



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2



FILE:

MSC 02 002 60475

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

**NOV 23 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:



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.

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application for permanent resident status under the Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act was denied by the District Director, New York. The decision is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application finding that the applicant had not provided credible evidence to establish that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, counsel states that the decision of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is against the weight of evidence and that the applicant has met his burden of proof. The applicant requested a copy of the record of proceedings under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The record reflects that the FOIA request was processed on May 14, 2009 (NRC2007068189).

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing that he (1) entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and (2) has continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period of time.

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 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.* 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.

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.

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, the submission of any other relevant document is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

The applicant in his sworn statement and the USCIS adjudicating officer’s notes reveal that during the Form I-485 interview, the applicant claimed to have first entered the United States with a nonimmigrant B-2 visitor’s visa in March, 1981. The applicant does not submit a copy of any passport, Form I-94 Departure Record or other testamentary or documentary evidence showing that he entered the United States with inspection prior to January 1, 1982.

The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1, 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits of relationship written by friends and other evidence. The AAO will consider all of the evidence relevant to the requisite period to determine the applicant’s eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The applicant submitted affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to establish his initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period. The affidavits all contain statements that the affiants have either personally known the applicant or know that the applicant resided in the United States since the 1980’s. [REDACTED] states that he worked with the applicant at Sandy Construction Company from 1981 to 1987. [REDACTED] states that he worked with the applicant at Micke Construction Company from 1986 to 1989. The record does not contain letters from either employer verifying the applicant’s employment. [REDACTED] states that he and the applicant lived together at [REDACTED], from 1981 to 1984.<sup>1</sup> The affiants generally attest to being the applicant’s friend but provide no other information about the applicant.

Upon review, the affidavits do not contain sufficiently detailed descriptions to establish the reliability of their assertions. The absence of sufficiently detailed affidavits to corroborate the applicant’s claim of continuous residence for the entire requisite period seriously detracts from the credibility of his claim. For instance, none of the affiants supplies any details about the applicant’s

---

<sup>1</sup> The applicant claims on his Form I-687 application that he resided at [REDACTED], from June, 1981, to November, 1986.

life, such as, knowledge about his family members, education, hobbies, shared activities with the applicant, and the manner he entered the United States.

The affiants do not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of those associations and demonstrate that they were a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence during the time addressed in the affidavits. To be considered probative and credible, witness affidavits must do more than simply state that an affiant knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific time period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that the relationship probably did exist and that the witness does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts alleged. Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that the applicant has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the requisite period. Therefore, the affidavits have little probative value.

On appeal, counsel states that the USCIS did not make any effort to verify the affidavits. The applicant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he resided continuously in the United States throughout the requisite period. The affidavits submitted do not have sufficient detail to establish the truth of their assertions. USCIS is not required to contact affiants to supplement their testimony.

The applicant's remaining evidence consists of six photographs of applicant which he claims were taken in Washington, D.C., Alaska, and New York in 1981. This evidence establishes that the applicant probably visited the United States in 1981, but does not, when considered with other evidence of record, establish the applicant's continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period.

The USCIS adjudicating officer noted during the Form I-485 interview that the applicant received a passport, No. [REDACTED] in Karachi, Pakistan, on October 17, 1986. A copy of the passport page showing this information is included in the record of proceeding. The applicant claimed on his Form I-687 application that he was absent from the United States from December, 1987, to January, 1988 and did not list an absence from the United States in 1986. No evidence of record explains this inconsistency. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. 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. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

An applicant applying for adjustment of status under this part has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he or she is eligible for adjustment of status under section 245A of the Act. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5). Given the lack of detail in the affidavits, and the unresolved inconsistencies noted above, the applicant failed to establish his continuous unlawful residence in the

United States for the duration of the requisite period. The applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to overcome the director's denial. The insufficiency of the evidence calls into question the credibility of the applicant's claim of continuous unlawful residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish the applicant's 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 the requisite period.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and continuously resided in an unlawful status in the United States for the requisite period 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.