

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

L2

FILE:

MSC 02 233 61665

Office: NEW YORK Date:

FEB 03 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. 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.


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

The district director denied the application because the applicant had not demonstrated that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The director noted an inconsistency in the applicant's testimony and application.

On appeal the applicant asks that USCIS reconsider her application.

An applicant for permanent resident status 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. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

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).

An applicant must establish eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. 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 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 (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.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulations provide an illustrative list of contemporaneous documents that an applicant may submit to establish presence during the required period. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(b)(1); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L). Such evidence may include employment records, tax records, utility bills, school records, hospital or medical records, or attestations by churches, unions, or other organizations so long as certain information is included. The regulations also permit the submission of affidavits and any other relevant

document, but applications submitted with unverifiable documentation may be denied. Documentation that does not cover the required period is not relevant to a determination of the alien's presence during the required period and will not be considered or accorded any evidentiary weight in these proceedings.

On April 23, 2007, the director sent the applicant a Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), which stated that the evidence submitted by the applicant was insufficiently probative of continuous unlawful residence in the U.S. from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, and continuous physical presence in the U.S. from November 6, 1986 through May 4, 1988. The director specifically noted the fraudulent nature of the evidence in the record.

The applicant did not respond.

On June 26, 2007, the director denied the application because the applicant had failed to establish her continuous unlawful presence during the required period.

On appeal the applicant asks that USCIS reconsider her application.

Some of the documentation submitted by the applicant is for a period outside of the required period, and not relevant to this proceeding. Relevant to the period in question the applicant has only submitted third party statements. The statements, from [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] contain notary stamps implicated in a fraud scheme under Operation [REDACTED]. The presence of this documentation raises serious doubts about the credibility of the applicant's assertions and the remaining evidence submitted by the applicant.

As stated above, the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the *extent* of the documentation. The minimal evidence furnished cannot be considered extensive, and in such cases a negative inference regarding the claim may be made as stated in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e).

As noted by the director the application was prepared by an individual convicted of legalization fraud, and the investigation under operation [REDACTED] exposed the fraudulent nature of the notary stamps used on the applicant's submitted affidavits. In light of this counsel argues that the assertions of the affiant are not necessarily fraudulent, and support the applicant's eligibility. The troubling nature of this assertion aside, the AAO refuses to ignore the investigation which exposed these documents as fraudulent, and rejects these third party affidavits as credible evidence. Counsel's assertion that evidences exposed as counterfeit may still constitute credible evidence is inappropriate and legally improper.

Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may undermine the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988).

The applicant has failed to submit any evidence which explains her misrepresentations to USCIS, establishes her eligibility, and otherwise clarifies inconsistencies in her testimony. Going on

record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

Given the lack of credible supporting documentation and the inconsistencies noted in the record, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and maintained continuous, unlawful residence from such date through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. The applicant is, therefore, 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.