

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

L2

FILE:

MSC 02 359 60058

Office: NEW YORK Date:

JUN 02 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).

IN 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, 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, counsel asserts that based upon the long delay of the director in processing the application, the director should be estopped from arguing that the affidavits could not be verified. Counsel asserts that the applicant has submitted sufficient documentation establishing continuous residence in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. Counsel provides copies of previously submitted documents in support of the 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 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).

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 several affidavits of residences, postmarked metered envelopes, letters of membership, a letter attesting to a 1987 departure from the United States and two employment affidavits.

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 October 30, 2007.

Counsel's statements on appeal relating to the sufficiency of the evidence the applicant had submitted in support of his claim of continuous residence have been considered. However, the AAO does not view the documents discussed above as substantive enough to support a finding that the applicant *continuously* resided in the United States during the requisite period, as he has presented contradictory and inconsistent documents, which undermines his credibility.

Item 35 of the Form I-687 application requests the applicant to list all absences from the United States since entry. The applicant indicated on his Form for Determination of Class Membership and his Form I-687 application to have been only absent from the United States from May 1987 to June 1987 to visit his ailing mother.

The record, however, contains three Forms G-325A, Biographic Information, signed April 26, 2002, July 20, 2004 and May 8, 2007. On each form, the applicant indicated that he was married in Bangladesh on July 28, 1985.

The applicant's failure to disclose this absence from the United States on his Form I-687 application is a strong indication that the applicant was not in the United States during this period or may have been outside the United States beyond the period of time allowed by regulation.

According to the interviewing officer's notes, the applicant indicated that he was married over the phone. Except for his own statement, the applicant does not provide any independent, corroborative, contemporaneous evidence to support his statement. Simply 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)).

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 inconsistencies in the evidence raise serious questions regarding the authenticity of the supporting documents submitted with the LIFE application and tend to establish that the applicant utilized the affidavits and letters in a fraudulent manner in an attempt to support his claim of *continuous* residence in the United States during the requisite period. The Forms G-325A undermine 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 under section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and the regulation, 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.11(b) and 15(c)(1). Therefore, the applicant 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.