

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



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

PUBLIC COPY

L2

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 03 037 61052

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: MAY 01 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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John F. Grissom".

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, California, 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 entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he has submitted sufficient evidence to establish his continuous residence. The applicant submits additional evidence on appeal.

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 “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 regulations provide an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit, the list also permits the submission of affidavits and any other relevant document. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

In the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), dated December 1, 2006, the director stated that the applicant failed to submit sufficient evidence demonstrating his continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period. The director granted the applicant thirty (30) days to submit additional evidence.

In the Notice of Decision, dated February 13, 2007, the director noted that the applicant responded to the NOID, but his response failed to substantiate his claim.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate his continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period. In an attempt to establish continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submits evidence, including letters, and affidavits, to support his Form I-485 application. The AAO has reviewed the entire record. The evidence, however, is neither probative, nor credible.

The applicant has submitted letters, affidavits, and other evidence, in support of his application, however, contrary to applicant's assertion, he has failed to submit sufficient reliable evidence of his continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. The applicant claims that he first entered the United States in January 1981, when he was 2 years old. During the years from about January 1984 when the applicant was age six (6) through 1988 the applicant was less than 14 years old and would be required to attend school. However, the applicant does not submit any school records for this period, nor does he provide a reasonable explanation as to why he is unable to provide his school records.

It is noted that in response to the director's specific request that the applicant provide his elementary school records, the applicant submitted a letter from [REDACTED], Principal of the Dos Palos – Oro Loma United School District, dated December 8, 2006, stating that they were unable to locate school records of files for the applicant prior to 1990. [REDACTED] also stated that the dates of enrollment for the applicant had been January 15, 1990 to March 16, 1990, and from September 14, 1990 to June 10, 1993; and, indicated that the applicant graduated from the Oro Loma Elementary School in June 1993. The complete lack of evidence of school attendance prior to January 1990, in the school district which the applicant claimed he attended, casts doubt on the applicant's claim that he attended elementary school in the United States. This discrepancy also casts considerable doubt on whether any of the affidavits and letters the applicant provided attesting to his continuous residence in the United States since January 1981 are genuine.

This lack of documentation, such as school records, without an satisfactory explanation as to why these documents are not available, casts considerable doubt on whether the applicant resided in the United States since January 1981 as he claims. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may

lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988). The applicant has failed to submit any objective evidence to explain or justify the discrepancies in the record. Therefore, the reliability of the remaining evidence offered by the applicant is suspect and it must be concluded that the applicant has failed to establish that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period.

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. Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988.

Therefore, based on the above, the applicant has failed to establish entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and continuous unlawful residence through May 4, 1988, as required under Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act. Given this, he is 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.