

**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  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

L2



FILE:



Office: NEW YORK

Date:

FEB 14 2011


IN RE:

Applicant:



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.

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, New York 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 he 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 and that the applicant submitted inconsistent testimony.

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 his 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 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. In support of his eligibility, the applicant submits the following:

- Affidavits from [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, or how they have direct personal knowledge of his continuous residency.
- A letter from [REDACTED], dated October 26, 1987, indicating that the applicant attends classes at the school.
- Three letters from [REDACTED]. The first letter, dated February 15, 2002, the [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant has been registered with the Consulate since September 18, 1981. In the second letter, dated May 17, 2004, the [REDACTED] indicates that the applicant entered the United States on September 18, 1981 and that he registered with the Consulate in 1982. The third letter, a certification issued by [REDACTED] on February 15, 1990, indicates that the applicant’s passport was issued on March 24, 1982 in Casablanca. Finally, the record contains a letter dated June 5, 2009, signed by [REDACTED], indicating that the applicant registered with the Consulate on September 18, 1981 and that he resided at [REDACTED]. The Consul indicates that the applicant’s passport was issued in Casablanca, Morocco on March 24, 1981 and that the previous certificate indicating the date in 1982 was an error. No additional evidence is provided which resolves the noted 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. at 591-92.

The record also contains inconsistent information regarding the applicant's departures from the United States during the relevant period. For example, in his interview, the applicant indicates that his only departure outside the United States during the relevant period was in May 1988. However, on his Form I-687 signed in 2003, the applicant indicated that he departed the United States from July 1985 until August 1988. On his Affidavit [REDACTED] signed in 1990, the applicant indicates that he departed the United States from July 30, 1985 until August 29, 1985. The applicant has been apprised of these inconsistencies and has not addressed them or provided any additional evidence in support of his eligibility.

Given the applicant's reliance upon documents with minimal probative value, and the multiple inconsistencies noted, 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.