

identifying data related to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



L2

FILE:

MSC 02 248 64544

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date:

JAN 22 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. 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, Los Angeles, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The director denied the application based upon the determination that the applicant had 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the record contains sufficient evidence to support the applicant's claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period. Counsel includes several new affidavits and copies of previously submitted documents in support of the appeal.

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. Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 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).

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.

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. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

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

The applicant made a claim to class membership in a legalization class-action lawsuit and as such, was permitted to previously file a Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status Pursuant to Section 245A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), on or about March 12, 1990. Subsequently, on June 5, 2002, the applicant filed her Form I-485 LIFE Act application.

In support of her claim of continuous residence in this country since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted affidavits, letters, and photocopied pages from her Mexican passport.

In the notice of intent to deny issued on January 25, 2006, the director questioned the veracity of the applicant's claimed residence in the United States for the requisite period. Specifically, the director indicated that the applicant had submitted documents that do not establish that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988. The director noted that the applicant stated that after her arrival in the United States in 1981, she resided with friends at [REDACTED], Orange, California for seven years. However, the applicant submitted an affidavit from [REDACTED], stating that the applicant worked with her as a babysitter and housekeeper from July 1981 through October 1989, and the applicant was provided room and board at her residence at [REDACTED], Orange, California.

In her denial notice, dated April 1, 2006, the director denied the instant application based on the reasons stated in the NOID. The director noted that the applicant responded to the NOID but failed to overcome the reasons for denial as stated in the NOID.

The AAO has conducted a de novo review, evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence in the record according to its probative value and credibility as required by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(f).

The statements of counsel on appeal regarding the amount and sufficiency of the applicant's evidence of residence, as well as the significant and considerable passage of time have been considered. In this instance, the applicant submitted evidence, including contemporaneous documents, affidavits, and letters, which tends to corroborate her claim of residence in the United States during the requisite period. It is noted that the applicant provided a reasonable response which clarified the apparent discrepancy in her address cited by the director. Specifically, in her response to the NOID the applicant submitted an affidavit explaining that she worked as a live-in employee during the week (where she was provided with room and board) and she spent weekends with her husband. The record does not establish that the information in this evidence was inconsistent with the claims made on the application, or that it was false information. As stated in *Matter of E-M-*, when something is to be established by a preponderance of evidence, the proof submitted by the applicant has to establish only that the assertion or asserted claim is probably

true. *Id.* That decision also points out that, under the preponderance of evidence standard, an application may be granted even though some doubt remains regarding the evidence. The documents that have been furnished may be accorded substantial evidentiary weight and are sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof of residence in the United States for the requisite period.

The documentation provided by the applicant establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that she satisfies the statutory and regulatory criteria of entry into the United States before January 1, 1982, as well as continuous unlawful residence in the country during the ensuing time frame of January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for legalization under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. Consequently, the applicant has overcome the basis of denial cited by the district director.

Accordingly, the applicant's appeal will be sustained. The district director shall continue the adjudication of the application for permanent resident status.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.