

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

L2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: HOUSTON

Date: OCT 05 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 [or Records] 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, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application, in part, finding the applicant had failed to establish that she satisfied the “basic citizenship skills” required under section 1104(c)(2)(E) of the LIFE Act. The director denied the application, finding that the applicant failed to establish her continuous residence throughout the requisite period.

The first issue to be addressed is whether the applicant established that she satisfied the “basic citizenship skills” requirement.

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act, regarding basic citizenship skills, an applicant for permanent resident status must demonstrate that he or she:

- (I) meets the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)) (relating to minimal understanding of ordinary English and a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States); or
- (II) is satisfactorily pursuing a course of study (recognized by the [Secretary of Homeland Security]) to achieve such an understanding of English and such a knowledge and understanding of the history and government of the United States.

Under section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive all or part of the above requirements for applicants who are at least 65 years of age or who are developmentally disabled. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(c).

The applicant, who is neither 65 years old nor developmentally disabled, does not qualify for either of the exceptions in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(ii) of the LIFE Act. Nor does she satisfy the “basic citizenship skills” requirement of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i)(I) of the LIFE Act because she does not meet the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act). An applicant may establish that he or she has met the requirements of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act) by demonstrating an understanding of the English language, including an ability to read, write, and speak words in ordinary usage in the English language and by demonstrating a knowledge and understanding of the fundamentals of the history and of the principles and form of government of the United States. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(1) and 8 C.F.R. §§ 312.1 – 312.3.

An applicant may also establish that he or she has met the requirements of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act by providing a high school diploma or general educational development diploma (GED) from a school in the United States. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2). The high school or GED diploma may be submitted either at the time of filing the Form I-485 LIFE Act application, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview. *Id.*

Finally, an applicant may also establish that he or she has met the requirements of section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act by establishing that:

He or she has attended, or is attending, a state recognized, accredited learning institution in the United States, and that institution certifies such attendance. The course of study at such learning institution must be for a period of one academic year (or the equivalent thereof according to the standards of the learning institution) and the curriculum must include at least 40 hours of instruction in English and United States history and government. The applicant may submit certification on letterhead stationery from a state recognized, accredited learning institution either at the time of filing Form I-485, subsequent to filing the application but prior to the interview, or at the time of the interview (the applicant's name and A-number must appear on any such evidence submitted).

8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3).

An applicant who fails to pass the English literacy and/or the United States history and government tests at the time of the initial LIFE interview shall be afforded a second opportunity after six months (or earlier at the request of the applicant) to pass the required tests or to submit the evidence described above. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(b), the applicant was interviewed once in connection with her LIFE Act application, on September 30, 2005, and a second time on March 1, 2006. The applicant failed to demonstrate a minimal understanding of ordinary English and knowledge of civics and history of the United States at her interview. The applicant does not dispute this on appeal. The applicant did not provide evidence of having passed a standardized citizenship test, as permitted by 8 C.F.R. § 312.3(a)(1). The applicant does not have a high school diploma or a GED from a United States school, and therefore does not satisfy the regulatory requirement of 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(2).

In a Notice of Decision, the director stated that the evidence the applicant provided in response to his Notice of Intent to Deny was insufficient because the applicant did not attend or was not attending a state recognized, accredited learning institution prior to the interview or at the time of the interview. On appeal, counsel for the applicant submits a February 9, 2009, letter by [REDACTED], Director, [REDACTED] stating that the applicant was currently attending English classes as of February 5, 2009. The letter does not indicate whether the curriculum includes at least 40 hours of instruction in English and United States history and government as required under 8 C.F.R. § 245a.17(a)(3). Further, the applicant failed to establish that [REDACTED] is an accredited state-recognized institution for learning.

Therefore, the applicant does not satisfy either alternative of the "basic citizenship skills" requirement set forth in section 1104(c)(2)(E)(i) of the LIFE Act. Accordingly, the AAO will not disturb the director's decision that the applicant is ineligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act.

The second issue to be addressed in this proceeding is whether the applicant established that she had resided in the United States throughout the requisite period.

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 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 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).

In support of her claim to have resided in the United States throughout the requisite period, the applicant submitted several affidavits, rent receipts and a bank letter.

The affidavits from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] contain statements that the affiants have known the applicant for all or part of the requisite period and that they attest to the applicant being physically present in the United States during the same period. These affidavits 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 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 three employment letters¹ that were submitted by the applicant's former employers are also of little value because they are inconsistent with the information she provided on her Form G-325A, dated May 17, 2002. The applicant's employment letters state that the applicant worked for [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] during the requisite period. On her Form 325A, the applicant indicated that she was a housewife throughout the requisite period.

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 is not eligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1103 of the LIFE Act for the reasons stated above.

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

¹ Both affidavits are dated the same day, August 4, 1988