



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

L2

FILE:

MSC 02 185 61328

Office: Los Angeles

Date:

FEB 04 2006

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.

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, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The district director denied the application because the applicant had failed to establish residence in the United States in an unlawful status from January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant contended that she had submitted sufficient evidence to support her claim of continuous residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988 to Citizenship and Immigration Services or CIS (formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Service). The applicant requested a copy of the record of proceedings and indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days of compliance with this request.

The record shows that CIS complied with this request and mailed a copy of the record to the applicant on March 16, 2006. The record reflects that counsel subsequently submitted a brief that will be incorporated into the applicant's appeal. The record further shows that counsel requested a copy of the record as well and that the AAO complied with this request and mailed a copy of the record to counsel on September 6, 2007.

An applicant for permanent resident status 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 and through May 4, 1988. Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

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 under the provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), 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).

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 to May 4, 1988, the submission of any other relevant document including affidavits is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

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 petitioner 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 or petition.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to establish 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. Here, the submitted evidence is relevant, probative, and credible.

The applicant made a claim to class membership in a legalization class-action lawsuit and as such, was permitted to file a Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status Pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), on or about October 18, 1991. Subsequently, on April 4, 2002, the applicant filed her Form I-485 LIFE Act application.

In support of her claim of continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted a doctor’s certificate, photocopied money order claims receipts, a photocopied purchaser’s receipt for a money order, letters, employment affidavits, a statement of earnings and deductions, receipts from a dairy, affidavits of residence, and tax returns.

On July 19, 2004, the district director issued a notice of intent to deny to the applicant informing her of CIS’s intent to deny her application because she failed to submit sufficient evidence of continuous unlawful residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The applicant was granted thirty days to respond to the notice.

In response, the applicant submitted a rebuttal statement and copies of previously submitted documents.

The district director determined that the applicant failed to submit sufficient credible evidence demonstrating her residence in the United States in an unlawful status from January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, and, therefore, denied the Form I-485 LIFE Act application on December 27, 2004.

The statements of counsel on appeal have been considered. It is noted that the applicant provided two affidavits and eight declarations in support of her claim of residence subsequent to the filing of her appeal. In this instance, the applicant submitted evidence, including affidavits, letters, and

contemporaneous documents, which tends to corroborate her claim of residence in the United States during the requisite period. The district director has not sufficiently established that the information in this evidence was inconsistent with the claims made on the application, or that it was false information. As stated in *Matter of E-M-*, when something is to be established by a preponderance of evidence, the proof submitted by the applicant has to establish only that the assertion or asserted claim is probably true. *Id.* That decision also points out that, under the preponderance of evidence standard, an application may be granted even though some doubt remains regarding the evidence. The documents that have been furnished may be accorded substantial evidentiary weight and are sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof of residence in the United States for the requisite period.

The documentation provided by the applicant establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that she satisfies the statutory and regulatory criteria of entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, as well as continuous unlawful residence in the country during the ensuing time frame of January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for legalization under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. Consequently, the applicant has overcome the basis of denial cited by the district director.

Accordingly, the applicant's appeal will be sustained. The district director shall continue the adjudication of the application for permanent resident status.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.