

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529-2090  
MAIL STOP 2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L2

FILE:

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: NOV 04 2008

MSC 02 143 65378

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 [or Records] 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.

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 Director, Los Angeles, California, 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 not demonstrated that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant submits a brief statement.

Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act states:

(i) In General – The alien must establish that the alien entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he or she has resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. In determining whether an alien maintained continuous unlawful residence in the United States for purposes of this subparagraph, the regulations prescribed by the Attorney General under section 245A(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) that were most recently in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act shall apply.

“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.

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 “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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit in support of his or her claim of continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982, the submission of any other relevant document is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L). *See* 8 C.F.R. 245a.15(b). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(f). Affidavits indicating specific, personal knowledge of the applicant's whereabouts during the relevant time period are given greater weight than fill-in-the-blank affidavits providing generic information.

On June 11, 2007, the director issued a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) the applicant's Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status under the LIFE Act, advising the applicant that her Citizenship and Immigration Service (CIS) record (A76 356 622) reflected that the applicant had stated under oath in prior proceedings that she first entered the United States in or about February 1, 1982, at 16-years of age. The director granted the applicant 30 days to explain discrepancies or rebut any adverse information.

In response, the applicant submitted affidavits from acquaintances stating that they had known the applicant since January 1982, but which did not indicate that the affiants knew of the applicant's presence in the United States prior to January 1, 1982.

In a decision to deny the application, dated July 24, 2007, the director denied the application based on the reasons sated in the NOID and the fact that the applicant had submitted no additional evidence establishing her entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that (1) the applicant meets the residency requirements of the Life Act, and (2) the applicant is eligible to adjust her status pursuant to the regulations under the Life Act. No new evidence or argument has been submitted by counsel on appeal.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(3)(iv), any appeal filed that fails to state the reason for appeal, or is patently frivolous, will be summarily dismissed. Counsel's general assertion on appeal, without specifically identifying any errors on the part of the director, is insufficient to overcome the well-founded and logical conclusions the director reached based on the record and the documentation submitted by the applicant. A review of the NOID and the notice of decision to deny the application reveals that the director accurately set forth a legitimate basis for denial of the application. On appeal,

counsel has not presented any additional evidence, nor has he specifically addressed the basis for denial. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

As always in these proceedings, the burden of proof rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

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