

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



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

**PUBLIC COPY**

[REDACTED]

L2

FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC 02 178 60028

Office: NEW YORK

Date: **APR 06 2009**

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. 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.

  
John F. Grissom, Acting Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the Director, New York, New York. A subsequent appeal was rejected by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter will be reopened *sua sponte* by the Chief, AAO. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant had failed to demonstrate her understanding of U.S. history and English as required under section 1104(c)(2)(E) of the LIFE Act. The record reflects that the applicant appeared for interviews twice, on April 28, 2004, and on October 29, 2004. However, at both interviews the applicant failed to demonstrate her understanding of U.S. history and English.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant has met the citizenship skills requirement. Counsel states that at her interview the applicant misspelled words; however, the misspelling of a few words should not prevent the applicant from satisfying the citizenship skills requirements. No additional evidence was submitted on appeal.

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 is neither 65 years old nor developmentally disabled, does not qualify for either of the exceptions in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act. Nor does she 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).

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. The “citizenship skills” requirement

of the section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(II) is defined by regulation in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3). As specified therein, an applicant for LIFE Legalization must establish that:

He or she has a high school diploma or general education development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States . . . . 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2), or

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 . . . . 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3).

Both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2) and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3) specify that applicants must submit evidence to show compliance with the basic citizenship skills requirement “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 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 interviewed on two occasions in connection with her LIFE Act application, on April 28, 2004, and again on October 29, 2004. On both occasions, the applicant failed to demonstrate a minimal understanding of ordinary English and knowledge of civics and history of the United States. The applicant does not dispute this on appeal. Counsel however asserts that at her interview the applicant misspelled words, but that the misspelling of a few words should not prevent the applicant from satisfying the citizenship skills requirements. The applicant did not provide evidence of having passed a standardized citizenship test, as permitted by 8 C.F.R. § 312.3(a)(1). 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).

Contrary to counsel’s assertion, there is no exception for misspelling of basic English words. The applicant has not provided evidence that she has attended or is attending a course of study at an approved institution for a period of one academic year (or the equivalent thereof according to the standards of the learning institution) as required under the provisions of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3).

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.

Beyond the decision of the director, the applicant has not established that she resided in the United States in a continuous unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required by section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act.

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.

The applicant has failed to furnish sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that she continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period. The applicant submitted evidence, including letters and affidavits as evidence to support her Form I-485 application. The AAO has reviewed the entire record. **Here, the submitted evidence is neither probative, nor credible.**

#### Employment Letters

The applicant submitted the following:

1. A letter of employment, from [REDACTED], located at [REDACTED] dated January 8, 1984, stating that the applicant had been employed since 1981. The letter, however, does not specify the capacity in which the applicant was employed as it only states that the applicant was employed "as maintenance."
2. A letter of employment, from [REDACTED] dated August 30, 1989, stating that the applicant had been his housekeeper from August 1985 to May 1986.
3. Two letters of employment, from [REDACTED] located at [REDACTED] dated September 7, 1989, and November 1, 1991, respectively. In her September 7, 1989, letter [REDACTED] states that the applicant had been employed since July 1986. In her November 1, 1991 letter, however, [REDACTED] states that the applicant has been employed since November 5, 1986. Also, the letters do not indicate the capacity in which the applicant had been employed.

It is noted however, that the letters failed to provide the applicant's address at the time of employment. Also, the letters failed to show periods of layoff, 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 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). The letters, therefore, are not probative as they do not conform to the regulatory requirements.

The applicant has submitted questionable documentation. In an attempt to establish her continuous residence in the United States, the applicant provided several affidavits and letters. These documents, however, are not credible as they lack consistency. For example, the applicant indicated

on her Form I-687 application that she first entered the United States on June 21, 1981, however, she provided an affidavit from [REDACTED] who attests that he has known the applicant to have resided in the United States since May 1981. It is noted that in his affidavit, [REDACTED] specifies that the applicant resided at [REDACTED], from May 1981 to November 1986. Also, a notarized letter from [REDACTED] states that the applicant came to Texas on June 25, 1981. It is also noted, however, that the applicant indicated on her Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status, filed on June 2, 1999, that she entered the United States on November 25, 1981.

These discrepancies cast considerable doubt on whether the applicant's claim that she has been in the United States since 1981 is true, and whether the affidavits and letters that the applicant submitted in support of her claimed residence are genuine. The applicant has failed to submit any reliable independent, corroborative, contemporaneous evidence to rebut the contradicting evidence in the record. 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.

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. Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that she has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988.

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. For this additional reason, 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.