


PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
protect personal privacy



La

MAR 02 2005

FILE:



Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER

Date:

IN RE:

Applicant:



PETITION: 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. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the Director, Missouri Service Center. It was reopened and denied again by the Director, National Benefits Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

In both decisions, the directors concluded the applicant had not established that he had applied for class membership in any of the requisite legalization class-action lawsuits prior to October 1, 2000 and, therefore, denied the application.

Subsequent to the director's initial decision, the applicant submitted a separate statement in which she reaffirmed her eligibility for permanent resident status under the LIFE Act as one who had applied for class membership in the *CSS/LULAC* class-action lawsuit.

The applicant does not respond to the subsequent decision.

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act must establish that before October 1, 2000, he or she filed a written claim with the Attorney General for class membership in one of the following legalization class-action lawsuits: *Catholic Social Services, Inc. v. Meese*, vacated sub nom. *Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 43 (1993) ("*CSS*"), *League of United Latin American Citizens v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 43 (1993) ("*LULAC*"), or *Zambrano v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Immigration and Naturalization Service v. Zambrano*, 509 U.S. 918 (1993) ("*Zambrano*"). See section 1104(b) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.10.

Furthermore, under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act each applicant for permanent resident status must establish that he or she entered and commenced residing in the United States *prior to January 1, 1982*. On the applicant's G-325A Biographic Information Form, however, the applicant indicated that she resided in her native Bangladesh from November 1952 until *October 1995*. Given the applicant's inability to meet the statutory requirement of residence in the United States since before January 1, 1982, he is ineligible for permanent residence under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

Accordingly, the issue of whether the applicant applied for class membership in the *CSS-LULAC* lawsuit is moot. Nevertheless, give the nature of the documentation the applicant submitted on this issue, some discussion is warranted.

With her LIFE application, in response to the director's notice of intent to deny, and now on appeal, the applicant has submitted photocopies of notices she allegedly received from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS). These notices related to applications and motions to reopen or reconsider that the applicant purports to have submitted, or attempted to submit, to CIS. If authentic, these notices could possibly serve as evidence of a claim by the applicant for class membership in *CSS/LULAC* prior to October 1, 2000.

None of these submissions, however, includes a CIS Alien Registration Number (A-number, or file number) for the applicant, as required in 8 C.F.R. § 245.14(b). Furthermore, there is no record of CIS generating the photocopied notices or receiving any of the applications allegedly submitted by the applicant. Clearly, the applicant did *not* file the special agricultural worker (SAW) application. If she had, an A-file would have been

created at that point. As she did not file a SAW application, she could not have filed a motion to reopen such application. The photocopies the applicant has submitted regarding the SAW application and motion cannot be authentic. Moreover, the applicant's failure to submit either originals or photocopies of the applications themselves, and the corresponding money orders which were purportedly rejected and returned by CIS, further undermines the credibility of his claim to have submitted such applications.

Doubt cast on any aspect of an applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence. It is incumbent upon an 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, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

It is further noted that the applicant is one of many aliens residing in New York City who have furnished such questionable photocopied documents with their LIFE applications. None of these applicants had pre-existing files with CIS prior to filing their LIFE applications, in spite of the fact that they all claim to have previously filed applications or questionnaires with CIS. In addition, despite the absence in these files of any Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Representation, the statements on appeal from these aliens are nearly identical in language and content. These factors raise even more serious questions regarding the authenticity of the applications and supporting documentation in the instant case.

It is concluded that the photocopies the applicant has submitted do not establish that she actually filed a written claim for class membership in *CSS/LULAC*, as required in section 1104(b) of the LIFE Act. For failure to meet this statutory requirement, and because the applicant acknowledges on her G-325A Biographic Information Form that she did not enter and begin residing in United States prior to January 1, 1982, as required in section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Act, the applicant 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.