

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy  
**PUBLIC COPY**

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

L2

[REDACTED]

FILE:

[REDACTED]

Office: SAN FRANCISCO

Date:

FEB 04 2011

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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

The director denied the application because the applicant failed to establish that he entered the United States on or before January 1, 1982, and that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status from such date through May 4, 1988, as required by section 1104(c)(2)(B) of the LIFE Act. The director determined that the submitted evidence failed to establish the applicant's eligibility and the applicant's claim was without merit.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that the director did not give the submitted evidence proper weight.<sup>1</sup> The applicant states that a brief will be submitted to the AAO within 30 calendar days. As of the date of this decision, no brief has been received; therefore, the record will be considered complete. The AAO has reviewed all of the evidence and has made a *de novo* decision based on the record and the AAO's assessment of the credibility, relevance and probative value of the evidence.<sup>2</sup>

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 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). 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 and is otherwise eligible for adjustment of status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act. 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). 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.12(f). 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6).

---

<sup>1</sup> The record reflects that, on September 5, 2010, counsel submitted a request to withdraw as representation from the instant case.

<sup>2</sup> The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

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 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 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.

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).

On May 22, 2002, the applicant filed a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Resident or Adjust Status pursuant to section 1104 of the Life Act (I-485 LIFE Legalization Application). The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant established 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. The relevant documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and resided in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of affidavits from twelve individuals claiming to know the applicant during the requisite period, a church letter, and a copy of an airline ticket. 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 witness statements from [REDACTED]

general in nature and state that the affiants have knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States for all, or a portion, of the requisite period. These statements 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 affidavits 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 have 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, the witness statements have little probative value.

It is also noted that the affidavits from [REDACTED] are inconsistent with the applicant's Form I-687. [REDACTED] stated that the applicant resided with him for one month at [REDACTED] whereas, the applicant stated that he resided at this address for six months. [REDACTED] stated that the applicant resided with him at [REDACTED] from 1984 to 1988; however, the applicant never listed this address as a residence during the requisite period. These inconsistencies cast doubt on the credibility of the applicant's claim.

The church letter from [REDACTED] states that the applicant has regularly attended [REDACTED] since 1987. The declaration fails to conform to the regulatory standards for letters from organizations as stated in the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(v). The declarant fails to state the address where the applicant resided during membership period, establish how the author knows the applicant, and establish the origin of the information being attested to. Given the lack of relevant details, the declaration provides no probative value. It is also noted that in his Form I-687, at Question 31, where the applicant was asked to list all affiliations or associations with any clubs, organizations, churches, unions, businesses, etc., the applicant failed to mention that he was ever a member of this organization. This discrepancy detracts from the credibility of the applicant's claim.

The record contains a copy an airline ticket, issued on August 19, 1987 and indicating travel on September 26, 1987. The record also contains affidavits from [REDACTED] stating that the applicant was absent from the United States in 1987. However, the affidavit from [REDACTED] is inconsistent with the airline ticket. [REDACTED] states that the applicant left the United States on July 10, 1987 and reentered on August 15, 1987. This inconsistency casts doubt on the credibility of the applicant's claim.

The record contains several 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 applicant submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

The record contains no independent, objective evidence to explain the above inconsistencies. The inconsistencies in the record, noted above, are material to the applicant's claim in that they have a direct bearing on the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period.

Based upon the foregoing, the documents submitted in support of the applicant's claim have been found to contain inconsistencies and to have minimal probative value as evidence of the applicant's residence and presence in the United States for the requisite period. The applicant has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982 and maintained continuous, unlawful residence from such date through May 4, 1988, as required for eligibility for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104(c)(2)(B)(i) of the LIFE Act. The applicant is, therefore, 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.