

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 MS2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

L2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: HOUSTON

Date:

NOV 22 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:

[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.

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, Houston, Texas and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application based on the determination that the applicant was ineligible to adjust to permanent resident status under the provisions of the LIFE Act. The director found that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that she had continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status for the duration of the requisite period. Specifically, the director noted that the applicant submitted several affidavits which lacked sufficient detail to be considered probative.

On appeal, through counsel, the applicant indicates that the director's decision was not supported by the evidence.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). Following *de novo* review, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to establish her continuous residence in the United States from January 1, 1982 through the end of the relevant period.

An applicant for permanent resident status 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 and through May 4, 1988. Section 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 periods, is admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 212(a) of the Act, 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).

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. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

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.

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.

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.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has established that she (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 several affidavits. Evidence which pertains to the period following the relevant period is not considered. The AAO has reviewed each document to determine the applicant’s eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision.

The record contains affidavits from [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. While the affiants indicate that they met the applicant during the relevant period, their statements do not include sufficient detailed information about the applicant’s continuous residency in the United States since before January 1, 1982 and throughout the requisite period. They do not indicate how they date their initial acquaintance with the applicant, how frequently they saw the applicant during the relevant period.

For example, [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant lived with her in [REDACTED] from April 1982 until December 1985. The letter is dated November 19, 1990 and the affiant indicates that she has lived in the United States for “over 20 years.” She is not specific about the dates of her residence, however, she indicates that she became a United States citizen in 1978. Most of the affiants, however, indicate only that they knew the applicant during the relevant period and that they saw her at church or social functions. [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant lived with her from December 1981 until April 1982 in [REDACTED] Mississippi. This is inconsistent with the information provided by the applicant on her Form I-687 filed in 1991. In that application, the applicant indicates that she lived in [REDACTED] Mississippi from December 1981 until December 1985. 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 applicant submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. at 591-92. The applicant has not submitted any evidence which resolves this inconsistency.

The record also includes a letter from [REDACTED] who indicates that she worked for [REDACTED] from May 1987 until November 1993 and that she told the

applicant that she could not apply for legalization due to an absence. She does not indicate when she encountered the applicant or how she dates the applicant's visit to the [REDACTED] office.

The record reveals that the applicant was arrested by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on November 14, 1989 for attempting to enter the United States with a Border Crossing Card issued under the name [REDACTED]. The applicant was found guilty and granted voluntary departure to Mexico on November 15, 1989.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides:

Misrepresentation. – (i) In general. – Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

By attempting to enter the United States using false documents, the applicant has sought to procure a benefit provided under the Act through fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact. She is therefore, inadmissible to the United States. This ground of inadmissibility may be waived, however, the applicant has not sought a waiver. Even if waived, the applicant remains ineligible for legalization benefits.

As is stated above, 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). The applicant has been given the opportunity to satisfy her burden of proof with a broad range of evidence pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3).

Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, it is concluded that she has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through the relevant period as required under section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act. The applicant is, therefore, ineligible for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act on this basis.

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