

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly
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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L2



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: FRESNO Date: OCT 26 2009
MSC-03-072-60129

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.

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, Fresno. The case 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 she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since before January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988. The director stated that the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to meet her burden of proof to establish her eligibility for the benefit sought.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, asserts that she has established her continuous unlawful residence for the requisite time period.

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. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The weight to be given any affidavit depends on the totality of the circumstances, and a number of factors must be considered. More weight will be given to an affidavit in which the affiant indicates personal knowledge of the applicant’s whereabouts during the time period in question rather than a fill-in-the-blank affidavit that provides generic information. The regulations provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment or attestations by churches or other organizations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.2(d)(3)(i) and (v).

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 or 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 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). To meet his or her burden of proof, an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from the applicant’s own testimony, and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant (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. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of her claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits and letters. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed.

The applicant submitted affidavits and letters from seven individuals in support of her application. The affidavits and letters are general in nature and state that the individuals have knowledge of the applicant’s residence in the United States for all, or a portion of, the requisite period. These documents fail, however, to establish the applicant’s continuous unlawful residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. As stated previously, the evidence must be evaluated not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality; an applicant must provide evidence of eligibility apart from his or her own testimony; and the sufficiency of all evidence produced by the applicant will be judged according to its probative value and credibility.

As noted by the director, the affidavits and letters in the record of proceeding contain information that is inconsistent regarding the applicant’s date of entry and the addresses at which she lived. The declarations from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] state that the applicant first entered the United States in 1979. In addition, the affidavits submitted by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] list addresses for the applicant that are inconsistent with the applicant’s Form I-687.

Further, the affidavits for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] state that the applicant lived with them beginning in 1979. However, the declarations for the same individuals state that the applicant began living with them in 1980. 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).

None of the witness statements provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted associations with her, 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. Upon review, the AAO finds that, individually and together, the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true. Therefore, they have little probative value.

The record of proceeding also contains two letters signed by [REDACTED] of Abdalian Carton Company stating that the applicant worked part-time on a cash basis from July 1985 to February 1989. [REDACTED] also states that the applicant became a full-time employee on February 19, 1989 and worked until 1995. As a full-time employee, the applicant earned \$5.50 per hour and worked 40 hours per week. 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. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i), the employer letters submitted do not provide sufficient information. Given these deficiencies, these letters have minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claims that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.

The record of proceeding also contains a letter from Our Lady of the Rosary Church signed by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] states that the applicant was a registered and active parishioner of the church since the early 1980s. [REDACTED] letter does not provide the applicant's dates of attendance or the source of the information provided. In his decision, the director noted that the church administrator was unable to find current or past registration records for the applicant. As stated previously, 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, supra.*

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v) provides requirements for attestations made on behalf of an applicant by churches, unions, or other organizations. Attestations must: (1) Identify applicant by name; (2) be signed by an official (whose title is shown); (3) show inclusive dates of membership; (4) state the address where applicant resided during membership period; (5) include the seal of the organization impressed on the letter or the letterhead of the organization, if the organization has letterhead stationery; (6) establish how the author knows the applicant; and (7) establish the origin of the information being attested to. The letters submitted do not provide all of the information required by 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v). Given these deficiencies, this letter has minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claims that he entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.

The applicant also submitted several photographs. The AAO is unable to verify that the photographs were taken in the United States during the requisite time period. Therefore, these documents have minimal probative value in supporting the applicant's claims that she entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and resided in the United States for the entire requisite period.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of the applicant's statements and application forms, in which she claims to have entered the United States before January 1, 1982. As noted above, the affidavits and declarations in the record of proceeding provide inconsistent dates for the applicant's first entry into the United States. The record of proceedings also contains a sworn statement dated May 19, 1992 which states that the applicant first arrived in 1980 and a sworn statement dated July 13, 2006 which states that the applicant first arrived in 1979. Finally, the applicant signed a Form G-325A on August 26, 2002 stating that she lived in Mexico until August 1980. As stated previously, 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, supra.* The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence in support of her claim that she was physically present or had continuous residence in the United States during the entire requisite period or that she entered the United States before January 1, 1982.

The AAO notes that the applicant was a minor in 1979 and the record of proceeding contains no school and vaccination records.

Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO agrees with the director that the evidence submitted by the applicant has not established that she is eligible for the benefit sought.

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, she 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.