

identifying data deleted to  
prevent identity information  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

L2

FILE:

MSC 02 009 62421

Office: SEATTLE

Date: APR 28 2009

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:

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.

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, Seattle, Washington, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988 as required by section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, the applicant reiterated his claim of residence in this country for the required period and asserted that he had submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate his residence in this country during the period in question.

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act must establish entry into the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

The applicant 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 under the provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), 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).

Although the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3) provides an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit in support of his or her claim of continuous residence in the United States in an unlawful status since prior to January 1, 1982 to May 4, 1988, the submission of any other relevant document including affidavits is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

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.* At 80. 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. *Id.*

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, 431 (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.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The applicant made a claim to class membership in a legalization class-action lawsuit and as such, was permitted to file a Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status Pursuant to Section 245A of the Act, on September 25, 1990. Subsequently, the applicant filed his Form I-485 LIFE Act application on October 9, 2001.

In support of his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period, the applicant submitted affidavits of residence, original receipts, an affidavit relating to the applicant’s absence from the United States in 1987, an original receipt for a bank check, an affidavit relating the applicant unsuccessful attempt to apply for legalization in the original application period, and original envelopes postmarked December 8, 1981, December 21, 1981, and September 23, 1985, respectively.

The director determined that the applicant failed to submit sufficient credible evidence demonstrating his residence in the United States in an unlawful status during the period in question and, therefore, denied the Form I-485 LIFE Act application on August 26, 2004.

The applicant’s remarks on appeal relating to the sufficiency of the evidence he submitted in support of his claim of continuous residence are noted. However, during the adjudication of the applicant’s appeal, information came to light that adversely affects the applicant’s overall credibility as well as the credibility of his claim of residence in this country from prior to January 1, 1982 to May 4, 1988. As has been previously discussed, the applicant submitted original envelopes postmarked December 8, 1981, December 21, 1981, and September 23, 1985. These original envelopes bear Indian postage stamps and were represented as having been mailed from India to the applicant at addresses he claimed as residences in this country on the date of each of the respective postmarks. A review of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* Volume 3 (Scott Publishing Company 2008), reveals the following regarding the postage stamps affixed to these envelopes:

- The envelope postmarked December 8, 1981, bears three of the same stamp each with a value of twenty-five paise that contains stylized illustrations of a farm, wheat, and a farmer on a tractor plowing. This stamp is listed at page 875 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED]. The catalogue lists this stamp’s date of issue as 1985.

- The envelopes December 21, 1981 bears a stamp with a value of one rupee and containing a portrait photograph of Mahatma Gandhi. A review of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* reveals that similar stamps were initially issued in two different sized versions (23mm X 29mm listed at page 869 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED] first issued in 1976 and 17mm X 20mm listed at page 869 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number 677 A410 first issued in 1978) both of which were valued at only twenty-five paise. Subsequent reissues of this type of stamp include a stamp with a value of thirty paise listed at page 875 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED] first issued in 1980, a stamp with a value of thirty-five paise listed at page 875 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED] first issued in 1980, and a stamp with a value of fifty paise listed at page 875 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED] first issued in 1983. The one rupee stamp depicting Mahatma Gandhi that is on the envelope submitted by the applicant in support of his claim of residence in this country for the requisite period is listed at page 877 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED]. The catalogue lists the date of issue for this one rupee stamp depicting Mahatma Gandhi as January 30, 1991. This envelope also bears a stamp with a value of ten rupees that contains a stylized illustration of a tiger from the Sundarbans Biosphere Reserve. This stamp is listed at page 904 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED]. The catalogue lists this stamp's date of issue as April 30, 2000.
- The envelope postmarked September 23, 1985, bears a stamp with a value of five paise that contains stylized illustrations of a Buddhist monument at Sanchi Stupa. This stamp is listed at page 893 of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED]. The catalogue lists this stamp's date of issue as April 4, 1994.

The fact that envelopes postmarked December 8, 1981, December 21, 1981, and September 23, 1985 bear postage stamps that were not issued until well after the date of these respective postmarks establishes that the applicant utilized documents in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations in an attempt to establish his residence within the United States for the requisite period. This derogatory information establishes that the applicant made material misrepresentations in asserting his claim of residence in the United States for the period in question and thus casts doubt on his eligibility for adjustment to permanent residence under the provisions of the LIFE Act. By engaging in such an action, the applicant has negated his own credibility, the credibility of his claim of continuous residence in this country for the requisite period, and the credibility of all documentation submitted in support of such claim.

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 visa petition. 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, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

The AAO issued a notice to the applicant and counsel on February 25, 2009 informing the parties that it was the AAO's intent to dismiss the applicant's appeal based upon the fact that he utilized the postmarked envelopes cited above in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations in an attempt to establish his residence within the United States for the requisite period. The parties were granted fifteen days to provide evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, these findings.

The record shows that as of the date of this decision, neither the applicant nor counsel has responded to the AAO's notice. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

The existence of derogatory information that establishes the applicant used postmarked envelopes in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations negates the credibility of the applicant's claim of residence in this country for the requisite period, as well as the credibility of the documents submitted in support of such claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e), 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 failed to submit sufficient credible documentation to meet his burden of proof in establishing that he has resided in the United States for the requisite period by a preponderance of the evidence as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e) and *Matter of E- M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989).

Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal or no probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988 as required under section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act. Because the applicant has failed to provide independent and objective evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, our finding that he submitted falsified documents, we affirm our finding of fraud. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act on this basis.

A finding of fraud is entered into the record, and the matter will be referred to the United States Attorney for possible prosecution as provided in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.21(c).

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