

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

PUBLIC COPY

L2



FILE: [REDACTED]
MSC-03-169-61837

Office: NEW YORK

Date:

MAY 04 2010

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.

Elizabeth McCormack

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. 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 entered the United States prior to January 1, 1982, and thereafter continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period.

On appeal, counsel states that the applicant is eligible to adjust his status because he entered the United States on November 22, 1981 and has been living continuously in the United States except for a brief trip to Canada. Counsel states that the applicant submitted affidavits from friends that attest to his residence in the United States.

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 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 written by friends, letters from previous employers 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’s class determination form reveals that the applicant claimed to have first entered the United States at Baltimore, Maryland, on November 22, 1981. However, the applicant claimed on his Form I-687 application that his first residence in the United States was [REDACTED], in November, 1987, and his first employment in the United States with [REDACTED] was not until February, 1988. In contrast, [REDACTED] states that the applicant resided with her at [REDACTED] New York, from January 1, 1982 to December, 1985. [REDACTED] states in his affidavit that the applicant resided with him from January, 1986, to September 30, 1987 at [REDACTED].

The inconsistencies regarding the applicant’s initial entry into the United States and residence are material to the applicant’s claim in that they have a direct bearing on the applicant’s continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period. No evidence of record resolves these inconsistencies. 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).

The applicant submitted affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to establish his initial entry and residence in the United States during the requisite period. The affiants attest to personally knowing and being acquainted with the applicant since the 1980's or knowing the applicant resided in the United States since the 1980's. The affiants generally attest to the applicant's good moral character and being friends with the applicant but provide no other information about the applicant.

In totality, the affidavits contained in the record do not include sufficient detailed information about the claimed relationship and the applicant's continuous residence in the United States throughout the requisite period. For instance, the witnesses do not supply any details about the applicant's life, such as, knowledge about his family members, education, hobbies, employment or other particulars about his life in the United States. The witnesses fail to indicate any other details that would lend credence to the claimed acquaintance with the applicant and the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

The affidavits do not provide concrete information, specific to the applicant and generated by the asserted association with him, which would reflect and corroborate the extent of this association and demonstrate that the affiants had a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant during the time addressed in their 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. Therefore, the affidavits have little probative value.

[REDACTED] states in his affidavit that the applicant worked with him at [REDACTED] as a construction helper from March, 1982, to November, 1985. [REDACTED] states that the applicant has been working with him since February, 1988. [REDACTED] states that the applicant was working with him as a construction helper from April, 1986, to September, 1987. The employers attest to the applicant's good moral character but provide no other information about the applicant or any evidence to verify the applicant's employment. 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. As the affidavits do not meet most of the requirements stipulated in the aforementioned regulation, they will be given nominal weight.

The remaining evidence consists of nine envelopes. However, the probative value of the envelopes is limited because the postmark dates are either not legible, or after the requisite period. The

evidence has minimal value. The evidence does not establish the applicant's continuous residence throughout the requisite period.

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). In the instant case, the applicant has failed to submit sufficient evidence to overcome the director's denial. The insufficiency of the evidence and the inconsistencies noted call into question the credibility of the applicant's claim to have entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and his continuous unlawful residence in the United States since such date and throughout 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.