

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

IC COPY

L2

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-05-228-10092

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: SEP 10 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. 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, Los Angeles, 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 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, the applicant, through counsel requested a copy of the record of proceeding. The request was processed on November 17, 2008. As of this date, the AAO has not received any additional evidence from counsel or the applicant. Therefore, the record is complete.

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 his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in continuous unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits. 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 affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] all contain statements that the affiants have known the applicant for years and that attest to the applicant being physically present in the United States during the required period. These affiants 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.

None of the witness statements 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. 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 applicant also submitted an employment letter on Figueroa Cleaner's letterhead signed by [REDACTED] and dated July 17, 1993. The letter states that the applicant worked for [REDACTED] from November 15, 1981 to July 1, 1987 and from August 15, 1987 to December 31, 1991. 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 letter submitted does not provide sufficient information. 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 remaining evidence in the record is comprised of the applicant's statements and application forms, in which he claims to have entered the United States in October 1981. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence in support of his claim that he was physically present or had continuous residence in the United States during the entire requisite period or that he entered the United States in 1981.

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 he is eligible for the benefit sought.

In her notice of intent to deny (NOID), the director noted that the record of proceeding contains evidence that the applicant has three children. On appeal, the applicant states that he has one child a daughter named [REDACTED] born on October 28, 1980, in India. The applicant submitted an affidavit from [REDACTED] stating that the applicant has one child, [REDACTED]. However, the record of proceeding contains biographic information for the applicant which states that he also has a son named [REDACTED] born on July 7, 1982 and a son named [REDACTED] born on July 10, 1983. The applicant does not provide an explanation for the inconsistent information in the record of proceeding. 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).

On appeal, the applicant argues that he was the victim of fraud perpetrated by [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) who presented himself as an immigration specialist. Although the applicant notes that he was not assisted by an attorney but by an agent, there is no remedy available for an applicant who assumes the risk of authorizing an unlicensed attorney or unaccredited representative to undertake representations on its behalf. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 292.1. The AAO only considers complaints based upon ineffective assistance against accredited representatives. *Cf. Matter of Lozada*, 19 I&N Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), *aff'd*, 857 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1988)(requiring an appellant to meet certain criteria when filing an appeal based on ineffective assistance of counsel).

On appeal, the applicant states that he never received notice of a deportation hearing or deportation order. The record of proceeding contains a Form I-221 Order to Show Cause and Notice of Hearing dated May 24, 1994. The Form I-221 states that the applicant entered the United States at or near El Paso, Texas on or about July 1, 1991. The Form I-221 contains a certificate of service signed by the applicant on September 21, 1994. The certificate of service also includes the applicant's right thumb print. 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 was not present at his hearing on March 21, 1996 and the immigration judge ordered deportation in *absentia*.

Section 245A(a)(4)(A) of the Act requires an alien to establish that he or she is admissible to the United States as an immigrant in order to be eligible for temporary resident status. Section 245A(a)(4)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1255a(a)(4)(A). Section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II) of the Act renders inadmissible aliens who departed the United States while an order of removal was outstanding and who seek admission within 10 years of the date of the alien's departure. Section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II). Although this ground of inadmissibility may be waived pursuant to section 245A(d)(2)(B) of the Act, the record indicates that the applicant requested a waiver of section 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the Act on May 16, 2006 and the request was denied.

The applicant received a deportation order on March 21, 1996. The applicant stated in the Form I-687 that he departed in January 2003 and entered the United States in March 2003. The applicant sought admission to the United States within 10 years of the date of his departure, in March 2003 and through his application for temporary resident status filed on May 16, 2005. Accordingly, the applicant was inadmissible as an immigrant under section 212(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II) of the Act and ineligible for temporary resident status under section 245A(a)(4)(A) of the Act.

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.