



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

L2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

MSC 02 250 65629

Office: BUFFALO

Date: **MAY 12 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. The file has been returned to the National Benefits Center. 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, Buffalo, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

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

On appeal, the applicant states that the record demonstrates her eligibility, and therefore, her application should be approved. The applicant submits additional evidence on appeal.

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 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 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).

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.

In the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), the director stated that the applicant failed to submit evidence demonstrating her continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period. The director also noted that the applicant submitted a questionable employment letter, because it indicates that the applicant was employed at age 13 years when she was still a minor. The director also noted that the applicant stated that she departed the United States on December 22, 1985, and returned on January 20, 1986, but she failed to submit reliable evidence of her trip. In addition, the director noted that the applicant submitted a Form I-94 the authenticity of which could not be verified because it was illegible and the applicant did not provide the original. The director granted the applicant thirty (30) days to submit additional evidence.

As noted by the director in his denial notice, the record reflects that the applicant responded to the NOID. The director, however, determined that the applicant failed to overcome the grounds for denial stated in the NOID. In the Notice of Decision, dated July 10, 2006, the director denied the instant application based on the reasons stated in the NOID. The director noted that the applicant failed to establish that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period.

As noted by the director, the applicant stated that she first entered the United States in 1981, and that she departed the United States and traveled to Nigeria on December 22, 1985 to visit her family and returned on January 20, 1986, with a visa. It is noted that the record reflects that in a LULAC Class Member declaration, dated April 9, 1990, and on Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability, Form I-690, dated April 3, 1990, the applicant also stated that she departed the United States and traveled to Nigeria on December 22, 1985, and returned on January 20, 1986, with a B-2 non-immigrant visa which she obtained in Nigeria in January 1986, and she subsequently violated her non-immigrant status when she worked without authorization. It is noted that in order to receive such a visa, the applicant had to convince a U.S. consular official that she resided and worked in Nigeria. Therefore, the applicant cannot establish that she resided in the United States in an unlawful status since January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

As also noted by the director, in support of her claim that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted a Form I-94 which could not be verified because it contained questionable information. Specifically, the date of birth on the I-94 appears to be March 3, 1967, while the applicant documents indicate that her date of birth is March 3, 1968. Also, the I-94 indicates that the individual who was issued the card boarded the airplane in Argentina, not in Lagos, Nigeria.

On appeal, the applicant reasserts that she entered the United States in 1981 when she was 12 years old as an unaccompanied minor. She states that she transited from Lagos, Nigeria, through Argentina, and someone assisted her in filling out the Form I-94. The applicant, however, does not submit any reliable contemporaneous documentation in support of her claimed entry date.

The applicant has failed to submit sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period. The discrepancies in the applicant's claimed entry date, and the record of evidence cast considerable doubt on the applicant's claim that she resided in the United States since 1981. The applicant has submitted affidavits from individuals attesting to knowing the applicant in the United States since 1981. As noted above, the issuance of the applicant's U.S. non-immigrant visa in January 1986, is inconsistent with her claim that she resided in the United States in an unlawful status since 1981. Doubt cast on any aspect of the applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the application. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988). The applicant has failed to submit any objective evidence to explain or justify the discrepancies in the record. Therefore, the reliability of the remaining evidence offered by the applicant is suspect and it must be concluded that the applicant has failed to establish that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period.

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. Given this, she is ineligible for permanent resident status under Section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

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