

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



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

U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

L2

FILE: [REDACTED]  
MSC 02 327 60960

Office: GARDEN CITY

Date: MAY 04 2009

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

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 on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to demonstrate that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, counsel for the applicant asserts that the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to establish the requisite continuous residence. Counsel submits additional evidence on appeal.

Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act states:

(i) In General – The alien must establish that the alien entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he or she has resided continuously in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. In determining whether an alien maintained continuous unlawful residence in the United States for purposes of this subparagraph, the regulations prescribed by the Attorney General under section 245A(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) that were most recently in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act shall apply.

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act 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 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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) states that letters from employers attesting to an applicant's employment must: provide the applicant's address at the time of employment; identify the exact period of employment; show periods of layoff; state the applicant's duties; declare whether the information was taken from company records; and identify the location of such company records and state whether such records are accessible or in the alternative state the reason why such records are unavailable.

In the Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID), dated May 22, 2007, the director requested that the applicant submit evidence establishing that he had entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988, and listing all absences from the United States. The director noted that the applicant had submitted several affidavits that were neither credible, nor amenable to verification. The director also noted that the only proof of entry that the applicant provided was evidence that he had entered the United States on February 1, 1986, with a B-2 non-immigrant visa. The director granted the applicant thirty (30) days to submit additional evidence.

In the Notice of Decision, dated December 13, 2007, the director denied the instant application based on the reasons stated in the NOID. The director noted that the applicant's response to the NOID failed to overcome the reasons for denial stated in the NOID.

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. The applicant submitted various documents, including letters and affidavits, as evidence to support his Form I-485 application. The AAO has reviewed the entire record. Here, the submitted evidence is neither credible, nor probative.

Contrary to counsel's assertion, although the applicant has submitted numerous affidavits, and other evidence, in support of his application, the applicant has submitted questionable documentation. The applicant claims that he has resided in the United States in an unlawful status since July 1981, and he submitted several affidavits from individuals attesting to knowing the applicant in the United States since 1981. However, the record reflects that the applicant obtained a U.S. non-immigrant visa in January 1986, which is inconsistent with his claim that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since 1981. The applicant does not provide any evidence or explanation as to how he was able to obtain such a visa in that he claimed continuous unlawful residence in the United States for several years prior to issuance of the visa.

It is also noted that several affiants attest to knowing the applicant to have resided in the United States since 1981. However, these affiants lived either in New York, or in California, during the periods when they claimed that the applicant had been a continuous resident in the United States. The applicant claims that he resided in California from October 1981 to December 1985, and in New York from February 1986 to August 1991. However, there is no indication in any of these affidavits as to how any of these affiants kept in contact with the applicant while he resided in California, or in New York. As an example, [REDACTED] attests that after the applicant left New York in October 1981 for California, the applicant kept in touch with her while she lived in California, and they continued their friendship when the applicant returned to New York in 1986. However, in October 1981 [REDACTED] was only 5 years of age, and it is unlikely that she had been in touch with the applicant at such a young age. Therefore, it is unlikely that affidavits the applicant provided in support of his claim of continuous residence since 1981 are genuine.

These discrepancies cast considerable doubt on the applicant's claim that he has resided continuously in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982. 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 application. 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 lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988). The applicant has failed to submit any objective evidence to explain or justify the discrepancies in the record. Therefore, the reliability of the remaining evidence offered by the applicant is suspect and it must be concluded that the applicant has failed to establish that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status during the requisite period.

Therefore, based on the above, the applicant has failed to establish entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and continuous unlawful residence through May 4, 1988, as required under Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act. Given this, he 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.