

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



L2

FILE:



Office: NEW YORK

Date:

MAR 30 2009

MSC 01 306 60193

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:



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.

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, New York, New York. It is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application on the ground that the applicant failed to establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided continuously in an unlawful status since then through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant submits a brief statement and an additional document.

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 its amenability to verification. *See* 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.* 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 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). *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.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v), states that attestations from churches, unions, or other organizations should: identify the applicant by name; be signed by an official (whose title is shown); show inclusive dates of membership; state the address where the applicant resided during the membership period; include the seal of the organization impressed on the letter or the letterhead of the organization, if the organization has letterhead stationery; establish how the author knows the applicant; and, establish the origin of the information being attested to.

The applicant filed a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Resident Status or Adjust Status, under the LIFE Act on August 2, 2001. On November 6, 2007, the director denied the application. The applicant, through counsel, filed a timely appeal from that decision on November 28, 2007.

The applicant, a native and citizen of Bangladesh, claims to have initially entered the United States without inspection in August 1981, and to have departed the United States on only one occasion during the requisite time period – from May through June 4, 1987, in order to visit a friend in Canada and look for a job.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review this matter on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see*

also, *Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp.*, NTSB, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The federal courts have long recognized the AAO's *de novo* review authority. See, e.g. *Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

The record reflects that the applicant has submitted the following documentation in an attempt to establish his continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite time period:

Employment letters: a fill-in-the-blank letter from the New Yorker Deli in Paterson, New Jersey, stating the applicant was employed as a dishwasher from November 1, 1981, to February 1987; and, a letter from [REDACTED] in New York, New York, stating the applicant was employed as a dishwasher from July 1, 1987, to November 27, 1989. The employment letter from the New Yorker Deli is not notarized and the signature of the owner is illegible. The letter from [REDACTED] does not comply with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) in that it fails to provide the applicant's address at the time of employment; show periods of layoff; 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.

Organization letters: a notarized letter from [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED], in Jamaica, New York, stating he had known the applicant since 1981 and the applicant sometimes visits the center; an un-notarized letter from [REDACTED] of the Islamic Foundation of New Jersey, stating the applicant had resided in the United States since 1981 and is a bona-fide member of the mosque. These letters do not comply with the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v) in that they do not show the address(es) where the applicant resided throughout the membership period or establish the origin of the information being attested to (i.e., whether the information being attested to is anecdotal or comes from church membership records).

Affidavits from acquaintances: affidavits from [REDACTED] stating the applicant visited him in Canada from May 5, 1987 to June 4, 1987 – that he drove the applicant from New York to Toronto and return; an affidavit from [REDACTED] stating that the applicant visited [REDACTED] in Canada from May 5, 1987, to June 4, 1987; and, affidavits from [REDACTED] stating that the applicant was his room-mate at two different addresses in Paterson, New Jersey, from September 1981 to December 1989. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] merely attest to the applicant having visited Canada from New York in 1987. Neither of them attests to the applicant's entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982, or his continuous unlawful residence throughout the requisite time period. The affidavits from [REDACTED] lack details as to how he first met the applicant and are devoid of any evidence that the affiant actually resided in the United States during the time period attested to.

Other documentation: envelopes addressed to the applicant with illegible postmarks; and, a letter from [REDACTED] in Brooklyn, New York, stating that the applicant had been in his office on December 16, 1987; May 11, 1988 and March 17, 1989. The envelopes carry no

evidentiary weight and the physician's letter merely attests to the applicant's presence in the United States in or after December 1987.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e) provides that "[a]n alien applying for adjustment of status under [section 1104 of the LIFE Act] has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods." Preponderance of the evidence is defined as "evidence which as a whole shows that the fact sought to be proved is more probable than not." *Black's Law Dictionary* 1064 (5th ed. 1979). *See Matter of Lemhammad*, 20 I&N Dec. 316, 320, Note 5 (BIA 1991).

The paucity of the documentation submitted to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period detracts from the credibility of his claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. 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 since such date through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for adjustment of status to permanent resident status under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b). Thus, he is ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

As always in these proceedings, the burden of proof rests solely with the applicant. Section 245a.2(d)(5) of the Act.

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