


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



L2

FILE: [Redacted]  
MSC 01 324 60417

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **AUG 29 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. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if your case 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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, 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 she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since such date through May 4, 1988, as required by section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that she does not have any paperwork from 1982. She asserts that since 1985 she has worked in the United States and paid taxes, and has not had any trouble with the law. She states that her family resides in California, she owns a home and is employed. She requests that her application be reconsidered.

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 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 through May 4, 1988. *See* § 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b). The applicant 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 section 1104 of the LIFE Act. 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.* at 80. 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 or 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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit in support of his or her claim of continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982, the submission of any other relevant document is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant’s own testimony. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.13(f).

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the applicant’s claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period is probably true. Upon an examination of each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The applicant has provided two affidavits in support of her claim. The record contains two affidavits, both dated April 25, 1990, from [REDACTED] in her first affidavit, the affiant stated that to her personal knowledge the applicant has resided in the United States from September 1981 to December 1985 and from August 1986 to the present (1990) in Costa Mesa, California. The affiant failed to provide details regarding her claimed friendship with the applicant or to provide any information that would indicate personal knowledge of the applicant’s 1981 entry to the United States, her places of residence or the circumstances of her residence over the prior nine years of her claimed relationship. Although the affiant claims to have known the applicant since 1981, she failed to note how or where she met the applicant. Lacking relevant details, this affidavit provides minimal probative value. In the affiant’s second affidavit, she stated that the applicant departed the United States on May 15, 1984, to visit Iran and returned on June 20, 1984. While this affidavit is consistent with the applicant’s Form I-687, Application for Status as a Temporary Resident, it is noted that the affiant did not mention the applicant’s second absence from the United States in 1985 that is listed on the applicant’s Form I-687.

For the reasons noted above, the documents submitted in support of the applicant’s claim have been found to have minimal probative value as evidence of the applicant’s residence and presence in the United States for the requisite period. The applicant has submitted only two

affidavits from the same person in support of her application. These affidavits lack sufficient detail to corroborate the applicant's claim. On appeal, the applicant did not submit additional evidence.

The AAO finds that, upon an examination of each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, the applicant has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that she resided in the United States for the requisite period.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e), 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 lack of credible supporting documentation, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and maintained continuous, unlawful residence from such date through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. The applicant is, therefore, 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.