

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

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: CHARLOTTE

Date: SEP 27 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, Charlotte, North Carolina, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The director denied the application based upon the determination that the applicant's class membership had been revoked because he allegedly procured a Form I-688A, Employment Authorization Card, through bribery.

On appeal, the applicant claimed that he was never involved in any illegal activity and reiterated his claim of residence in this country for the required period.

It must be noted that the decision of the director was incorrect as there is no statutory or regulatory authority to revoke class membership in a legalization class action lawsuit. Therefore, the director's basis of denial will be withdrawn and the AAO shall determine the applicant's eligibility to adjust to permanent resident status under the provisions of the LIFE Act. The AAO conducts a *de novo* review, evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence in the record according to its probative value and credibility and making a determination based upon a preponderance of the evidence as required by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(5) as well as the precedent decision reached in *Matter of E-- M--*, 20 I. & N. Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989).

The AAO maintains plenary power to review this matter on a *de novo* basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp.*, NTSB, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The federal courts have long recognized the AAO's *de novo* review authority. *See, e.g. Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989).

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 and through May 4, 1988. Section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act and 8 C.F.R. § 245a.11(b).

The applicant 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 Immigration and Nationality Act (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 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 to

May 4, 1988, the submission of any other relevant document including affidavits is permitted pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(vi)(L).

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. *Id.*

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.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has submitted sufficient credible evidence to meet his burden of establishing his continuous unlawful residence in the United States during the requisite period. Here, the applicant has failed to meet this burden.

The applicant made a claim to class membership in a legalization class-action lawsuit and as such, was permitted to file a Form I-687, Application for Temporary Resident Status Pursuant to Section 245A of the Act, on August 6, 1990. Subsequently, the applicant filed his Form I-485 LIFE Act application on June 16, 2001.

In support of the applicant’s claim of residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982, he submitted affidavits from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] respectively. While all of these affiants attested to the applicant’s residence in the United States for the period in question or a portion thereof, their testimony was general and vague and lacked sufficient details and verifiable information to corroborate the applicant’s residence in this country for the requisite period. The witnesses provided generic testimony that does not lend credence to their claimed knowledge of your residence in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982.

The AAO determined that the applicant failed to submit sufficient evidence demonstrating his residence in the United States in an unlawful status for the requisite period. Therefore, the AAO issued a notice on August 5, 2010 to the applicant and counsel informing the parties that it was the AAO’s intent to dismiss the applicant’s appeal based upon the fact that the record did not

contain sufficient evidence to establish that the applicant had continuously resided in the United States since prior to January 1, 1982. The parties were granted thirty days to respond to the notice and submit additional documentation in support of his claim of residence for the required period.

In response, counsel states that the applicant has no new supporting evidence to submit. Counsel requests that the AAO take no further action in the case. However, counsel fails to cite any precedent, regulation, or statute that would allow the AAO to withhold the issuing of a final decision in this matter.

The absence of sufficiently detailed supporting documentation seriously undermines the credibility of the applicant's claim of residence in this country for the requisite period, as well as the credibility of the documents submitted in support of such claim. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e), the inference to be drawn from the documentation provided shall depend on the extent of the documentation, its credibility and amenability to verification. The applicant has failed to submit sufficient credible documentation to meet his burden of proof in establishing that he has resided in the United States for the requisite period by a preponderance of the evidence as required under both 8 C.F.R. § 245a.12(e) and *Matter of E- M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 (Comm. 1989).

Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal or no probative value, it is concluded that he has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States from prior to January 1, 1982 through May 4, 1988 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.