

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

L₁



FILE:

SRC 02 247 67116

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

SEP 09 2009

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:

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.

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, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The district 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 the director erred in her determination, and that he has established his eligibility for LIFE Act legalization. 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).

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.

In the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), dated May 17, 2005, the director requested that the applicant submit evidence establishing that he had entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988, and listing all absences from the United States. The director noted that the applicant had submitted affidavits that are neither credible nor amenable to verification. The director granted the applicant thirty (30) days to submit additional evidence.

In the Notice of Decision, dated May 18, 2006, the director denied the instant application because the applicant failed to establish the requisite continuous residence. The director noted that the applicant's response to the NOID was insufficient to overcome the reasons for denial as stated in the NOID.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period. The applicant submitted various documents, including letters and affidavits, as evidence to support his Form I-485 application. Here, the submitted evidence is neither credible, nor probative.

Contrary to the applicant's assertion, he has submitted questionable documentation. In an attempt to establish his continuous residence since 1981, the applicant submitted receipts which are questionable. For example, the applicant provided a receipt from Vishal Jewels, Inc., located at 37-19 74th Street, Jackson Heights, NY 11372. The receipt which is dated January 3, 1983, bears a telephone number "(718) 651-1909." The "718" area code, however, did not come into existence until September 1984. It is also noted that the records of the New York State Department, Division of Corporations, indicate that the first filing for Vishal Jewels, Inc., was on March 21, 2001. Yet, the receipt from Vishal Jewels, Inc., is dated in January 1983.

Also, the applicant testified during his interview before an immigration officer, on March 23, 2004, that he first entered the United States in July 1981. However, on his Form I-687 applications the applicant does not indicate an address in the United States until December 1981. Yet, the applicant provided a photocopy of a mail envelope date-stamped "05 06 81" addressed to him at "[REDACTED]"

The above glaring discrepancies cast considerable doubt on whether the evidence provided by the applicant, including receipts and affidavits, are genuine; and, whether the applicant's claim that he

entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided continuously in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988, is true. 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). 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.

In addition, it is noted that the record reflects that the applicant has submitted questionable affidavits. The applicant has submitted two affidavits attesting to his continuous residence since 1981. However, this evidence is unreliable as the record reflects that the affidavits were notarized by [REDACTED], who is known to have prepared fraudulent immigration documentation for various applicants.

As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. 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.