

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L2



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 02 208 61307

Office: LOS ANGELES


Date:

AUG 11 2009

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:



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.

John F. Grissom
Acting 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, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The district director denied the application because the applicant has multiple criminal convictions in the state of California.

The applicant is represented by counsel on appeal. In a brief submitted in support of the appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant's constitutional right to due process of law was violated because the Notice of Denial issued on May 12, 2006 failed to specify the applicant's grounds of ineligibility. In further support, counsel submits evidence to indicate that the applicant's criminal convictions were dismissed under section 1203.4 of the California Penal Code, and therefore are no longer disqualifying criminal convictions.

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 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 applicant has the burden of proving 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 under the provisions of section 245A of the Act, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. 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.2(d)(5). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own testimony, and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

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).

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 petitioner 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 petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. *See U.S. v. Cardozo-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 431 (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 or petition.

Furthermore, an alien who has been convicted of a felony or of three or more misdemeanors committed in the United States is ineligible for adjustment to Lawful Permanent Resident status. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.18(a)(1). “Felony” means a crime committed in the United States punishable by imprisonment for a term of more than one year, regardless of the term such alien actually served, if any, except when the offense is defined by the state as a misdemeanor, and the sentence actually imposed is one year or less, regardless of the term such alien actually served. Under this exception, for purposes of 8 C.F.R. Part 245a, the crime shall be treated as a misdemeanor. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(p).

“Misdemeanor” means a crime committed in the United States, either (1) punishable by imprisonment for a term of one year or less, regardless of the term such alien actually served, if any, or (2) a crime treated as a misdemeanor under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(p). For purposes of this definition, any crime punishable by imprisonment for a maximum term of five days or less shall not be considered a misdemeanor. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.1(o).

The term 'conviction' means, with respect to an alien, a formal judgment of guilt of the alien entered by a court or, if adjudication of guilt has been withheld, where - (i) a judge or jury has found the alien guilty or the alien has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or has admitted sufficient facts to warrant a finding of guilt, and (ii) the judge has ordered some form of punishment, penalty, or restraint on the alien's liberty to be imposed.

Section 101(a)(48)(A) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(48)(A).

Under the statutory definition of "conviction" provided at section 101(a)(48)(A) of the INA, no effect is to be given, in immigration proceedings, to a state action which purports to expunge, dismiss, cancel, vacate, discharge, or otherwise remove a guilty plea or other record of guilt or conviction. An alien remains convicted for immigration purposes notwithstanding a subsequent state action purporting to erase the original determination of guilt. *See Matter of Pickering*, 23 I&N Dec. 621 (BIA 2003); *rev'd on other grounds, Pickering v. Gonzales*, 465 F.3d 263 (6th Cir. 2006); *Matter of Roldan*, 22 I. & N. Dec. 512 (BIA 1999).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant established his eligibility for permanent resident status pursuant to the terms of the LIFE Act and is otherwise admissible to the United States. The AAO has reviewed all of the evidence in the file, including the court documents that outline the applicant's arrest and conviction, as well as the statutes under which he was convicted and under which the conviction was later dismissed. We conclude that the applicant is not eligible for permanent resident status on account of his multiple criminal convictions, and the application for permanent residence under the LIFE Act must be denied on that ground.

First, contrary to counsel's assertions on appeal, the Notice of Denial identifies the applicant's multiple criminal convictions and the federal regulatory provisions that render an applicant ineligible for permanent resident status on account of those convictions. Therefore, this argument is without merit.

The record contains a facsimile copy of an order of dismissal and expungement issued by the Superior Court of California, Kern County, North Division, dated November 21, 2006, pursuant to section 1203.4 of the California Penal Code. This order identifies [REDACTED] and lists six convictions under the applicant's name as having occurred on or about October 20, 1998: 1) *DUI*, 2) *Possession of a Controlled Substance*, 3) *Use/Under Influence of Controlled Substance*, 4) *Driving Without License*, 5) *Driving Without Insurance*, and 6) *Driving Without Proper Registration*.

The AAO notes that the order of expungement lists all six convictions as misdemeanor offenses. However, a photocopy of a Criminal Case Information summary issued on February 23, 2007 by the California Superior Court identifies the *Possession of a Controlled Substance* conviction as a felony offense, and the *Driving Without Insurance* conviction as an infraction. This document does not list the conviction for *Driving Without Proper Registration*. All remaining three convictions are identified on this document as misdemeanor offenses, and these convictions, in and of themselves, are sufficient to render the applicant ineligible for permanent resident status under the terms of the LIFE Act. Because of the conflict between these two records (the order of dismissal and the case information summary), it is unclear whether the conviction for possession of a controlled substance is classified in this instance as a felony or misdemeanor. As noted above, a single felony conviction makes the applicant ineligible for adjust to permanent resident status under the LIFE Act pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.18(a)(1). Within the provisions of the LIFE Act, there is no waiver available to an alien convicted of a felony or three or more misdemeanors committed in the United States.

Additionally, the court's order purporting to expunge or dismiss the convictions under section 1203.4 of the California Penal Code is a state rehabilitative statute. There is nothing in the court's order of dismissal or the evidence in the record to suggest that the applicant's criminal convictions were dismissed on account of a constitutional defect in the underlying trial court proceedings. Thus, the convictions remain valid for immigration purposes. *Matter of Pickering, supra*.

An alien applying for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 1140 of the LIFE Act has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he or she has continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States from January 1, 1982 to May 4, 1988, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 212(a) of the INA, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11. The applicant has failed to meet this burden.

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