed denial. The applicant will be granted a period of 30 days from the date of the notice in which to respond to the notice of intent to deny. All relevant material will be considered in making a final decision.

A thorough review of the applicant's file confirms that no notice of intent to deny was issued prior to the denial of the application. Accordingly, the decision of the director is withdrawn. The case will be remanded for the purpose of the issuance of a new notice of intent to deny as well as a new final decision to both the applicant and counsel. The new decision, if adverse to the applicant, shall be certified to this office for review.

**ORDER:** This matter is remanded for further action and consideration pursuant to the above.