

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

E2

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: HIALEAH, FL

Date:

**JAN 15 2010**

IN RE: [REDACTED]

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).

  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

<sup>1</sup> The AAO notes that the applicant's file contains a Form G-28, Notice of Entry of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, signed by [REDACTED]. The AAO notes, however, that [REDACTED] does not claim to be an attorney or accredited representative. Therefore, she is not authorized to appear as the applicant's representative in these proceedings. See 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(a)(3); 292.1(a).

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

The record reflects that the applicant was born on February 1, 1975 in the Dominican Republic. The applicant's parents are [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The applicant was born out of wedlock. The applicant's father became a U.S. citizen upon his naturalization on September 23, 1988, when the applicant was 13 years old. The applicant's mother is not a U.S. citizen. The applicant was admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident on April 27, 1989, when he was 14 years old. The applicant presently seeks a Certificate of Citizenship pursuant to section 321 of the former Immigration and Nationality Act (the former Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1432 (repealed).

The field office director determined that the applicant could not derive U.S. citizenship through his father, because he had failed to establish that he was in his father's legal and physical custody. The application was accordingly denied.

On appeal, the applicant maintains that he was in his father's custody. *See* Statement of Applicant on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the AAO. The applicant submits school and medical records in support of his appeal.

The Child Citizenship Act of 2000 (the CCA), Pub. L. No. 106-395, 114 Stat. 1631 (Oct. 30, 2000), which took effect on February 27, 2001, amended sections 320 and 322 of the Act, and repealed section 321 of the Act. The provisions of the CCA are not retroactive, and the amended provisions of section 320 and 322 of the Act apply only to persons who were not yet 18 years old as of February 27, 2001. *See Matter of Rodriguez-Tejedor*, 23 I&N Dec. 153 (BIA 2001). Because the applicant was over the age of 18 on February 27, 2001, he is not eligible for the benefits of the amended Act. Section 321 of the former Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1432, is therefore applicable in this case.

Section 321 of the former Act, stated, 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.

8 U.S.C. § 1431 (emphasis added).

The AAO notes that the applicant was born out of wedlock. The plain language of section 321(a)(3) of the former Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1432(a)(3), allows for derivation of U.S. citizenship by a child born out of wedlock only through a naturalizing mother (when paternity has not been established by legitimation).

The AAO notes the Second Circuit's decision in *Lewis v. Gonzales*, 481 F.3d 125, 130 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 2007) where the court emphasized that "because the second clause of § 1432(a)(3) explicitly provides for the circumstance in which 'the child was born out of wedlock,' we cannot interpret the first clause to silently recognize the same circumstance . . . ." Although the issue in the *Lewis* case was whether the parents had legally separated, the analysis and logic remain the same. Where the second clause of section 321(a)(3) explicitly provides for the mechanism for derivation of U.S. citizenship when a child is born out of wedlock, the first clause cannot be read to provide a way around the listed requirements.

"There must be strict compliance with all the congressionally imposed prerequisites to the acquisition of citizenship." *Fedorenko v United States*, 449 U.S. 490, 506 (1981). 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 AAO finds that the applicant has not met his burden of proof, and his appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.