

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, D.C. 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L-2

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 01 299 60297

Office: NEW YORK

Date: **MAY 02 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.

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

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

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant was given only one test of his citizenship skills. Counsel submits no additional documentation in support of the appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b) provides 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 six months (or earlier at the request of the applicant) to pass the tests or submit evidence as described in paragraphs (a)(2) or (a)(3) of this section.

The record reflects that on August 30, 2004, the director notified the applicant that he had failed the first test of his citizenship skills, and that he was scheduled for another test on March 5, 2005. The Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) informed the applicant that “[f]ailure to appear for your final re-examination will result in the denial of your application based solely on 8 C.F.R. 245a.17(b).” The record further reflects that the applicant appeared for his scheduled interview.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.20(a)(2) provides that when an adverse decision is proposed, Citizenship and Immigration Services shall notify the applicant of its intent to deny the application and the basis for the proposed denial. The applicant will be granted 30 days from the date of the notice in which to respond to the notice of intent to deny.

The Notice of Decision (NOD) informed the applicant that his application was denied “for the reasons stated, in the Notice of Intent to Deny.” However, the only basis for the proposed denial stated in the NOID was for failure to appear for a second interview. As the applicant attended his scheduled second interview, he overcame the proposed ground for denial set forth in the NOID. However, it is clear that the basis of the director’s denial was the applicant’s failure to satisfy the basic citizenship skills requirement of the LIFE Act. The record does not reflect that, prior to issuing her NOD denying the application for this reason, the director issued a NOID advising the applicant of the reasons for her subsequent proposed denial of his application. Nonetheless, we find that the director’s failure to issue a NOID notifying the applicant that the application would be denied because he failed the second civics exam constitutes harmless error. The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. 557(b) (“On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule.”); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO’s *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). As discussed below, the applicant would, in his response to a NOID, be unable to cure the deficiency regarding his eligibility based on his failure of the civics exam.

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 above requirements for aliens who are at least 65 years of age or developmentally disabled.

The applicant, who was 44 years old at the time he took the basic citizenship skills test and provided no evidence to establish that he 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 he does not meet the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the 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).

The record reflects that the applicant was interviewed twice in connection with his LIFE Act application, first on April 1, 2004, and again on October 22, 2004. On both occasions, the applicant failed to demonstrate a minimal understanding of English and minimal knowledge of United States history and government. Furthermore, the applicant has not provided evidence of having passed a standardized citizenship test, as permitted by 8 C.F.R. § 312.3(a)(1).

Counsel asserts on appeal that the applicant’s first interview consisted of questions regarding his entry and residence in the United States, and that the applicant was not administered a civics test. The record reflects that during his first interview, the applicant was unable to understand the questions posed to him on history and government. Therefore, the interviewing officer did not administer the reading and writing portions of the test. The applicant’s failure to understand and to respond to the questions asked of him constituted his first failure of the civics exam.

The applicant, however, could still meet the basic citizenship skills requirement under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(II) of the LIFE Act, if he met one of the criteria defined in 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.17(a)(2) and (3). In part, an applicant must establish that he meets the following under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17:

- (2) has a high school diploma or general educational development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States; or
- (3) has attended, or is attending, a state recognized, accredited learning institution in the United States, and that institution certifies such attendance.

The record does not reflect that the applicant has 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 submitted a June 19, 2001, letter from [REDACTED] Inc., stating that the applicant had been enrolled

in English as a second language class with the organization since May 28, 2001. The letter from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] nc. does not provide any confirmation that it is a state recognized, accredited learning institution, and has a course content that includes any instruction on United States history and government as required by 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(3). The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3) requires that the applicant submit certification on letterhead stationery from a state recognized, accredited learning institution either at the time of filing the Form I-485, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview. In the instant case, therefore, documentation from a state recognized, accredited learning institution would have had to be submitted to Citizenship and Immigration Services prior to, or at the time of, the applicant's second interview on October 22, 2003.

As previously discussed, the applicant failed to meet the "basic citizenship skills" requirement of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act because at neither of his two interviews did he demonstrate a minimal understanding of the English language.

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 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.