

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

L2

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: DALLAS Date: **AUG 30 2007**  
MSC 01 312 60384

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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:  
[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, Dallas, Texas, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO affirms the director's decision denying the LIFE Act application, and remands the case for further action and consideration.

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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant enrolled in an English as a Second Language (ESL) class over two years ago. Counsel asserts that at the time he attempted to enroll at the Forth Worth Independent School District's Adult Basic Education class, he was informed that class would not commence until the fall. Therefore, the applicant continued to attend his ESL classes. However, when the applicant returned to the Forth Worth Independent School, he was informed that the class was full. Counsel contends that through no fault of the applicant, he has repeatedly attempted to enroll in a course that is recognized by the Secretary.

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act ("Basic Citizenship Skills"), an applicant for permanent resident status must demonstrate that he or she:

- (I) meets the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)) (relating to minimal understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States); or
- (II) is satisfactorily pursuing a course of study (recognized by the Attorney General) to achieve such an understanding of English and such a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States.

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act, the Attorney General may waive all or part of the above requirements for aliens who are at least 65 years of age or developmentally disabled.

The applicant, who was 53 years old at the time he took the basic citizenship skills test and provided no evidence to establish that he was developmentally disabled, does not qualify for either of the exceptions in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act. Further the applicant does not satisfy the "basic citizenship skills" requirement of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act because he does not meet the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act). An applicant can demonstrate that he or she meets the requirements of section 312(a) of the Act by "[s]peaking and understanding English during the course of the interview for permanent resident status" and answering questions based on the subject matter of approved citizenship training materials, or "[b]y passing a standardized section 312 test . . . by the Legalization Assistance Board with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) or the California State Department of Education with the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)." 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.3(b)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b) provides that an applicant who fails to pass the English literacy and/or the United States history and government tests at the time of the interview, shall be afforded a second opportunity after 6 months (or earlier at the request of the applicant) to pass the tests or submit evidence as described in paragraphs (a)(2) or (a)(3) of this section.

The record reflects that the applicant was interviewed twice in connection with his LIFE application, on December 2, 2003, and again on June 7, 2004. On the both occasions, the applicant failed to demonstrate a

minimal understanding of English and minimal knowledge of United States history and government. Furthermore, the applicant has not provided evidence of having passed a standardized citizenship test, as permitted by 8 C.F.R. § 312.3(a)(1).

The applicant, however, could have met the basic citizenship skills requirement under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(II) of the LIFE Act by showing, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a), that he:

- (2) has a high school diploma or general educational development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States; or
- (3) has attended, or is attending, a state recognized, accredited learning institution in the United States, and that institution certifies such attendance.

The record does not reflect that the applicant has a high school diploma or a GED from a United States school, and therefore does not satisfy the regulatory requirement of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2).

In response to a Notice of Intent to Deny issued on June 10, 2004, the applicant indicated that he had registered to attend Forth Worth Independent School. As evidence, the applicant provided Form I-699 Certificate of Satisfactory Pursuit, dated and signed by a representative of Forth Worth Independent School District Adult Basic Education on April 8, 2004. This document, however, cannot be considered as the individual's name and alien registration number have been blacked out.

On appeal, counsel submits a letter dated February 2, 2005 from [REDACTED], a representative of Birdville Independent School District, who indicated that the applicant has been attending ESL classes for the past two years. The representative further indicated that the classes meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays for about two hours per session.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3) requires that the applicant submit certification on letterhead stationery from a state recognized, accredited learning institution either at the time of filing the Form I-485, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview. In the instant case, documentation from a state recognized, accredited learning institution should have been submitted to Citizenship and Immigration Services prior to or at the time of the applicant's second interview on June 7, 2004. Assuming, arguendo, that the organization is a state recognized, accredited learning institution, the applicant would not qualify for the benefit being sought as the letter was presented subsequent to the applicant's interview, and no documentation from the entity was presented establishing that that the course of study is equivalent to once academic year and the curriculum includes at least 40 hours of instruction in English and United States history and government as required by 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(3).

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant is once again attempting to register for an Adult Basic Education class.

Counsel, however, cites no statute or regulation that compels the director to schedule the applicant for third interview. The regulation only provides *one* opportunity after the failure of the first test. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b).

As previously discussed, the applicant failed to meet the "basic citizenship skills" requirement of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act because at his two interviews he did not demonstrate a minimal

understanding of the English language and minimal knowledge of United States history and government. Therefore, the applicant does not satisfy either alternative of the “basic citizenship skills” requirement set forth in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act. Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

Although the director found the applicant ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act, the record does not reflect that the director considered the applicant’s eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6 provides, in pertinent part:

If the district director finds that an eligible alien as defined at § 245a.10 has not established eligibility under section 1104 of the LIFE Act (part 245a, Subpart B), the district director *shall* consider whether the eligible alien has established eligibility for adjustment to temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act, as in effect before enactment of section 1104 of the LIFE Act (part 245a, Subpart A).

(Emphasis added).

Accordingly, this case is remanded for a determination as to the applicant’s eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6.

**ORDER:** The director’s decision denying the LIFE Act application is affirmed. The application is remanded to the director for further action in accordance with the foregoing and entry of a new decision that, if adverse to the applicant, may be certified to the AAO for review.