


**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2



FILE:



Office: CHICAGO

Date:

**JUN 03 2008**

MSC 02 252 61616

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

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, Chicago, Illinois, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The district director denied the application because the applicant failed to demonstrate that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status from then through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant submits a brief statement requesting that his file be reviewed.

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 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 states 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.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provide an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit. While affidavits “may” be accepted as “other relevant documentation” [See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L)] in support of the applicant’s claim, the regulations do not suggest that such evidence alone is necessarily sufficient to establish the applicant’s unlawful continuous residence during the requisite time period.

In a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), dated May 19, 2004, the district director determined that the applicant had failed to submit sufficient evidence demonstrating his continuous unlawful residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988. In a Notice of Decision (NOD), dated May 11, 2006, the district director denied the application based on the reasons stated in the NOID.

The issue in the proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to establish that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status from then through May 4, 1988.

In an attempt to establish his continuous unlawful residence since before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988, the applicant provided the following evidence throughout the application process:

1. Affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] - all of Chicago, Illinois - attesting to the applicant’s presence in the United States since in or after 1981. Attempts by Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) to contact these individuals were unsuccessful.
2. A letter, dated November 28, 1990, from [REDACTED], President of Bethlehem Services Co., Chicago, Illinois, stating that the applicant had been employed temporarily since 1984.
3. A letter, dated February 118, 2003, from [REDACTED], Pastor of St. Pius V Parish, Chicago, Illinois, stating that the applicant had been a member of the parish since 1986.
4. A letter, dated February 18, 2003, from [REDACTED], of Chicago, Illinois, stating that the applicant had been a customer at her grocery store since 1986.

The applicant also submitted the following additional documentation that does not cover the relevant time period: envelopes, addressed both to and from him, postmarked on or after November 1988; money order receipts, dated in or after 1989; employment pay receipts, dated in and after 1989; and, a letter, dated February 3, 2003, from [REDACTED], of AH Financial, Chicago, Illinois, stating that he has known the applicant since June 1995.

In summary, the applicant has provided no employment letters that comply with the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i)(A) through (F), no utility bills according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(ii), no school records according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. §

245a.2(d)(3)(iii), and no hospital or medical records according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(iv). The applicant also has not provided documentation (including, for example, money order receipts, passport entries, children's birth certificates, bank book transactions, letters of correspondence, a Social Security card, or automobile, contract, and insurance documentation) according to the guidelines set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(A) through (I) and (K) that cover the relevant time period. The documentation provided by the applicant consists solely of third-party affidavits ("other relevant documentation") from affiants who could not be contacted (No. 1, above), and documentation regarding his presence in the United States in or after 1984.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e) provides that "[a]n alien applying for adjustment of status under [section 1104 of the LIFE Act] has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he or she has resided in the United States for the requisite periods." Preponderance of the evidence is defined as "evidence which as a whole shows that the fact sought to be proved is more probable than not." Black's Law Dictionary 1064 (5<sup>th</sup> ed. 1979). See *Matter of Lemhammad*, 20 I&N Dec. 316, 320, Note 5 (BIA 1991).

The absence of verifiable documentation to support the applicant's claim of continuous residence during the relevant period detracts from the credibility of his claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification.

The applicant has not established, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in this country in an unlawful status continuously since that time through May 4, 1988, as required under 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b). Thus, he is ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

It is noted that, beyond the decision of the district director, the applicant has also failed to submit proof of his identity pursuant to 8 C.F.R. §245a.2(d)(1).

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