

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2



FILE: MSC 01 353 60924 Office: NEW YORK Date: FEB 26 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).

IN BEHALF OF APPLICANT:  
[Redacted]

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, 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 had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he entered the United States on January 10, 1981 as a crewman and since that date has continuously resided in the United States. The applicant submits copies of documents that were previously provided in support of his appeal.

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).

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 issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

In an attempt to establish continuous unlawful residence since before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988, the applicant provided the following evidence:

- An affidavit from [REDACTED] of Quebec, Canada, who attested to the applicant's visit from July 23, 1987 to August 21, 1987.
- A letter dated January 16, 1993, from [REDACTED] secretary of Muslim Community Center of Brooklyn, Inc. in Brooklyn, New York, who indicated that the applicant has been participating in Friday congregations since 1982.
- Affidavits from [REDACTED] a general contractor in Brooklyn, New York, who attested to the applicant's Brooklyn residences at [REDACTED] from January 1981 to December 1985 and at [REDACTED] since January 1986, and who indicated that the applicant was in his employ as a construction worker from 1981 to 1986.
- An affidavit from [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] Brooklyn, New York, who indicated that the applicant resided with him from 1981 to December 1985.
- Affidavits from [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] Brooklyn, New York, who indicated that the applicant has been residing with him since 1986. The affiant attested to the applicant's absence from the United States from July 23, 1987 to August 21, 1987.
- An affidavit from [REDACTED] a general contractor in Brooklyn, New York, who indicated that the applicant has been employed by his company since 1987.

On August 3 2007, the director issued a Notice of Intent to Deny, which advised the applicant that he had provided no evidence of his January 10, 1981 entry as a crewman at the Baltimore (Maryland) port of entry. The applicant was also advised that the affidavits submitted appeared to be neither credible nor amenable to verification and that no evidence was submitted demonstrating that the affiants had direct personal knowledge of the events testified in their respective affidavits.

The applicant, in response, asserted that he has been residing in the United States since 1981 and submits copies of previously submitted affidavits along with:

- Affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of Brooklyn, New York, who attested to the applicant's Brooklyn residences at [REDACTED] from January 1981 to December 1985 and at [REDACTED] from January 1986 to February 1999.
- An additional affidavit from [REDACTED], who attested to the applicant's Brooklyn residences at [REDACTED] from January 1981 to December 1985 and at [REDACTED] since January 1986.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has determined that affidavits from third party individuals may be considered as evidence of continuous residence. *See Matter of E-- M--*, *supra*. In ascertaining the evidentiary weight of such affidavits, USCIS must determine the basis for the affiant's knowledge of the information to which he is attesting; and whether the statement is plausible, credible, and consistent both internally and with the other evidence of record. *Id.*

Following the dicta set forth in *Matter of E-- M--*, *supra*, the affidavits would not necessarily be fatal to the applicant's claim, if the affidavits upon which the claim relies are consistent both internally and with the other evidence of record, plausible, credible, and if the affiant sets forth the basis of his knowledge for the testimony provided. The statements issued by the applicant have been considered. However, the AAO does not view the documents discussed above as substantive enough to support a finding that the applicant entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and resided since that date through May 4, 1988.

The employment affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] failed to include the applicant's address at the time of employment as required under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i). Under the same regulations, the affiants also failed to 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 letter from [REDACTED] has little evidentiary weight or probative value as it does not conform to the basic requirements specified in 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v). Most importantly, the affiant does not explain the origin of the information to which he attests. In addition, the applicant did not list any association with clubs or organizations during the requisite period at item 34 on his Form I-687 application.

The remaining affiants failed to provide any details regarding the nature of their relationship with the applicant or the basis for their continuing awareness of the applicant's residence. The absence of sufficiently detailed documentation to corroborate the applicant's claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of his claim.

Doubt cast on any aspect of an applicant's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence. It is incumbent upon an 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 (BIA 1988).

The evaluation of the applicant's claim is a factor on both the quality and quantity of the evidence provided. While affidavits in certain cases can effectively meet the preponderance of evidence standard, the affidavits submitted by the applicant are lacking in probative value and evidentiary weight and, therefore, the applicant has not met his burden of proof. The applicant has not established, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in this country in an unlawful status continuously from before January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988, as required under 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b). Given this, the applicant is ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

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).

Accompanying the Form I-485 application, is a Form G-325A, Biographic Information, signed by the applicant on September 10, 2001. The applicant indicated on his Form G-325A that he resided in his native country, Bangladesh, from August 1986 to August 1987.

This factor further raises serious questions regarding the authenticity of the supporting documents submitted with the LIFE application and tends to establish that the applicant utilized the affidavits in a fraudulent manner in an attempt to support his claim of *continuous* residence in the United States. The Form G-325A undermines the credibility of the applicant's claim to have *continuously* resided in the United States during the period in question and, therefore, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status from prior to January 1, 1982, through May 4, 1988, as required.

The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for dismissal.

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