

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Eg

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:



Office: CLEVELAND, OHIO (COLUMBUS)

Date: MAR 20 2007

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native of Greece and a naturalized citizen of the United States. She seeks to have her 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 her date of birth from November 18, 1945 to November 18, 1943.

The District Director reviewed the applicant's record and determined that a correction to the Certificate of Naturalization was not justified. The applicant submitted a copy of her Greek birth certificate and certified translation stating her date of birth was November 18, 1943. In his decision, the District Director noted that the applicant had stated her date of birth was November 18, 1945 during the naturalization process. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the District Director*, dated June 19, 2006.

On appeal, the applicant submitted a letter stating that as her Greek birth certificate indicates her correct date of birth, a clerical error occurred when she was sworn in by a naturalization examiner on April 3, 1973. In response, the District Director reopened the matter and requested the applicant submit her original birth certificate. Following a review of the Certificate, the District Director again denied the application. *Decision of the District Director*, dated September 26, 2006.

Section 338 of the Act provides the 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.

Based on the evidence contained in the record, the applicant has not established that her Certificate of Naturalization contains Immigration and Naturalization Service (now Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)) related clerical errors, and the AAO finds that that the information on the applicant's Certificate of Naturalization conforms to the facts as set forth in her application for that document. It also notes that November 18, 1945 is indicated as the applicant's date of birth on the Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative, filed on her behalf by her husband. Moreover, the record includes a November 6, 1965 certification of the applicant's birth by Greek authorities listing her birth date as November 18, 1945. Accordingly, the District Director correctly found that there are no provisions under 8 C.F.R. § 338.5 that 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]henever 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.