



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

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

L2

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 02 236 61492

Office: CHICAGO

Date: MAY 11 2007

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:

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, Chicago, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The case is remanded for further action and consideration.

The director denied the application because the applicant had failed to establish that she satisfied the “basic citizenship skills” required under section 1104(c)(2)(E) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the applicant has satisfied the basic citizenship skills requirement. Counsel does not submit any evidence in support of this assertion.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.20(a)(2) requires that when an adverse decision is proposed, an applicant for LIFE legalization must be notified of the intention to deny the application and the basis for the proposed denial, and granted a period of 30 days to respond to this notice.

Here, the applicant was issued a decision on February 16, 2005, but the record lacks evidence that the director notified the applicant of the intention to deny the application and the basis for the proposed denial, or granted the applicant 30 days to respond to such notice.

In addition, although the director found the applicant ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act, the director failed to consider the applicant’s eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6 provides, in pertinent part:

If the district director finds that an eligible alien as defined at § 245a.10 has not established eligibility under section 1104 of the LIFE Act (part 245a, Subpart B), the district director *shall* consider whether the eligible alien has established eligibility for adjustment to temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act, as in effect before enactment of section 1104 of the LIFE Act (part 245a, Subpart A).

(Emphasis added).

Accordingly, this case is remanded for the issuance of a new decision. If the director determines that the application should be denied, the director shall issue a Notice of Intent to Deny containing a detailed statement of the basis for the proposed denial, and the applicant must be granted a period of 30 days to respond to this notice. If, following this period, the director’s final decision is adverse to the applicant, it shall be certified to this office. In addition, if the director determines that the applicant has not established eligibility under section 1104 of the LIFE Act, the director shall make a determination as to the applicant’s eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6.

ORDER: The application is remanded to the director for further action in accordance with the foregoing and entry of a new decision that, if adverse to the applicant, is to be certified to the AAO for review.