



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
**PUBLIC COPY**

L2

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: Los Angeles  
MSC 02 148 60552

Date: JUL 13 2006

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. 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, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the District Director, Los Angeles, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The district director determined that the applicant had not established that he resided in the United States in a continuous unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required by section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to support his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period. Counsel includes copies of previously submitted documents as well as photocopies of bank book pages, three retail receipts, one bank stop payment order, two money order receipts, and five American Express Travelers Cheques record of purchase receipts.

An applicant for permanent resident status must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. *See* § 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(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 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 petitioner 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 or petitioner 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 or petition.

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. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. Here, the submitted evidence is relevant, probative, and credible.

The applicant made a claim to class membership in a legalization class-action lawsuit and as such, was permitted to previously file a Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status Pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), on May 3, 1990. Subsequently, on January 25, 2002, the applicant filed his Form I-485 LIFE Act application. In support of his claim of continuous residence in this country since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted two original rent receipts, two original purchaser's receipts for Traveler's Express money orders, eight photocopied purchaser's receipts for bank money orders, four affidavits, an employment letter, eighty photocopied rent receipts, twenty-one postmarked envelopes, one letter of membership, and a letter from a dentist and corresponding dental records.

In the notice of intent to deny issued on December 19, 2003, the district director questioned the veracity of the applicant's claimed residence in the United States for the requisite period. Specifically, the district director stated that the Rediform rent receipts provided by the applicant had a revision date subsequent to the dates written on the receipts for which rent had been purportedly paid. While the district director concluded that the applicant's claim of residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 was not credible because of these documents, a review of the receipts in question does not support such a finding. The receipts themselves does not contain any notation to show a revision date in format and the record contains no evidence to suggest that any attempt was made to contact the manufacturer of the receipt in order to determine the printing date of this particular style of receipt. Further, the district director failed to cite a specific source or authority to demonstrate that the format for the receipts in question had been revised after the date such receipts had been executed. And while the district director concluded that many of the postmarked envelopes submitted by the applicant contained indiscernible postmarks, a review of these postmarked envelopes reveals that the majority contain legible postmarks clearly demonstrating that such envelopes were mailed to the applicant during the requisite period. Therefore, the district director's conclusions regarding the credibility of the applicant's claim of residence and the sufficiency of his supporting documentation as expressed in the notice of intent must be considered as an inadequate basis to deny the application.

The statements of counsel regarding the volume and sufficiency of the applicant's supporting documentation in light of the significant and considerable passage of time have been considered. In this instance, the applicant submitted evidence, including contemporaneous documents, affidavits, and letters, which tends to corroborate his claim of residence in the United States during the requisite period. The district director has not established that the information in this evidence was inconsistent with the claims made on the application, or that it was false information. As stated in *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, when something is to be established by a preponderance of evidence, the proof submitted by the applicant has to establish only that the assertion or asserted claim is probably true. That decision also points out that, under the preponderance of evidence standard, an application may be granted even though some doubt remains regarding the evidence. The documents that have been furnished may be accorded substantial evidentiary weight and are sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof of residence in the United States for the requisite period.

The documentation provided by the applicant establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that he satisfies the statutory and regulatory criteria of entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, as well as continuous unlawful residence in the country during the ensuing time frame of January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for legalization under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. Consequently, the applicant has overcome the basis of denial cited by the district director.

Accordingly, the applicant's appeal will be sustained. The district director shall continue the adjudication of the application for permanent resident status.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.