

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

L2

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:


MSC 03 182 62958

Office: NEW YORK

Date: JAN 11 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. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. If your appeal was sustained, or if the matter 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, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The director denied the application because the applicant had failed to establish that she satisfied the “basic citizenship skills” required under section 1104(c)(2)(E) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant requests reconsideration for the denial, noting that the applicant was nervous at the time the tests were administered. Counsel claims that the applicant is currently prepared to retake the test, and requests approval of the application for humanitarian reasons. No additional evidence is submitted.¹

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act (“Basic Citizenship Skills”), an applicant for permanent resident status must demonstrate that he or she:

- (I) meets the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a))(relating to minimal understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States); or
- (II) is satisfactorily pursuing a course of study (recognized by the Attorney General) to achieve such an understanding of English and such a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States.

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act, the Attorney General may waive all or part of the requirements for aliens who are at least 65 years of age or developmentally disabled.

The applicant, who was 56 years old at the time she took the basic citizenship skills test and provided no evidence to establish that she was developmentally disabled, does not qualify for either of the exceptions in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act. Further, the applicant does not satisfy the “basic citizenship skills” requirement of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act because she does not meet the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act). An applicant can demonstrate that he or she meets the requirements of section 312(a) of the Act by “[s]peaking and understanding English during the course of the interview for permanent resident status” and answering questions based on the subject matter of approved citizenship training materials, or “[b]y passing a standardized section 312 test . . . by the Legalization Assistance Board with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) or the California State Department of Education with the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS).” 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.3(b)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2).

¹ On Form I-290B, counsel indicated that he would be sending a brief and/or additional evidence to the AAO within 30 days. However, no additional documentation is contained in the record. On December 18, 2007, a fax was sent to counsel which requested that he forward a copy of the documentation, if any, he had submitted in support of the appeal. As of the date of this decision, no response was received and no additional evidence was submitted. Therefore, the record as it currently stands will be deemed complete for purposes of adjudication of the appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b) states that:

An applicant who fails to pass the English literacy and/or the United States history and government tests at the time of the interview, shall be afforded a second opportunity after 6 months (or earlier at the request of the applicant) to pass the tests or submit evidence as described in paragraphs (a)(2) and (a)(3) of this section [8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3)]. The second interview shall be conducted prior to the denial of the application for permanent residence and may be based solely on the failure to pass the basic citizenship skills requirements.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b), the applicant was afforded two interviews in connection with her LIFE Act application, on April 16, 2004 and again on September 30, 2005. On both occasions, the applicant was unable to demonstrate an understanding of ordinary English. Specifically, the applicant failed both the English language and U.S. government/history portions of the test during both interviews. The applicant did not provide evidence of having passed a standardized citizenship test, as permitted by 8 C.F.R. § 312.3(a)(1).

In the alternative, an applicant can satisfy the basic citizenship skills requirement by demonstrating compliance with section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(II) of the LIFE Act, if he or she meets one of the criteria defined in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3). In part, an applicant must establish that he or she meets the following under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17:

- (2) He or she has a high school diploma or general education development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States; or
- (3) He or she has attended, or is attending, a state recognized, accredited learning institution in the United States, and that institution certifies such attendance. The course of study at such learning institution must be for a period of one academic year (or the equivalent thereof according to the standards of the learning institution) and the curriculum must include at least 40 hours of instruction in English and United States history and government.

On April 16, 2004, a notice of intent to deny (NOID) was mailed to the applicant notifying her of the basic citizenship skills requirements. The exceptions to these requirements were clearly stated, and the applicant was afforded an opportunity to respond to the notice with evidence in support of her eligibility. No response was submitted, and no additional evidence was presented at the time of the second interview.

The applicant does not have a high school diploma or a GED from a United States school, and therefore does not satisfy the regulatory requirement of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2). The applicant also has not demonstrated that she attended, or was attending, a state recognized, accredited learning institution in the United States that provides a course of study for a period of one academic year (or the equivalent thereof according to the standards of the learning institution) with curriculum including at least 40 hours of instruction in English and United States history and government as allowed under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3).

As previously discussed, aside from counsel's brief statements in support of the application, no additional evidence in support of the applicant's eligibility is submitted on appeal. The statements of counsel are insufficient to overcome the basis for director's denial in this matter.

Therefore, the applicant does not satisfy either alternative of the "basic citizenship skills" requirement set forth in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act. Accordingly, the AAO will not disturb the director's decision that the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

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