

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L2

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC 01 298 60057

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

OCT 05 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:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. 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.

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 Director, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application after determining that the applicant had not demonstrated that he had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, the applicant states that he has submitted relevant, probative and credible affidavits in support of his claim, and that his application should be approved.

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 through May 4, 1988. See § 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

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 period, 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 states 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 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 (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 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).

Here, the applicant submitted evidence that is not relevant, probative and credible. The applicant submitted the following information in support of his claim that he resided continuously in the United States from a date prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988:

- The applicant submitted affidavits from four individuals in support of his application. The affidavits are general in nature and state that the affiants have knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States for all, or a portion of, the requisite period.

As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality. The affidavits provided do not provide detailed evidence establishing how the affiants knew the applicant, the details of their association or relationship, or detailed accounts of an ongoing association establishing a relationship under which the affiants could be reasonably expected to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence, activities and whereabouts during the requisite period covered by the applicant's Form I-687. To be considered probative, 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. The affidavits must contain sufficient detail, generated by the asserted contact with the applicant, to establish that a relationship does in fact exist, how the relationship was established and sustained, and that the affiant does, by virtue of that relationship, have knowledge of the facts asserted. The affidavits submitted by the applicant, therefore, are not deemed probative and are of little evidentiary value.

- The affiant's passport was issued in Karachi, Pakistan on March 12, 1985. The record also contains a Form I-687 which was denied by the director and is under appeal before the AAO. The applicant does not list a March 12, 1985 departure from the United States during the requisite period on the Form I-687. The credibility of the applicant's evidence/statements with regard to his presence in the United States is, therefore, brought into question.

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 petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

Thus, it is found that the applicant has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. Accordingly, the applicant is not eligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. This decision constitutes a final notice of ineligibility.