

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



U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



L2

Date: **MAY 04 2011**

Office: HOUSTON

FILE: 

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

The director denied the application, for reasons set forth in a notice of intent to deny (NOID) the application, finding that the applicant had not established by a preponderance of the evidence that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in a continuous unlawful status through May 4, 1988.

On appeal, counsel asserts that he will file a brief within 30 days of the processing of the applicant's FOIA request. The record reveals that the applicant's FOIA request, number [REDACTED] was processed on January 20, 2011. Counsel has not submitted a brief on appeal. The applicant has not submitted any additional evidence on appeal. 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>1</sup>

An applicant for permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act must establish that he or she entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and resided in continuous unlawful status since that date through May 4, 1988. 8 C.F.R. § 245a.15(a).

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 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. See 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(6). The weight to be given any affidavit depends on the totality of the circumstances, and a number of factors must be considered. More weight will be given to an affidavit in which the affiant indicates personal knowledge of the applicant's whereabouts during the time period in question rather than a fill-in-the-blank affidavit that provides generic information. The regulations provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation

---

<sup>1</sup> The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

when proving residence through evidence of past employment or attestations by churches or other organizations. 8 C.F.R. §§ 245a.2(d)(3)(i) and (v).

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). 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.2(d)(6).

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 or petition. 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA).

The issue in this proceeding is whether the applicant has furnished sufficient credible evidence to demonstrate that he entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and that he continuously resided in the United States in an unlawful status since such date and through May 4, 1988. The documentation that the applicant submits in support of his claim to have arrived in the United States before January 1982 and lived in an unlawful status during the requisite period consists of witness statements. The AAO has reviewed each document in its entirety to determine the applicant's eligibility; however, the AAO will not quote each witness statement in this decision. Some of the evidence submitted indicates that the applicant resided in the United States after May 4, 1988; however, because evidence of residence after May 4, 1988 is not probative of residence during the requisite time period, it shall not be discussed.

The record contains witness statements from the following witnesses: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The statements are general in nature, and state that the witnesses have knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States from all, or a portion of, the requisite statutory period.

Although the witnesses claim to have personal knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period, the witness statements do not 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 were a sufficient basis for reliable knowledge about the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. To be considered probative and credible, witness statements must do more than simply state that a witness knows an applicant and that the applicant has lived in the United States for a specific period. Their content must include sufficient detail from a claimed relationship to indicate that it probably did exist and that the witness, by virtue of that relationship, does have knowledge of the facts alleged. For instance, the witnesses do not state how they date their initial meeting with the applicant in the United States, or specify social gatherings, other special occasions or social events when they saw and communicated with the applicant during the requisite period. The witnesses also do not state how frequently they had contact with the applicant during the requisite period. The witnesses do not provide sufficient details that would lend credence to their claimed knowledge of the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. For these reasons the AAO finds that the witness statements do not indicate that their assertions are probably true.

The applicant submitted employment verification letters from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for him from December 1981 through September 1984 doing yard maintenance. [REDACTED] states that the applicant worked for him as a subcontractor from November 1984 through the end of the requisite period. However, the applicant failed to list any employment with [REDACTED] in a Form I-687, application for status as a temporary resident, filed in 1991.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the applicant failed to list any self-employment with [REDACTED], in four I-687 applications filed in 1991, 1995, 2001 and 2005, respectively.

In addition, the employment verification letters of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] do not meet the requirements set forth in the regulations, which provide specific guidance on the sufficiency of documentation when proving residence through evidence of past employment. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(d)(3)(i) provides that letters from employers must include: (A) Alien's address at the time of employment; (B) Exact period of employment; (C) Periods of layoff; (D) Duties with the company; (E) Whether or not the information was taken from official company records; and (F) Where records are located and whether the Service may have access to the records. If the records are unavailable, an affidavit-form letter stating that the alien's employment records are unavailable and why such records are unavailable may be accepted in lieu of subsections (E) and (F). The employment verification letters fail to comply with the above cited regulation because they lack considerable detail regarding the applicant's employment. For instance, the witnesses do not state the applicant's daily work duties, the number of hours he was employed, the location at which he was employed, or his address at the time of employment. Furthermore, the witnesses do not state how they were able to date the applicant's employment. It is unclear whether they referred to their own recollection or any records they may have maintained. For all of the above reasons, the employment verification letters will be given no weight.

---

<sup>2</sup> The applicant did list employment with [REDACTED] in three I-687 applications filed in 1995, 2001, and 2005, respectively.

The remaining evidence in the record is comprised of copies of the applicant's statements, the I-485 application, the initial Form I-687, application for status as a temporary resident, filed in 1991 to establish the applicant's CSS class membership, and three additional I-687 applications, filed in 1995, 2001 and 2005, respectively.

The AAO finds in its *de novo* review that the record of proceedings contains materially inconsistent statements from the applicant regarding his employment and absences from the United States during the requisite period.

In the I-687 applications filed in 1995 and 2001, the applicant stated that he first entered the United States in November 1981. He listed residences in Houston beginning in November 1981. The applicant also listed employment in Houston from December 1981 to September 1984 with [REDACTED], and from November 1984 through the end of the requisite period with [REDACTED]. The applicant listed one absence from the United States during the requisite period, from February 7, 1988 to February 17, 1988, when he traveled to Mexico because his father was ill.

In the I-687 application filed in 1991, the applicant did not list any employment with Arturo Villalpando during the requisite statutory period, and did not list any employment in the United States prior to November 1984.

In the I-687 application filed in 2005, the applicant listed one absence from the United States, from February 7, 1988 to March 17, 1988, to visit Mexico

The applicant has failed to provide probative and credible evidence of his continuous residence in the United States for the duration of the requisite period. The inconsistencies regarding the applicant's employment in the United States, and the dates of his absence from the United States during the requisite period are material to his claim in that they have a direct bearing on the applicant's residence in the United States during the requisite period. No evidence of record resolves these inconsistencies. It is incumbent upon the applicant to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent 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. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I & N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA). These contradictions undermine the credibility of the applicant's claim of entry into the United States prior to January 1, 1982 and continuous residence in the United States during the requisite period.

Upon a *de novo* review of all of the evidence in the record, the AAO agrees with the director that the evidence submitted by the applicant has not established that he is eligible for the benefit sought. The various statements currently in the record which attempt to substantiate the applicant's residence and employment in the United States during the statutory period are not objective, independent evidence such that they might overcome the inconsistencies in the record regarding the applicant's claim that he maintained continuous residence in the United States throughout the statutory period, and thus are not probative.

The AAO notes that on December 26, 1992, the applicant was charged with a violation of the Texas Penal Code, *Driving While Intoxicated*. On April 12, 1993, the applicant pleaded guilty to the charge, a misdemeanor. Also on that date, the court sentenced the applicant to serve 180 days in the county jail, suspended the sentence, and ordered the applicant to serve two years probation and pay a fine. On June 27, 1995, the applicant's probation was terminated, the judgment was set aside and the case was dismissed. (County Criminal Court at Law No. 4, Harris County, Texas, case number

██████████). The applicant's one misdemeanor conviction is not an additional basis on which to find the applicant to be ineligible for adjustment to permanent resident status.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish continuous residence in an unlawful status in the United States for some time prior to January 1, 1982 and through May 4, 1988. The applicant is, therefore, not eligible for adjustment to permanent resident status under section 1104 of the LIFE Act. The appeal is dismissed on this basis.

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