



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

E2



FILE: Office: NEW YORK Date: **MAR 03 2009**

IN RE: Applicant:

APPLICATION: Application for Certificate of Citizenship under Section 321 of the former Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. §1432.

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED<sup>1</sup>

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom, Acting Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

<sup>1</sup> On February 11, 2008, the AAO received a letter from attorney Jorge Guttlein withdrawing his appearance as applicant's counsel.

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

The record reflects that the applicant was born on [REDACTED] in the Dominican Republic. The birth certificate indicates that his parents are [REDACTED]. The applicant's mother became a U.S. citizen upon her naturalization on June 30, 1996, when the applicant was 14 years old. The applicant's father is not a U.S. citizen. The applicant was admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident on March 3, 1998, when he was 15 years old. The applicant seeks a certificate of citizenship pursuant to section 321 of the former Immigration and Naturalization Act (the former Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1432 (repealed) claiming that he derived citizenship through his mother.

The district director denied the applicant's citizenship claim upon finding that his paternity was established by legitimation. Thus, the director concluded that the applicant did not derive U.S. citizenship under section 321 of the former Act, or under any other provision of law. The application was accordingly denied.

On appeal, the applicant, through counsel, states that the district director erred in denying his claim. See Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the AAO. The AAO notes that counsel requested 30 days in which to submit an appeal brief. *Id.* On February 11, 2008, counsel submitted a letter to the AAO withdrawing his appearance and noting that he did not file an appeal brief or additional evidence.

"The applicable law for transmitting citizenship to a child born abroad when one parent is a U.S. citizen is the statute that was in effect at the time of the child's birth." *Chau v. Immigration and Naturalization Service*, 247 F.3d 1026, 1029 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). The applicant in this case was born in 1982. The applicant was over 18 on the effective date of the Child Citizenship Act of 2000. Section 321 of the former Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1432, is therefore applicable to this case.

Section 321 of the former Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1432, provided, in pertinent part, that:

(a) a child born outside of the United States of alien parents, or of an alien parent and a citizen parent who has subsequently lost citizenship of the United States, becomes a citizen of the United States upon fulfillment of the following conditions:

- (1) The naturalization of both parents; or
- (2) The naturalization of the surviving parent if one of the parents is deceased; or
- (3) The naturalization of the parent having legal custody of the child when there has been a legal separation of the parents or the naturalization of the mother if the child was born out of wedlock and the paternity of the child has not been established by legitimation; and if-

(4) Such naturalization takes place while said child is under the age of 18 years; and

(5) Such child is residing in the United States pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence at the time of the naturalization of the parent last naturalized under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection, or thereafter begins to reside permanently in the United States while under the age of 18 years.

The AAO finds that the applicant has established that his mother naturalized and that he was admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident prior to his 18<sup>th</sup> birthday. The AAO finds, however, that his paternity was established by legitimation. Therefore, the applicant did not derive U.S. citizenship from his mother alone.

Under *Matter of Martinez*, Interim Dec. 3329 (BIA 1997), a child residing or domiciled in the Dominican Republic is legitimated if he is under the age of 18 on January 1, 1995 (the effective date of the Code for the Protection of Children and Adolescents, Law No. 14-94) and was acknowledged by his father prior to his 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, unless he was legitimated under the country's former laws. When a country, such as the Dominican Republic, eliminates all legal distinctions between children born in and out of wedlock, "all children born out of wedlock are deemed to be legitimate or legitimated children of their natural fathers from the time that country's laws are changed." *Matter of Martinez, supra*, citing *Matter of Hernandez*, 19 I&N Dec. 14 (BIA 1983) and *Matter of Clarke*, 18 I&N Dec. 369 (BIA 1983).

The applicant was under 18 when the Dominican Republic eliminated the distinctions between children born in and out of wedlock. The AAO also notes that the applicant's father's name appears in his birth certificate. The AAO finds that the applicant was legitimated because he was under 18 when the legitimation law took effect.

The AAO must therefore conclude that, because the applicant's paternity was established by legitimation, he did not derive U.S. citizenship upon his mother's naturalization pursuant to section 321(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1421(a)(3).

8 C.F.R. § 341.2(c) provides that the burden of proof shall be on the claimant to establish the claimed citizenship by a preponderance of the evidence. In order to meet this burden, the applicant must submit relevant, probative and credible evidence to establish that the claim is "probably true" or "more likely than not." *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77, 79-80 (Comm. 1989). The applicant has failed to meet his burden to prove that paternity was not established by legitimation. He therefore did not derive U.S. citizenship under section 321 of the former Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1431, and the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.