

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



*E3*

FILE:



Office: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
(INDIANAPOLIS, IN)

Date:

AUG 05 2005

IN RE:

Applicant:



APPLICATION:

Application for Replacement Naturalization/Citizenship Document under Section 338  
of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1149.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

*Robert P. Wiemann*

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the District Director, Chicago, Illinois. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native of Nigeria and a naturalized citizen of the United States. He seeks to have his Certificate of Naturalization corrected under section 338 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1449, to reflect a change in his date of birth from November 11, 1944 to November 12, 1939.

The district director reviewed the applicant's record and determined that his request was not justifiable. The application was denied accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, asserts that although he believed that his birth date was November 11, 1944 when he was admitted into the U.S. as a lawful permanent resident in 1983, the applicant later learned that his birth date is November 12, 1939. Counsel asserts that the applicant has submitted a July 1994, issued corrected birth certificate and a May 2000, Nigerian passport establishing his correct birth date. Counsel asserts further that the applicant is entitled to a correction in his Certificate of Naturalization because he advised U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) staff of his actual birth date and attempted to correct his birth date prior to his naturalization as a U.S. citizen.

Section 338 of the Act provides the relevant statutory authority relating to the contents of a Certificate of Naturalization. In addition, the specific regulations regarding the execution and issuance of Certificates of Naturalization are contained in 8 C.F.R. § 338.5, and provide, in part, that:

- (a) Whenever a Certificate of Naturalization has been delivered which does not conform to the facts shown on the application for naturalization, or a clerical error was made in preparing the certificate, an application for issuance of a corrected certificate, Form N-565, without fee, may be filed by the naturalized person.

. . . .

- (e) The correction will not be deemed to be justified where the naturalized person later alleges that the name or date of birth which the applicant stated to be his or her correct name or date of birth at the time of naturalization was not in fact his or her own name or date of birth at the time of naturalization.

The record reflects the applicant stated his birth date was November 11, 1944, for all immigrant visa purposes. In addition, the AAO notes that although counsel claims that the N-400, Application for Naturalization (N-400 Application) filed by the applicant reflects the applicant's corrected November 12, 1939 birth date, the N-400 application actually filed by the applicant on September 27, 1994, and contained in the record states that the applicant's birth date is November 11, 1944.

Based on the evidence contained in the record, the applicant has not established that his Certificate of Naturalization contains Immigration and Naturalization (Service, now, CIS) related clerical errors. The AAO therefore finds that the district director correctly found that there are no provisions under 8 C.F.R. § 338.5 to justify or to allow for a CIS correction to the applicant's Certificate of Naturalization.

Because there are no clerical errors in the present matter, CIS has no statutory authority to make any corrections to the applicant's certificate of citizenship, and only a federal court with jurisdiction over the applicant's naturalization proceedings has the authority to order that an amendment be made to the applicant's Certificate of Naturalization, after a hearing in which the Government is provided an opportunity to present its position on the matter. Such a hearing ensues pursuant to a motion to the court for an Order Amending a Certificate of Naturalization. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 334.16(b). *See also, Chan v. Immigration and Naturalization Service*, 426 F. Supp. 680 (1976) and *Varghai v. Immigration and Naturalization Service*, 932 F. Supp. 1245 (1996).

8 C.F.R. § 334.16(b) states in pertinent part that:

[W]henver an application is made to the court to amend a petition for naturalization after final action thereon has been taken by the court, a copy of the application shall be served upon the district director having administrative jurisdiction over the territory in which the court is located, in the manner and within the time provided by the rules of court in which the application is made. No objection shall be made to the amendment of a petition for naturalization after the petitioner for naturalization has been admitted to citizenship if the motion or application is to correct a clerical error arising from oversight or omission. A representative of the Service [CIS] may appear at the hearing upon such application and be heard in favor of or in opposition thereto. When the court orders the petition amended, the clerk of court shall transmit a copy of the order to the district director for inclusion in the Service file.

Based on the reasoning set forth above, the appeal will be dismissed without prejudice to the applicant's submitting a request to a U.S. Federal Court in accordance with the Act and Regulations.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.