

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2

FILE:

MSC 01 284 60080

Office: GARDEN CITY

Date: **MAR 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, Garden City, 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 since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988 as required by section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act.

On appeal, counsel reiterated the applicant's claim of residence in this country since 1981. Counsel asserted that the applicant submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period. Counsel included copies of previously submitted documents as well as new documentation 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).

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 Immigration and Nationality Act (Act), on May 7, 1990. Subsequently, the applicant filed his Form I-485 LIFE Act application on July 11, 2001.

In support of his claim of continuous residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, the applicant submitted affidavits attesting to the applicant’s absence from this country in 1987, employment affidavits, affidavits of residence, photocopied receipts, a Form W-2, Wage and Tax Statement, and photocopied envelopes five of which contain indiscernible postmarks with the remaining envelopes postmarked July 12, 1981, June 14, 1982, December 12, 1984, and May 8, 1986, respectively.

The director determined that the applicant failed to submit sufficient evidence demonstrating his residence in the United States in an unlawful status from prior to January 1, 1982. Therefore, the director concluded that the applicant was ineligible to adjust to temporary residence and denied the Form I-485 LIFE Act application on August 9, 2008.

Counsel’s remarks on appeal relating to the sufficiency of the evidence submitted by the applicant 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. As noted above, the applicant provided photocopied envelopes postmarked July 12, 1981, June 14, 1982, December 12, 1984, and May 8, 1986, in support of his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period. These postmarked envelopes bear Indian postage stamps and were represented as having been mailed from India to the applicant at addresses that 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:

- The photocopied envelope postmarked July 12, 1981 bears two 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 photocopied envelope postmarked December 12, 1984 bears two of the same stamp each with a value of forty paise that commemorates the telecommunications industry. The stamp contains stylized illustrations of a television, a broadcast antennae, and a satellite dish. This stamp is listed at page 877 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 October 15, 1988.

The fact that envelopes postmarked July 12, 1981 and December 12, 1984 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 since prior to January 1, 1982. This derogatory information 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 January 21, 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 applicant and counsel were granted fifteen days to provide substantial 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 submitted a response to the AAO's notice. Therefore, the record must be considered complete.

The existence of derogatory information that establishes the applicant used the postmarked envelope in a fraudulent manner and made material misrepresentations seriously undermines 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.