



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



L2

MAY 30 2008

FILE: [Redacted] Office: NEW YORK Date:

MSC 02 117 63245

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:

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, New York, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) 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, the applicant states that he has never been to school, but he knows a little about United States history and government. The applicant requests another chance to meet the citizenship skills requirement.

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 23, 2004, the director notified the applicant that he had failed the first test of his citizenship skills, and that he was granted six months in which to prepare himself for a re-examination. 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, in his response to a NOID, would 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, regarding 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 [Secretary of Homeland Security]) 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 Secretary of Homeland Security may waive all or part of the above requirements for applicants who are at least 65 years of age or who are developmentally disabled. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(c).

An applicant may establish that he or she has met the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) by demonstrating an understanding of the English language, including an ability to read, write, and speak words in ordinary usage in the English language and by demonstrating a knowledge and understanding of the fundamentals of the history and of the principles and form of government of the United States. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(1) and 8 C.F.R. §§ 312.1 – 312.3.

An applicant may also establish that he or she has met the requirements of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act by providing a high school diploma or general educational development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2). The high school or GED diploma may be submitted either at the time of filing the Form I-485 LIFE Act application, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview. *Id.*

Finally, an applicant may also establish that he or she has met the requirements of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act by establishing that:

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. The applicant may submit certification on letterhead stationery from a state recognized, accredited learning institution either at the time of filing Form I-485, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview (the applicant's name and A-number must appear on any such evidence submitted).

8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3).

The record reflects that the applicant was interviewed twice in connection with his LIFE Act application, first on August 23, 2004, and again on April 8, 2005. 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).

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). Additionally, the applicant does not allege that he is attending or had attended a state recognized, accredited learning

institution in the United States with a course of study for a period of one academic year and a curriculum that includes at least 40 hours of instruction in English and United States history and government. Further, 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, documentation from a state recognized, accredited learning institution would have had to have been submitted to Citizenship and Immigration Services prior to or at the time of the applicant's second interview on April 8, 2005.

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.

The director also considered the applicant's eligibility for adjustment of status to that of a temporary resident pursuant to regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.6, and determined that he was also ineligible for adjustment to temporary resident status under section 245A of the Act, as in effect before enactment of section 1104 of the LIFE Act (part 245a, Subpart A). We concur with the director that the evidence of record does not establish the applicant's eligibility for adjustment of status pursuant of section 245A of the Act.

The record reflects that on April 19, 2005, the applicant filed a Form I-687 application pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreements reached in *Catholic Social Services, Inc., et al., v. Ridge, et al.*, CIV. NO. S-86-1343-LKK (E.D. Cal) January 23, 2004, and *Felicity Mary Newman, et al., v. United States Immigration and Citizenship Services, et al.*, CIV. NO. 87-4757-WDK (C.D. Cal) February 17, 2004, (CSS/Newman Settlement Agreements). The director denied the application on February 9, 2006, and the record does not reflect that the applicant has appealed the director's denial. We note that the director's decision was mailed to the applicant at an incorrect address, and the letter was returned as undeliverable by the United States Postal Service

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