



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

E3



FILE:



Office: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS (INDIANAPOLIS)

Date: MAR 08 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
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 AAO notes that although counsel has signed the Form I-290B and submitted a brief in support of the applicant's appeal, the record does not contain a Form G-28, Notice of Appearance as Attorney or Representative, which authorizes this representation. Accordingly, the AAO will consider the applicant to be self-represented in this matter.

The applicant is a native of China 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 December 25, 1953 to February 25, 1947.

The District Director reviewed the applicant's record and determined that a correction of the Certification of Naturalization was not justified. In her decision the District Director noted that although the applicant submitted a Chinese schooling certificate and a household registration indicating her birthday to be February 25, 1947, at the time of naturalization the applicant stated and confirmed her birthday to be December 25, 1953. The application was denied accordingly.

On appeal, the applicant asserts that her Certificate of Naturalization contains an erroneous date of birth. To establish her correct date of birth as February 25, 1947, the applicant submits: a certificate issued by a public notary of Guangdong province indicating that the applicant's household register shows her date of birth as February 25, 1947; a schooling certificate that provides the applicant's date of birth as February 25, 1947; a sworn affidavit and statements from her family members and a friend.

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 legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service (now, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS)) related clerical errors. 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. The AAO also observes that the record contains numerous forms with the December 25, 1953 date of birth, including the

Form G-325, Biographic Information sheet, filed with the application for citizenship; the Form I-131, Application for Issuance or Extension of Permit to Reenter the United States; the Form FS-511, Immigrant Visa And Alien Registration; the Form I-130, Petition to Classify Status of Alien Relative for Issuance of Immigrant Visa; a March 14, 1979 declaration before the Commissioner for Oaths, Hong Kong Home Affairs Department and a Biographic Data Report completed at the American Consulate General in Hong Kong on March 4, 1979. 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]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.