

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



LR

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 02 250 65635

Office: PHILADELPHIA

Date: **APR 25 2008**

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: SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

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, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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 submits a letter.

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act must establish his continuous unlawful residence in the United States from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, and his continuous physical presence in the United States from November 6, 1986, through May 4, 1998.

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.

It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the applicant submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant’s proof may, of

course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Id.*

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 applicant filed his Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status, on June 7, 2002.

On February 25, 2004, the district director issued a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) stating that although the applicant had submitted affidavits regarding his father's presence in the United States since before January 1, 1982, the applicant had had only established his own presence in the United States since May 1988.

In response to the NOID, the applicant asserted that he was eligible to adjust status under the LIFE Act as a beneficiary of his father's application.

The district director denied the application on June 10, 2004, stating that the evidence submitted regarding the applicant's father's application did not suffice as evidence of the applicant's own eligibility for adjustment of status under the Life Act.

Although the applicant indicates that he came to the United States in 1987 "for a couple of weeks," the record reflects that, by his own admission, he did not re-enter the United States until May 14, 1998. Furthermore, it should be stressed that the applicant is required to establish eligibility for adjustment of status under the Life Act on his own – his father's residence in the United States and/or his father's eligibility for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act has no impact on the applicant's own eligibility for the benefit sought.

An alien applying for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 1140 of the LIFE Act has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he or she has continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States from January 1, 1982 to May 4, 1988, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 212(a) of the INA, and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

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