

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 MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

L2

FILE:

Office: NEW YORK

Date: MAR 31 2009

MSC 02 157 61247

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. 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 district 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 for the required period and asserted that the applicant had submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate his residence in this country during the period in question. Counsel provided copies of previously submitted documentation as well as a new document 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 his 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 or about May 28, 1993. Subsequently, the applicant filed his Form I-485 LIFE Act application on March 6, 2002.

In support of his claim of residence in the United States for the requisite period, the applicant submitted affidavits of residence, employment affidavits, an affidavit relating to the applicant’s absence from this country in 1987, photographs, and original postmarked envelopes.

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 August 22, 2007.

Counsel’s remarks on appeal regarding the sufficiency of evidence submitted by the applicant in support of his claim of 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 including envelopes postmarked April 2, 1981 and October 13, 1985 as proof of his residence in the United States for the requisite period. The envelopes contain Bangladeshi postage stamps and were represented as having been mailed from Bangladesh to the applicant at the address he claimed to have resided for a portion of the requisite period. A review of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* Volume 1 (Scott Publishing Company 2008) reveals the following:

The envelope postmarked April 2, 1981 bears seven of the same postage stamp each with a value of fifty paises that depicts a mobile post office. This stamp is listed at page 735 of Volume 1 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* as catalogue number [REDACTED]. The catalogue lists this stamp’s date of issue as December 21, 1983. The envelope also contains three of the same postage stamps each with a value of five takas that depict Curzon Hall. This stamp is listed at page 738 of Volume 1 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp*

Catalogue as catalogue number [REDACTED] this stamp as March 31, 1989.

The catalogue lists the date of issue for

- The envelope postmarked October 13, 1985 contains three of the same postage stamps each with a value of five takas that depict Curzon Hall. This stamp is listed at page 738 of Volume 1 of the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue* with catalogue number [REDACTED]. The catalogue lists the date of issue for this stamp as March 31, 1989.

The fact that envelopes postmarked April 2, 1981 and October 13, 1985 both bear stamps that were not issued until well after the date of these postmarks establishes that the applicant utilized these 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, the applicant's former and most current counsel submit statements in which both assert that the stamps in question had been issued prior to the postmarks, April 2, 1981 and October 13, 1985, contained on these envelopes. The applicant's former counsel contends that reviews of the internet web sites at <http://www.bdstamps.com> and http://www.geocities.com/dak_tiket reveal no evidence that the stamps had been issued on the dates cited in the *2009 Scott Standard Postage Stamp Catalogue*. However, the home page of http://www.geocities.com/dak_tiket specifically acknowledges that it does not contain every postage stamp issued by Bangladesh in stating, "Unfortunately, information on all the issues [of stamps] could not be included here. It is hoped that with time, more and more stamps will be

included in this site.” In addition, a review of <http://www.bdstamps.com> reveals that the stamp valued at fifty paisas that depicts a mobile post office with *Scott* catalogue number [REDACTED] is listed at this site under both Bangladesh Definitive Stamps (Non Service) and Bangladesh Definitive Stamps (Service) with an issue date of 1983. Further, the stamp valued at five takas that depicts Curzon Hall with *Scott* catalogue number [REDACTED] is listed at this site under Bangladesh Definitive Stamps (Non Service) with an issue date of March 31, 1989.

The applicant’s former counsel includes a statement from the applicant who indicates that he did not know when the stamps on the envelopes had been issued but that the person who wrote the letters placed the stamps on the envelopes and mailed them from Bangladesh, the Bangladeshi government applied the postmarks to the envelopes, and the envelopes 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 April 2, 1981 and October 13, 1985 both bear postage stamps that were not issued by the government of Bangladesh until after the date of these respective postmarks.

The applicant’s most current counsel claims that the Bangladeshi postage stamps contained on the envelopes postmarked April 2, 1981 and October 13, 1985 cited in the AAO’s notice had in fact been issued and were in use as of the date of these respective postmarks. Counsel provides numerous printouts of various Bangladeshi postage stamps from the internet web site at <http://www.bdstamps.com>. However, none of these printouts match either the stamp valued at fifty paisas that depicts a mobile post office with *Scott* catalogue number [REDACTED] that is listed at this site under both Bangladesh Definitive Stamps (Non Service) and Bangladesh Definitive Stamps (Service) with an issue dates of 1983, or the stamp valued at five takas that depicts Curzon Hall with *Scott* catalogue number [REDACTED] that is listed at this site under Bangladesh Definitive Stamps (Non Service) with an issue date of March 31, 1989.

The existence of derogatory information that establishes the applicant used 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.