



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
**PUBLIC COPY**

L2



FILE:



Office: GARDEN CITY

Date: **MAR 12 2009**

MSC 02 246 61909

IN RE:



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. 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 submitted a statement from the applicant in which he reiterated his claim of residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982 and asserted that he had submitted sufficient evidence in support of such claim. Counsel included additional 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 Act, on March 8, 1991. Subsequently, the applicant filed his Form I-485 LIFE Act application on June 3, 2002.

In support of his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period, the applicant submitted an affidavit of residence, an employment letter, affidavits relating to the applicant’s purported absence from this country in 1987, and original envelopes postmarked the fifteenth day of an indeterminate month in 1981 and September 28, 1982.

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 September 7, 2007.

The applicant’s remarks on appeal relating to the sufficiency of the evidence submitted 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 to May 4, 1988. As has been previously discussed, the applicant submitted original envelopes postmarked the fifteenth day of an indeterminate month in 1981 and September 28, 1982. The envelopes bear Indian postage stamps and were represented as having been mailed from India to the applicant at an address in this country that he claimed as his residence as of the date of these respective postmarks. A review of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue Volume 3* (Scott Publishing Company 2008), reveals the following regarding the postage stamps affixed to these envelopes:

- The envelope postmarked on the fifteenth day of an indeterminate month in 1981 contains three of the same stamp that is valued at fifty paise, commemorates the Indian dairy industry, and depicts a woman carrying a jar on her head, dairy cows, and milk containers. 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 the date of issue for this stamp as January 25, 1982.

- The envelopes postmarked on the fifteenth day of an indeterminate month in 1981 and September 28, 1982 both contain one of same stamp with a value of twenty-five paise that contain 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 fact that envelopes postmarked the fifteenth day of an indeterminate month in 1981 and September 28, 1982 bear postage stamps that were not issued until 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 for the requisite period. This derogatory information establishes that the applicant made material misrepresentations in asserting his claim of residence in the United States for the period in question and thus 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 29, 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 parties were granted fifteen days to provide evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, these findings.

In response, both the applicant and counsel submitted statements objecting to the findings relating to the envelopes cited within the AAO's notice of January 29, 2009. Specifically, the parties object to the AAO's reliance upon the *Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as a basis of authority regarding postage stamps because it is not an official Indian government source but is instead published by a private company. It is acknowledged that the *Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* is published by a private company, Scott Publishing Co, a subsidiary of Amos Press Inc. A review of the Amos Press Inc., internet website at <http://www.amospress.com/History.aspx> reveals the following:

In 1984 Amos Publishing became the world's largest philatelic publisher with the purchase of Scott Publishing Company. Scott is the most recognized name in

stamp collecting and is both a publisher and merchandiser of stamp related products. The internationally renowned, 8-volume *Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* is produced annually to assist collectors in valuing and identifying their stamp holdings. A monthly magazine is also produced under the Scott name which provides collectors with entertaining and informative feature articles along with the very latest new stamp issues from around the world.

While the *Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* is privately published, it is considered to be so authoritative on the subject of postage stamps and philately (stamp collecting) that the United States Postal Service has adopted the *Scott* Numbering System as its own for identification purposes of all postage stamps issued by the United States. Further, recent editions of the *Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* are maintained at the reference desks of a large number of public libraries in the United States because the catalogue is considered to be an authoritative resource source on the subject of postage stamps and philately.

Both applicant and counsel assert that the applicant did not commit fraud as he was not the person who placed the stamps on the envelopes and mailed them from India, the Indian government applied the postmarks to the envelopes, the envelopes passed through “normal U.S. postal channels from India,” and were delivered to the applicant at his residence in the United States on the dates of the postmarks. However, neither counsel nor the applicant has offered an explanation as to how all of these occurrences transpired in light of the fact that envelopes postmarked the fifteenth day of an indeterminate month in 1981 and September 28, 1982 both bear postage stamps that were not issued by the Indian government until after the date of these respective postmarks. In addition, neither counsel nor the applicant provided any evidence to support these assertions. Moreover, it was the applicant himself who included the envelopes in question with the initial Form I-687 application as evidence of his residence in this country for the requisite period. Without independent evidence to corroborate the applicant’s and counsel’s claims, these statements cannot be considered as persuasive. 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)). Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner’s burden of proof. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter Of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

Counsel contends that the AAO did not contain copies of either the envelopes in question or the relevant pages of Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* with the notice issued on January 29, 2009. However, the pertinent regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16) states the following:

Inspection of evidence. An applicant or petitioner shall be permitted to inspect the record of proceeding which constitutes the basis for the decision, except as provided in the following paragraphs.

(i) Derogatory information unknown to petitioner or applicant. If the decision will be adverse to the applicant or petitioner and is based on derogatory information considered by the Service and of which the applicant or petitioner is unaware, he/she shall be advised of this fact and offered an opportunity to rebut the information and present information in his/her own behalf before the decision is rendered, except as provided in paragraphs (b)(16)(ii), (iii), and (iv) of this section. Any explanation, rebuttal, or information presented by or in behalf of the applicant or petitioner shall be included in the record of proceeding.

(ii) Determination of statutory eligibility. A determination of statutory eligibility shall be based only on information contained in the record of proceeding which is disclosed to the applicant or petitioner, except as provided in paragraph (b)(16)(iv) of this section.

(iii) Discretionary determination. Where an application may be granted or denied in the exercise of discretion, the decision to exercise discretion favorably or unfavorably may be based in whole or in part on classified information not contained in the record and not made available to the applicant, provided the regional commissioner has determined that such information is relevant and is classified under Executive Order No. 12356 (47 FR 14874; April 6, 1982) as requiring protection from unauthorized disclosure in the interest of national security.

(iv) Classified information. An applicant or petitioner shall not be provided any information contained in the record or outside the record which is classified under Executive Order No. 12356 (47 FR 14874; April 6, 1982) as requiring protection from unauthorized disclosure in the interest of national security, unless the classifying authority has agreed in writing to such disclosure. Whenever he/she believes he/she can do so consistently with safeguarding both the information and its source, the regional commissioner should direct that the applicant or petitioner be given notice of the general nature of the information and an opportunity to offer opposing evidence. The regional commissioner's authorization to use such classified information shall be made a part of the record. A decision based in whole or in part on such classified information shall state that the information is material to the decision.

Clearly, the language of the regulation does not mandate that the Service or its successor CIS provide an applicant or petitioner with a copy of a document containing derogatory information used to deny an application or petition. Rather, the regulation requires that an applicant or petitioner be advised of such derogatory information and offered an opportunity to rebut the information and present information in his or her own behalf before the decision is rendered. This is the procedure that has been utilized in the instant case as the AAO issued a notice to the parties specifically informing him of the derogatory information relating to the envelopes and the corresponding page numbers and catalogue numbers of the stamps as contained in Volume 3 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue*.

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