

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

[Redacted]

lr

FILE: [Redacted]
MSC-01-364-60257

Office: WASHINGTON

Date: FEB 06 2008

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. The file has been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case 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.

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, Washington. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The case will be remanded.

The director determined that the applicant had failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she is eligible for permanent resident status under the LIFE Act. Specifically, the director indicated the applicant stated in an interview with an immigration officer that she was absent from the United States from June to September 1987.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant restated the requirements for permanent resident status and stated that the applicant has met her burden of proof, the applicant never testified that she was absent from June to September 1987, the immigration officer did not review the applicant's Form I-485 application for corrections during the interview, the other documents submitted by the applicant indicate she was not absent from June to September 1987, and the applicant was denied due process of law.

Under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.20(a)(2), when an adverse decision is proposed in response to an application for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act, Citizenship and Immigration Services (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 (NOID). 8 C.F.R. § 245a.20(a)(2).

A review of the record reveals that the director failed to issue a NOID to the applicant including the basis for the proposed denial and granting the applicant 30 days to submit a response. Accordingly, the decision of the director is withdrawn. The case will be remanded for reconsideration by the director.

If the director finds that the applicant is ineligible for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act, the director must first issue a NOID explaining the basis for the proposed denial and provide the applicant with 30 days to submit a response. Once the applicant has had an opportunity to respond to such notice, if the applicant has not overcome the director's finding, then the director must issue a new decision regarding the applicant's eligibility for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act. Any new adverse decision and still pending appeal shall be forwarded to the AAO for review and adjudication of the applicant's appeal as it relates to the issues raised by the director in the NOID and for entry of a new decision by the AAO.

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