

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 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L2

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted]
MSC 02 247 63315

Office: NEW YORK

Date: DEC 24 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:

[Redacted]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John F. Grissom".

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to demonstrate 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 director's decision is arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable. Counsel contends that the applicant's initial application, supporting documents and his affidavit clearly establish the fact that he first entered the United States in 1981. Counsel states that the applicant does not have any additional information or evidence to provide in support of his claim. Counsel asserts that the applicant has proved, by a preponderance of evidence, that he resided in the United States during the requisite period and is eligible to adjust status under the LIFE Act.

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). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant's own testimony, and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(f). 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

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 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.

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).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and resided in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of employment letters, employment documents, a lease, and receipts. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed. The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant’s eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The employment letters from [REDACTED] do not conform to regulatory standards for letters from employers as stated in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). None of the letters provide the applicant’s address at the time of employment, declare whether the information was taken from company records, and identify the location of such company records and state whether such records are accessible or in the alternative state the reason why such records are unavailable. Given the lack of relevant details, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the employment letters do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

It is also noted that the employment letter from [REDACTED] is inconsistent with the applicant’s own Form I-687 in the record. [REDACTED] stated that the applicant was employed from July 3, 1985 to November 1988. However, in his Form I-687, the applicant stated that he worked for

Woolworth in New York from March 1984 to March 1988. This discrepancy casts serious doubt on the credibility of the applicant's claim.

The record also contains copies of a time sheet and a store schedule in the applicant's name, dated in December 1981 and January 1982. Both documents fail to contain the employer's name, address or phone number. The record also contains a Big Mini Food Store Break Shift and Closing Report, dated December 20, 1981. These documents provide minimal probative value and, therefore, will be given little weight as evidence in support of the applicant's claim.

The record includes a copy of a residential lease in the applicant's name, dated from December 15, 1982, to December 14, 1984, at [REDACTED] Miami, Florida. The record includes a copy of a rent receipt and a bill in applicant's name for the above address, dated March 16, 1983, and April 9, 1985, respectively. However, the lease and bill are inconsistent with the applicant's Form I-687 in which he stated that he worked in New York from March 1984 to March 1988 and resided in New York from November 1981 through December 1989. This discrepancy further detracts from the credibility of the applicant's claim.

Although the applicant has submitted several documents in support of his application, the documents have been found to lack credibility or to have minimal probative value as evidence of the applicant's residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. 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). The record contains no independent objective evidence to explain the above inconsistencies. In addition, no credible evidence was submitted for the years 1986 through 1988.

A few errors or minor discrepancies are not reason to question the credibility of an alien or an employer seeking immigration benefits. *See, e.g., Spencer Enterprises Inc. v. U.S.*, 345 F.3d 683, 694 (9th Cir., 2003). However, anytime an application includes numerous errors and discrepancies, and the applicant fails to resolve those errors and discrepancies after USCIS provides an opportunity to do so, those inconsistencies will raise serious concerns about the veracity of the applicant's assertions. The applicant was given an opportunity to resolve the above inconsistencies on appeal. No explanation was given to reconcile the applicant's claimed employment and residence in Florida and employment and residence in New York during the same time period.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he 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.