

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

FILE:

MSC 01 313 60337

Office: NEW YORK

Date: DEC 31 2008

IN RE:

Applicant:

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. The file has 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.

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: On September 14, 2007, the Director, New York, denied the application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application, finding that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. The director also found that the applicant was inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) for fraud or willful misrepresentation because he procured or attempted to procure an Employment Authorization Document (EAD) through the payment of a bribe to a Legalization Officer.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the evidence already in the record is sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof in this case. The applicant asserts that he was a victim, not a perpetrator of fraud. He states that he paid his representative a legal fee and did not intend to circumvent the laws of the United States. He states that he did not speak English and was new to this country when he became a victim of a conman.

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 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 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.

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act has the burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence 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). 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 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 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 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). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own testimony. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(f). Affidavits that indicate specific, personal knowledge of the applicant's whereabouts during the relevant time period are given greater weight than fill-in-the-blank affidavits that provide generic information.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that letters from employers attesting to an applicant's employment must: provide the applicant's address at the time of employment; identify the exact period of employment; show periods of layoff; state the applicant's duties; 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.

A LIFE Legalization applicant must also provide evidence establishing that, before October 1, 2000, he or she was a class member applicant in a legalization class-action lawsuit. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.14. In this case, the record reflects that the applicant applied for such class membership by submitting a “Form for Determination of Class Membership in *CSS v. Meese* [CSS lawsuit],” accompanied by a Form I-687 “Application for Status as a Temporary Resident (Under § 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act),” dated August 21, 1991.

On August 9, 2001, the applicant submitted the current Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status. On May 9, 2007, the applicant appeared for an interview based on the application.

The first issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden and establish by a preponderance of the evidence, that his claim of entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period is probably true.

The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim consists of affidavits from two of the applicant's friends, a work verification letter, and a letter from the applicant's place of worship.

The fill-in-the-blank affidavits and statements from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] can be given minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's required continuous residence as they contain minimal details regarding any relationship with the applicant during the requisite period. Although the affiants assert that they have known the applicant since 1981, they fail to indicate any personal knowledge of the applicant's claimed entry to the United States during that year. While they assert that they have seen the applicant regularly since 1981, the affiants also fail to provide sufficient relevant details regarding the circumstances of the applicant's residence during the statutory period. Lacking such relevant detail, the statements can be afforded only minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's continuous residence in the United States for the requisite period.

The employment verification letter from [REDACTED] of Malabar Restaurant can be given minimal evidentiary weight as it fails to comply with the regulatory requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). Specifically [REDACTED] does not provide the applicant's address at the time of employment, show periods of layoff, or declare whether the information was taken from company records, or 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.

The letter from [REDACTED] can be given minimal evidentiary weight and has little probative value as it does not provide basic information that is expressly required by 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). Specifically, the letter does not explain the origin of the information given and does not provide the address where the applicant resided during the period of his involvement with the temple. Instead, the letter refers generically to the applicant's attendance of religious ceremonies since January 1981. Given this lack of detail, the letter can be given minimal weight as evidence of the applicant's continuous residence or physical presence in the United States during the requisite period;

Although the applicant has submitted several letters and affidavits in support of his application, he has not provided any contemporaneous evidence of residence in the United States during the

duration of the requisite period. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. Although not required, none of the affidavits included any supporting documentation of the affiant's presence in the United States during the requisite period.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of the applicant's statements and application forms, in which he claims to have first entered the United States without inspection on December 12, 1980, and to have resided for the duration of the requisite period in California. As noted above, to meet his burden of proof, the applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his own testimony. The applicant has failed to do so. In this case, his assertions regarding his entry are not supported by any credible evidence in the record.

Having examined each piece of evidence, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, the AAO finds that the applicant has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence he entered into the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he resided continuously in an unlawful status for the requisite period.

The second issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden and establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he is admissible to the United States and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under the LIFE Act.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part, that:

- (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

The record reflects that the applicant obtained his employment authorization document and CSS class membership through payment of a bribe to a Legalization officer in the Stockton, California, Legalization Office. The application with the bribe payment attached was seized by the Office of Inspector General. The AAO finds that the documentation in the record supports the finding that the applicant is inadmissible under INA § 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Act for procuring documentation and another benefit under the Act by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact to immigration officials.

Therefore, based on the above, the applicant has failed to establish entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and continuous unlawful residence through May 4, 1988, as required under Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act. Furthermore, the applicant is inadmissible under INA § 212(a)(6)(C)(i). Given this, he is ineligible for permanent resident status under Section 1104 of the LIFE Act.



ORDER: The director's decision is affirmed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.