



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

L2

FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC 03 007 60650

Offices: GARDEN CITY

Date: MAY 06 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:  
[REDACTED]

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 in Garden City, 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 the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

On appeal the applicant asserts that the documentation in the record is sufficient to establish his continuous residence requirement in the United States for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act.

To be eligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under the LIFE Act applicants must establish their continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as well as their continuous physical presence in the United States from November 6, 1986 through May 4, 1988. See section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) and (C)(i) of the LIFE Act, 8 U.S.C. § 245A(a)(2)(A) and (3)(A).

“Continuous unlawful residence” is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(c)(1), as follows: “An alien shall be regarded as having resided continuously in the United States if *no single absence* from the United States has *exceeded forty-five (45) days*, and the aggregate of all absences has not exceeded one hundred and eighty (180) days between January 1, 1982, and May 4, 1988, unless the alien can establish that due to *emergent reasons*, his or her return to the United States could not be accomplished within the time period allowed.” (Emphases added.)

“Continuous physical presence” is described in section 1104(c)(2)(C)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act, 8 U.S.C. § 245A(a)(3)(B), and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.16(b), in the following terms: “An alien shall not be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States by virtue of *brief, casual, and innocent absences* from the United States.” (Emphasis added.) The regulation further explains that “[b]rief, casual, and innocent absence(s) as used in this paragraph means *temporary, occasional trips abroad* as long as the purpose of the absence from the United States was consistent with the policies reflected in the immigration laws of the United States.” (Emphasis added.) 8 C.F.R. § 245a.16(b).

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 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).

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 applicant, a native of Brazil who claims to have lived in the United States since October 1981, filed his application for legal permanent resident status under the LIFE Act (Form I-485) on October 7, 2002.

In a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), dated July 27, 2007, the director indicated that the applicant had not submitted sufficient credible evidence to establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided continuously in the country in an unlawful status through May 4, 1988. The applicant was granted 30 days to submit additional evidence.

The applicant did not submit a response to the NOID and on August 31, 2007, the director issued a Notice of Decision denying the application based on the reasons stated in the NOID. The applicant timely appealed.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The record reflects that the applicant submitted a second Form I-290B – Notice of Appeal or Motion, which was received on December 2, 2007. The director rejected the appeal as untimely. The AAO has determined that the October 2, 2007 appeal was timely and will adjudicate the appeal.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he has submitted sufficient credible evidence to establish his continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period required under the LIFE Act. The applicant submits photocopies of documentation previously submitted in the record. The applicant submits no new evidence with the appeal.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal 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 AAO's *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

The documentation submitted by the applicant in support of his claim that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided continuously in the country in an unlawful status through May 4, 1988 consists of the following:

- A letter of employment from [REDACTED], who identified himself as "cleaners supervisor" at International Service System, Inc. dated October 17, 1990, stating that the applicant was employed from October 1981 to April 1985 as a full time cleaner and was paid \$5.80 per hour.  
Affidavits – dated in 1990 – from four individuals who claim to have known the applicant resided in the United States during the 1980s.

The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility. Here the documentation is not probative or credible.

There is no contemporary documentation from the 1980s that shows the applicant to have resided continuously in the United States during the requisite period for LIFE legalization. For someone claiming to have lived in the United States since 1981, it is noteworthy that the applicant is unable to produce a solitary piece of primary evidence during the following seven years through May 4, 1988.

The letter of employment from International Service System, Inc. does not comport with the regulatory requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) because the author did not provide the applicant's address during the periods of employment, did not indicate whether the information was taken from company records, and did not indicate whether such records are available for review. The letter was not supplemented by any earnings statements, pay stubs, or tax records demonstrating that the applicant was actually employed during any of the years claimed. In addition, the letter does not have any contact information, thereby calling into question the credibility of the letter. In view of these substantive deficiencies, the letter of employment has limited probative value. It is not persuasive evidence that the applicant resided continuously in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required for legalization under the LIFE Act.

The affidavits in the record – dated in 1990 – from individuals who claim to have known the applicant during 1980s, all have fill-in-the-blank format with little details about the applicant’s life in the United States, such as where he worked, and the nature and extent of his interaction with the affiants over the years. Nor are the affidavits accompanied by any documentary evidence – such as photographs, letters, and the like – of the affiants’ personal relationships with the applicant in the United States during the 1980s. Only two of the affiants claim to have known the applicant before January 1, 1982, and the remaining two affiants claim to have known the applicant in 1986 and 1988, respectively. In view of these substantive shortcomings, the AAO finds that the affidavits have little probative value. They are not persuasive evidence of the applicant’s continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

Given the paucity of evidence in the record, the AAO concludes that the applicant has failed to establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for permanent resident status under the LIFE Act.

The appeal will be dismissed, and the application denied.

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