

identifying data deleted 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 02 213 60640

Office: NATIONAL BENEFITS CENTER

Date: MAR 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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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, National Benefits Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The district director denied the application because the applicant failed to demonstrate that he filed a claim for written class membership in the *Catholic Social Services, Inc. (CSS)*, *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULUC)*, or *Zambrano* legalization class action lawsuits.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that he was a participant in the class action lawsuits *CSS* and *LULAC*. He contends that the documents in support of his claim are not in his possession. The AAO has reviewed all of the evidence and has made a *de novo* decision based on the record and the AAO's assessment of the credibility, relevance and probative value of the evidence.¹

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act must establish that before October 1, 2000, he or she filed a written claim with the Attorney General for class membership in one of the following legalization class-action lawsuits: *Catholic Social Services, Inc. v. Meese*, vacated sub nom. *Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 43 (1993) ("*CSS*"), *League of United Latin American Citizens v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Reno v. Catholic Social Services, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 43 (1993) ("*LULAC*"), or *Zambrano v. INS*, vacated sub nom. *Immigration and Naturalization Services v. Zambrano*, 509 U.S. 918 (1993) ("*Zambrano*"). See section 1104(b) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. §245a.10.

The regulations provide an illustrative list of documents that an applicant may submit to establish that he or she filed a written claim for class membership before October 1, 2000. Those regulations also permit the submission of "[a]ny other relevant document(s)." See 8 C.F.R. §245a.14.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established that he filed a timely written claim for class membership. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden. The evidence in the record does not establish that the applicant applied for class membership in one of the previously mentioned legalization class action lawsuits. The applicant has failed to provide any Service documents which prove his claim for class membership was filed. On appeal, the applicant provides copies of previously submitted evidence. In the absence of additional evidence, the applicant has failed to prove that he filed a timely written claim with the Attorney General for class membership.

Based upon the foregoing, the applicant failed to demonstrate that he filed a claim for written class membership in the *Catholic Social Services, Inc. (CSS)*, *League of United Latin American Citizens*

¹ 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).

(LULUC), or *Zambrano* legalization class action lawsuits. 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.