



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2

FILE:

MSC 01 353 60548

Office: DALLAS

Date:

**OCT 27 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. 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.

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, Dallas, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to demonstrate that he resided in the United States in a continuous, unlawful status from before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988, as required by section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, the applicant asserts he has provided evidence showing that he has resided in the United States since before 1982. He submits three affidavits and copies of previously submitted documentation.

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.

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 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 periods, is admissible to the United States and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act. 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.* at 80. 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 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). 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).

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the applicant's claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period is probably true. Upon an 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 applicant has provided the following evidence relating to the requisite period:

1. A declaration, dated May 4, 1990, from [REDACTED], who stated that the applicant worked on [REDACTED] planting and harvesting truck crops from January 5, 1981 to May 4, 1990. The affiant stated the applicant resided at the farm. By regulation, letters from employers should be on employer letterhead stationery if available and must include the applicant's address at the time of employment, exact period of employment and layoffs, duties with the company; whether the information was taken from official company records; and where records are located and whether CIS may have access to the records; if records are unavailable, an affidavit explaining this shall also state the employer's willingness to come forward and give testimony if requested. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). The affidavit does not meet these regulatory standards. The affiant does not offer to either produce official company records or to testify regarding unavailable records. In addition, the director has raised questions, which have not been answered by the applicant, regarding the validity of the business entity. This declaration can be accorded only minimal weight as evidence of residence during the requisite period.
2. An affidavit, dated August 6, 2006, from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] the wife and daughter of [REDACTED], respectively. The affiants stated that Mr. [REDACTED] was deceased and verified the facts contained in his affidavit. The affiants failed to provide details that would indicate any personal knowledge of the affiant's residence or the circumstances of his residence in the United States during the statutory period. Lacking any relevant details, this affidavit can be given no probative value.
3. An affidavit, dated August 21, 1990, from [REDACTED], who stated that he has known the applicant since October 1982 to the present and that he met the applicant through the

applicant's sister. The affiant also provided a second affidavit, dated August 7, 2006, affirming his previous affidavit. Both affidavits failed to provide details regarding his claimed friendship with the applicant or to provide any information that would indicate personal knowledge of the applicant's place of residence or the circumstances of his residence over the prior seven or eight years of his claimed relationship. Lacking relevant details, this affidavit has minimal probative value.

4. An affidavit, dated September 7, 2001, from [REDACTED], the applicant's sister. The affiant stated that the applicant has resided in the United States since January 5, 1981. The affiant provided a second affidavit, dated August 7, 2006, affirming her previous affidavit. Both affidavits failed to provide any information that would indicate personal knowledge of the applicant's entry into the United States, place of residence or the circumstances of his residence during the statutory period. Because the affidavits are significantly lacking in relevant details, they lack probative value and have only minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

For the reasons noted above, the documents submitted in support of the applicant's claim have been found to lack credibility or to have minimal probative value as evidence of the applicant's residence and presence in the United States for the requisite period. In addition, the director has raised discrepancies, which have not been reconciled by the applicant, regarding the validity of the business entity, [REDACTED]

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of the applicant's statements and application forms, in which he claims to have entered the United States on January 5, 1981, through Mexico and to have resided for the duration of the requisite period in Texas. As noted above, to meet his burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his own testimony. In this case, his assertions regarding his entry are not supported by any credible evidence in the record.

The AAO finds that, upon an 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 applicant has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that he resided in the United States for the requisite period.

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 lack of credible supporting documentation and the discrepancy noted in the record, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and maintained continuous, unlawful residence from such date through May 4, 1988, 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.