

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2



FILE:

MSC 02 183 62599

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **NOV 28 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter was remanded for further action, you will be contacted. If your appeal was dismissed, 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Grissom".

John Grissom, Acting Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** On August 1, 2007, the Director, Los Angeles, denied the application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application, finding that the applicant did not establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided continuously in the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that the documentation the applicant submitted is all she has and wants to know what more the Service wants. She asserts that the documents she submitted are sufficient to meet her burden of proof.

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. See § 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b). The applicant has the burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite period, 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 states 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 or 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 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.

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.

A LIFE Legalization applicant must also provide evidence establishing that, before October 1, 2000, he or she was a class member applicant in a legalization class-action lawsuit. See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.14. In this case, the record reflects that the applicant applied for such class membership by submitting a "Form for Determination of Class Membership in *CSS v. Meese* [CSS lawsuit]," accompanied by a Form I-687 "Application for Status as a Temporary Resident (Under Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act)," dated May 15, 1994.

On April 1, 2002, the applicant submitted a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status. On May 23, 2007, the applicant appeared for an interview based on the application.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to meet her burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence, that her claim of entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period is probably true. Upon examination of each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The letters and affidavits the applicant submitted from [REDACTED] and, [REDACTED] contain minimal details regarding any relationship with the applicant during the requisite period. The affiants assert that they know that the applicant has been in the United States since 1981 but do not appear to have any specific, personal knowledge of the applicant's travel to or entry into the United States or the circumstances regarding her move to the United States as a child of 11. None of the affiants mention why the applicant, a child of 11 in 1981, was not attending school and does not appear to have been residing with her parents or any other adult relative. While they claim to have been in constant contact with her throughout the statutory period, they provide minimal details about the circumstances of her residence during that period except that she lived with the [REDACTED] family and sometimes worked as a babysitter. Lacking such relevant detail, the letters and affidavits can be afforded only minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States for the requisite period.

As noted above, to meet her burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from her own testimony. When viewed within the context of the totality of the evidence, such documentation is not sufficient to support a finding that it is more likely than not that the applicant *resided continuously in the United States from before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988*; nor does such documentation place the applicant in the United States prior to January 1, 1982.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of the applicant's statements and application forms, in which she claims to have first entered the United States without inspection in December 28, 1980, and to have resided for the duration of the requisite period in California. As noted above, to meet his or her burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own testimony. The applicant has failed to do so. In this case, her assertions regarding her entry are not supported by any credible evidence in the record.

The absence of credible and probative documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of entry and continuous residence for the entire requisite period detracts from the credibility of her claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. Given the applicant's reliance on only affidavits, which lack relevant details, and the lack of any probative evidence of her entry and residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 and through May 4, 1988, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she maintained continuous, unlawful residence in the United States as required for eligibility for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

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