

**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**

**PUBLIC COPY**

*E,*

FILE:

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **SEP 07 2007**

IN RE:

Applicant:

APPLICATION: Application for Replacement Naturalization/Citizenship Document under Section 338 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1449.

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.

*Robert P. Wiemann*

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The applicant is a native of Vietnam 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 February 16, 1950 to February 16, 1944.

The Director reviewed the applicant's record and determined that a correction to his Certificate of Naturalization was not justified. In his decision the Director noted that Service records indicate that from the date of the applicant's admission into the United States until the date of his naturalization, the applicant consistently claimed that his date of birth was February 16, 1950. Service records further indicate that at the time of his naturalization, the applicant declared under oath that his date of birth was February 16, 1950. The application was denied accordingly. *Decision of the Director*, undated.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that his correct date of birth is February 16, 1944. *Form I-290B*, filed April 27, 2007. In support of his assertions, the applicant submits a copy of a Court Order from the Los Angeles Superior Court and a Court Order Delayed Registration of Birth from the State of California, Department of Health Services stating that the applicant was born on February 16, 1944. The record also includes a copy of the applicant's Vietnamese certificate in lieu of birth certificate stating that his date of birth is February 16, 1944.

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 his 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 his application for that document. The AAO observes that the record also contains other forms with the February 16, 1950 date of birth including a Form G-325A, Biographic Information sheet; a Form I-181, Memorandum of Creation of Record of Lawful Permanent Residence; a Form I-485, Application for Status as Permanent Resident; and a Form I-94 arrival card. A refugee resettlement letter from the Project Director of Refugee Services, United States Catholic Conference,

also lists the applicant's date of birth as February 16, 1950. Accordingly, 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]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.