

Comment #	Public Comments	USCIS Response
Comment 1.	<p>Commenter: Matthew Dillinger (received Feb. 15, 2018)</p> <p>This appears to be only another example of the administration trying to make being a nonimmigrant in the United States more difficult.</p>	<p>Response: Section 5 of Executive Order (E.O.) 13780, entitled, “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States,” calls for the implementation of uniform screening and vetting standards for all immigration programs, including “a mechanism to ensure that applicants are who they claim to be” and “any other appropriate means for ensuring the proper collection of all information necessary for a rigorous evaluation of all grounds of inadmissibility or grounds for the denial of other immigration benefits.”</p> <p>USCIS believes that the I-539 biometrics requirement will enhance national security and identity verification, and that the burden of complying with the biometrics requirement is not excessive.</p>

Comment 2.	Commenter: Laurie Cox, Ball State University (received Mar. 5, 2018)	
	<p>2.a. This comment reflects a question about the instructions on page 4 of the revised I-539, Application to Extend/Change Nonimmigrant Status, which indicates that all individuals submitting this form will be required to appear for an appointment to have biometrics taken. However, the extensive proposed instructions indicates that biometrics may be required, and that the fee should be paid if applicable. So these 2 separate communications appear to contradict each other.</p> <p>2.b. I also do not recommend that biometrics should be required for students who complete this application form to extend/change their status in the United States. These students have already gone through extensive security checks. Moreover, not everyone can get to USCIS Application Support Centers without driving for many hours. Many states only have one USCIS Application Support Center.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Response 2.a.: USCIS tries to standardize the language it uses on all of its forms to streamline form development. All forms state that an ASC appointment may be required and some state that an ASC appointment will be required. Because a small number of I-539 filers for certain diplomatic visas are not required submit biometrics, the instructions cannot be revised to state that filers will or must submit biometrics. The fee provisions of the form instructions provide those who submit biometrics must pay the \$85 fee. Regardless of the form instructions, each applicant and co-applicant for Form I-539 who must submit biometrics will be notified of the time and place he or she is scheduled for an ASC appointment.</p>

		<p>Response 2.b. Section 5 of Executive Order (E.O.) 13780, entitled, “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States,” calls for the implementation of uniform screening and vetting standards for all immigration programs, including “a mechanism to ensure that applicants are who they claim to be” and “any other appropriate means for ensuring the proper collection of all information necessary for a rigorous evaluation of all grounds of inadmissibility or grounds for the denial of other immigration benefits.”</p> <p>USCIS believes that the biometrics requirement will enhance national security and identity verification, and that the burden of complying with the biometrics requirement is not excessive.</p>
--	--	--

Comment 3.	Commenter: Anonymous (received Feb. 22, 2018)	
	<p>Hello. Can you please clarify on page 4 of the Form I-539, do the proposed changes to require biometrics or appointments for ALL I-539 applications? If so, can you please explain why this is necessary? This will create an additional financial burden on the applicant.</p>	<p>Response: For the Form I-539, applicants who are requesting A, G, or NATO classifications are exempt from the biometrics fee by regulation. All other classifications must appear for biometrics collection and submit the associated fee.</p> <p>USCIS appreciates your concerns, but believes that the biometrics requirement will enhance national security, public safety, as well as identity verification, and that the burden of complying with the biometrics requirement is not excessive.</p>
Comment 4.	Commenter: Anonymous 2 (received Feb. 26, 2018)	
	<p>To gain Employment Authorization(EAD) there are lots of fraudulent practices happening, especially to get unconstitutional EAD's like H4 and OPT being very popular and there are lots of loopholes being exploited.</p> <p>Please stop issuing change of status there is lots of B1 to F1 conversion happening. COS need to be given on in exceptional conditions other wise the petitioner need to go back home country, get the new visa status he/she is requesting for</p>	<p>Response: USCIS must implement the immigration laws, and under Section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1258), the</p>

		<p>Secretary of Homeland Security may, under such conditions as he or she may prescribe, authorize a change from any nonimmigrant classification to any other nonimmigrant classification in the case of any alien lawfully admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant who is continuing to maintain that status.</p> <p>DHS regulations at 8 CFR 214.1(c)(2) provide for the extension of nonimmigrant stay beyond the initial period of admission under the authority of Section 214 of the INA through the use of the Form I-539. The data collected on Form I-539 is used by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine if a non-immigrant alien of the appropriate status who seeks to extend his or her stay beyond the currently authorized period of admission meets the criteria necessary to grant</p>
--	--	---

		an extension or change in status.
Comment 5.	Commenter: Anonymous 3 (received Feb. 24, 2018)	
	<p>View document:</p> <p>5.a. Conversion of status is misused category, given the fact out of 11 Million Undocumented over 1.5 Million are visa overstay. Its has become a cycle every 20-25 years to legalize undocumented and conversion of status is another loop hole Attorneys suggest to circumvent and stay beyond period of stay allotted by Department of State and DHS. So a conversion to another visa category need to make sure all the same check and verification are done as it a fresh application.</p> <p>There is wide spread misuse to F1 conversion , H4 conversion and those are exploiting loopholes to gain status and to work. Each such work permits H4 EAD or OPT EAD cost an American jobs. This has been going on for decades and Attorney Lobby and some of their contacts in USCIS has encouraging these practices.</p> <p>Example there are B1 to F1 Status conversion changes, H4 to F1 status these are cases where a person come into US and making a use of exiting status and then doing the ground work to a University Admission, given then fact that there mushrooming University Business by Asians origin Especially Chinese and Indian to misuse to get temporary work permits of CPT and OPT most of such universities in the past USCIS has found for fraud and not real Universities and the business model is to issue documents to unlawfully gain CPT and OPT work-permit.</p> <p>All such cases are prepared and backed by Attorneys who are aim to bring more immigrants and exploit them and make more money. USA need best and brightest and legal immigrants and they need come via legal process not exploiting current loop holes. Please stop status changes issuance other than extra ordinarily circumstances.</p> <p>5.b. All such application need to be processed at home country consular process. Please don't waste tax payer money , understand that USCIS runs on fees, however fundamental constitutional intent is protect well being of US citizens not non-immigrants. Last 8-9 years USCIS and Attorneys has the same agenda, collect more fees and bring more immigrants, that need to be changed, US Citizens needs jobs and safety that need to DHS and USCIS highest priority.</p> <p>Some of examples Attorney website where such loop holes discussion and guidance are encouraged</p>	<p>Response 5.a.: Section 5 of Executive Order (E.O.) 13780, entitled, "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States," calls for the implementation of uniform screening and vetting standards for all immigration programs, including "a mechanism to ensure that applicants are who they claim to be" and "any other appropriate means for ensuring the proper collection of all information necessary for a rigorous evaluation of all grounds of inadmissibility or grounds for the denial of other immigration benefits."</p> <p>USCIS believes that the biometrics requirement will address your concerns, enhance national security, public safety, and identity</p>

<http://forum.murthy.com/topic/103022-b1b2-to-f1-rfe/> <http://forum.murthy.com/topic/104309-change-of-status-from-b1b2-to-f1/> <http://mpoudatlaw.com/aspiring-student-going-b1b2-f1/> <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/b1b2-f1m1-change-nonimmigrant-status-alexander-segal-esq/> <http://myattorneyusa.com/uscis-faq-on-change-of-status-from-b-visitor-to-f1m1-student> <http://desiopt.com/news/631/How-to-Change-Status-from-B1-B2-to-F1-Visa-.html> <http://www.katzlawchicago.com/blogs/687-how-f1-students-can-apply-for-a-green-card>

verification, and that the burden of complying with the biometrics requirement is not excessive.

Response 5.b. USCIS must implement the immigration laws, and under Section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1258), the Secretary of Homeland Security may, under such conditions as he or she may prescribe, authorize a change from any nonimmigrant classification to any other nonimmigrant classification in the case of any alien lawfully admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant who is continuing to maintain that status.

DHS regulations at 8 CFR 214.1(c)(2) provide for the extension of nonimmigrant stay beyond the initial period of admission under the authority of Section 214

		<p>of the INA through the use of the Form I-539. The data collected on Form I-539 is used by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine if a non-immigrant alien of the appropriate status who seeks to extend his or her stay beyond the currently authorized period of admission meets the criteria necessary to grant an extension or change in status.</p>
Comment 6.	Commenter: Anonymous 4 (received Feb. 24, 2018)	
	<p>American are unsafe and non-immigrants are taking away jobs. All these visa conversion and overstay are money minting for Attorneys, Also they can national threats sneaking in due to unlimited flow and continue to be undetected.</p> <p>Make it mandatory to have person go back to home country and get approval of DHS/USCIS and then take DOS approval in case of change in visa status.</p> <p>There is lots of popularity to gain work permits under H4 EAD which is now a days Infinite renewal and gaining Employment Authorization forever displacing American workers and OPT EAD which is for 3 years though limited are issues by fraudulent Universities to gain access later to H1 visa. Address the misuse of H1 Visa, H4 EAD , F1 and OPT EAD</p>	<p>Response: USCIS must implement the immigration laws, and under Section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1258), the Secretary of Homeland Security may, under such conditions as he or she may prescribe, authorize a change from any nonimmigrant classification to any other nonimmigrant classification in the case of any alien lawfully admitted to the United</p>

		<p>States as a nonimmigrant who is continuing to maintain that status.</p> <p>DHS regulations at 8 CFR 214.1(c)(2) provide for the extension of nonimmigrant stay beyond the initial period of admission under the authority of Section 214 of the INA through the use of the Form I-539. The data collected on Form I-539 is used by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine if a non-immigrant alien of the appropriate status who seeks to extend his or her stay beyond the currently authorized period of admission meets the criteria necessary to grant an extension or change in status.</p> <p>The last part of the comment appears to address the Form I-765 rather than Form I-539, so is outside the scope of this I-539 revision.</p>
--	--	---

Comment 7.	Commenter: Anonymous 5 (received Feb. 26, 2018)	
	A step in right direction. Please stop hopping of one Visa category to another category. Change to another visa category need to be done afresh as a new applications.	Response: Thank you for your comment.
Comment 8.	Commenter: Anonymous 6 (received Feb. 26, 2018)	
	A welcome step. Stop issuing change of visa status from one to another.	Response: Thank you for your comment.
Comment 9.	Commenter: Anonymous 7 (received Mar. 15, 2018)	
	<p>There is be fabricated studies and tons of media articles by Paid below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Attorneys and their consortium 2) Non-Profits who is business of importing more immigrants. 3) A group of Federal Employees who are working in departments which benefits in eating funds based on importing more immigrants 4) Unethical Politicians who get lobbying money from above 3 groups. 5) Left wing media photo shopping plight of immigrants, fake stories to create more readership, blackmailing American compassion. <p>Those will be submitted as comments and How immigrants will be contributing Zillion dollars when they allowed to come freely and hop on different visa categories to circumvent visa overstays and covering up their fraudulent intentions.</p> <p>If USCIS has 1% commitment to US Citizens and follow Constitution and laws, then do you work to throw out the bullying by Attorney Cartel and stop change of visa status, EAD's for H4, OPT, Visa abuse of H1B,L1,B1/B2 etc.</p> <p>Introspect what you have done in last 2 season of H1B visa lottery, just check how many job titles companies are hiring low cost immigrants. US Unemployment figures are fabricated, millions of people are looking for Job even in field of Teaching, Sales job, physiotherapist and what not. Over last 3 decades dummy universities and mushroomed giving these degrees for immigrants in the pretext of getting EAD/Work Permits and then stealing American jobs. Do something, substantial than LIP service and TWEETS @USCIS.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS must implement the immigration laws, and under Section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1258), the Secretary of Homeland Security may, under such conditions as he or she may prescribe, authorize a change from any nonimmigrant classification to any other nonimmigrant classification in the case of any alien lawfully admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant who is continuing to maintain that status.</p> <p>DHS regulations at 8 CFR 214.1(c)(2) provide for the extension of nonimmigrant stay beyond the initial period of admission under the</p>

		<p>authority of Section 214 of the INA through the use of the Form I-539. The data collected on Form I-539 is used by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine if a non-immigrant alien of the appropriate status who seeks to extend his or her stay beyond the currently authorized period of admission meets the criteria necessary to grant an extension or change in status.</p> <p>The last part of the comment appear to address the EADs for H4s, visa abuse of H1B,L1,B1/B2 and OPT, and Visa Lottery rather than Form I-539 specifically, so is outside the scope of this I-539 revision.</p>
<p>Comment 10.</p>	<p>Commenter: Xuan Luo (I) (received Mar. 27, 2018)</p>	
	<p>In the I-539 instructions, page 1, under "Who May File Form I-539", "Nonimmigrant Categories", it says "This application may be used by the following nonimmigrants, listed in alphabetical order." For people applying for Change of Status, this text seems to indicate that they should look under the</p>	<p>Response: USCIS agrees with the commenter and has amended the</p>

	<p>subsection for their existing status, and not for the status they are changing into. But this wouldn't make sense, as the requirements in the subsection for each status are about requirements to show one is eligible to be granted status. Also, some statuses, like H1B, are not listed, but it is possible to apply for Change of Status from H1B to one of the statuses listed here, like B2. It would make more sense if a Change of Status applicant should look under the status they are changing into (and the statuses that are not listed, like H1B, are not listed because they can only be changed into via I-129 and not I-539). The text in the instructions should be clarified to indicate that Change of Status applicants should look under the status they are seeking Change of Status into.</p>	<p>instructions for clarification:</p>
Comment 11.	Commenter: Xuan Luo (II) (received Mar. 27, 2018)	
	<p>On the I-539 form, Part 3 item 2 says "Select this box if you were granted, or are seeking, Duration of Status (D/S)." For someone using I-539 to apply for Change of Status, it would seem that this checkbox should be checked if the existing status they are changing from was admitted for D/S, or the new status they are changing into should be admitted for D/S, or both. For example, for someone filing I-539 to change status from F2 status to H4 status, and F2 status was admitted for D/S, it would seem like they would need to check the box, even though they are not seeking D/S for the H4 status they are changing into. It seems odd that they would be asking for such a "logical or" of the two conditions, as it won't necessarily allow the officer to distinguish whether the box was checked because the applicant was in D/S in the existing status, or because the applicant is seeking D/S for the status they are changing into (or both). Part 1 item 16 already asked if the person was granted D/S for their existing status, so it seems unnecessary to ask for this again, and it would make more sense if Part 3 item 2 only asked about whether the applicant seeks D/S for the status they are extending or changing into.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS agrees with this comment and has eliminated the duplicate question.</p>
Comment 12.	David Zaret (received Apr. 10, 2018)	
	<p>April 10, 2018</p> <p>RE: DHS Docket No. USCIS-2007-0038, OMB Control Number 1615-0003</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I write on behalf of Indiana University in response to the proposed USCIS adjustments to Form I-539 "Application to Extend/Change Nonimmigrant Status."</p>	

Indiana University enrolls more than 114,000 students on its eight campuses: the flagship campus in Bloomington, which is a residential campus; an urban campus in Indianapolis, which also includes the IU Medical Center; and six regional campuses in the Indiana cities of Gary, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Kokomo, Richmond, and New Albany. The University offers 1,124 degree programs, has more than 250 research centers and institutes, and employs more than 20,000 faculty, professional, and support staff.

Internationally known for the quality of its academic programs and strong international student and scholar support services, Indiana University enrolls more than 8,500 international students, and also processes immigrant and non-immigrant work petitions for international faculty, researchers, physicians and support staff and obtains J-1 waivers through the Conrad 30 program.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Form I-539. Specific comments and suggestions are outlined below.

Instructions:

It would be helpful to add additional information (beyond the reference made on page 3, section 6) that speaks more to the new policy USCIS appears to be following regarding bridging one status to the next.

Additionally, on page 3, section 6, clarification about the Form I-94 that must be submitted would be useful. It appears as though the instructions indicate that applicants should submit original Forms I-94, but without saying that specifically. Since many Forms I-94 are now electronic, it would be helpful to clarify if an original document is required, or if a print out of the electronic Form I-94 or photocopy of the paper Form I-94 would be acceptable. If an original Form I-94 is required, clarification about how one could fulfill that requirement with an electronic Form I-94 will be appreciated.

Application Form

In a review of the entire Form, street name and number come up quite a bit. In some cases, it's for a U.S.-based address, and in other cases, it appears to permit a non-U.S. address. In all cases, we ask that you kindly add an additional street address box. Some addresses will take up

Response: Bridging- USCIS is not making changes to the bridge application. Guidance has been available on the USCIS website for many months and has represented a policy change. We will consider these suggestions in a future revision.

Response: I-94- USCIS will add "a copy of" to the I-94 language.

<p>more space than is allotted in the one line given for street number and name.</p> <p>Reference is made throughout the Form to providing additional information in Part 8. Given the length of the form, we would recommend adding the page number that Part 8 is located on.</p> <p>Part 1. Information About You:</p> <p>1.a., 1.b. and 1.c. – We appreciate the clear boxes designated for the applicant’s name. We would suggest, however, increasing the character limit, rather than having the applicant provide full names on a separate page. On the separate page, we note that the box is the same size as it is on page 1. If it doesn’t fit on page 1, it won’t fit in the box on page 8. We recommend making the spacing longer to allow for longer names.</p> <p>2. – We suggest adding “(if any)” to this question – Alien Registration Number (A-Number).</p> <p>13. – We suggest adding “(if any)” to this question – Travel Document Number.</p> <p>15.a. – It would be helpful to add some examples of what information you’re looking for regarding current immigration status. [e.g. F-1 student, H-4 dependent, etc.]</p> <p>Part 2. Application Type</p> <p>2.a.-c. – Is the applicant meant to check both 2.a. and 2.b. and to fill out 2.c.? That’s not inherently clear from the form itself. Perhaps if a person checks 2a “a change of status” then you could have questions 2b and 2c underneath it (indented) and just refer to it as 2.</p> <p>Part 3. Processing Information</p> <p>2. – This question is unclear. It reads “Select this box if you were granted, or are seeking, Duration of Status (D/S)”. Form I-539 is used for more than one purpose, but it would be clearer to remove “were granted” from that sentence. In the case of a change of status or reinstatement of status application where D/S is involved, “are seeking” is applicable, and less confusing.</p>	<p>Response: Field length- USCIS is not making changes to the form field lengths at this time. Each field contains character limits and updates to the processing system would take significant time and resources. If additional space or explanation is needed to provide completely information, Part 8. Additional Information can be used. Part 8 contains free text space that does not have the same character limitations.</p> <p>Response: 2 and 13- USCIS has added “if any” to these fields.</p> <p>Response: 15a USCIS has added examples to this question.</p> <p>Response: 2.a.-2.c. USCIS has removed one checkbox and re-ordered the questions to help provide clarity</p> <p>Response: Processing This question has been removed.</p> <p>Response: 3.b. Updates</p>
--	--

	<p>3.b. – This question refers back to a previous question, but it appears as though there may be a typo. Is this referring back to Question 3.a.?</p> <p>5.-6.c. – The individual filing this form has already provided the receipt number (see 4.b.). Are Questions 5 and 6 necessary? If so, we suggest clarifying that you are asking for the Service Center or Field Office where the petition or application was filed.</p> <p>Part 4. Additional Information About the Applicant</p> <p>1.a. 1.a. – We suggest that the wording here could be made clearer by using “Country of Passport Issuance”.</p> <p>1.b. – We suggest that asking for the “Passport Expiration Date” would be clearer.</p> <p>Part 5. Applicant’s Statement, Contact Information, Declaration, Certification and Signature</p> <p>The new paragraph at the top of column two states that biometrics will be required. The related instructions (pg. 11, “Biometrics Services Appointment”) more accurately states that biometrics <i>may</i> be required. We suggest the form be adjusted to match the instructions.</p> <p>Supplement A</p> <p>12.b. – This item asks for the individual’s current status expiration date with a mm/dd/yyyy indicator. We would ask that you include reference to “Duration of Status”, or provide a “Duration of Status (D/S)” box that the applicant could check.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the above recommendations into consideration prior to issuing the final revised version of Form I-539.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>made to the form have corrected this error.</p> <p>Response: 5 and 6 USCIS has deleted the questions regarding the office and location where the prior cases were filed.</p> <p>Response: 1.a-1.b-USCIS has made the suggested changes.</p> <p>Response: Part 5- USCIS has added clarifying language.</p> <p>Response: USCIS is not making changes to the form field lengths at this time. Each field contains character limits and updates to the processing system would take significant time and resources and delay</p>
--	---	---

	<p>David Zaret Vice President</p> <p>cc: Christopher Viers, Associate Vice President for International Services</p>	<p>implementation of biometrics collection. If additional space or explanation is needed to provide completely information, Part 8. Additional Information can be used. Part 8 contains free text space that does not have the same character limitations.</p>
<p>Comment 13.</p>	<p>Sheila Schulte</p>	
	<p>April 12, 2018</p> <p>Samantha Deshommes Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division Office of Policy and Strategy U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Department of Homeland Security 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20529</p> <p><i>Submitted via the Federal eRulemaking Portal at litt p:lll-vww.regulations.gov</i></p> <p>Re: U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Proposed Revision of Form I-539; DHS Docket ID Number USCIS-2007-0038; OMB Control Number 1615-0003</p> <p>Dear Ms. Deshommes:</p> <p>NAFSA: Association of International Educators submits this comment letter in response to the notice at 83 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 687,46874-6875 (Feb. 14, 2019) concerning the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services' (USCIS) proposed revision of Form I-539 "Application to Extend/Change</p>	

Nonimmigrant Status." NAFSA is the world's largest association of international education professionals with over 10,000 members, many of whom work with international students, faculty, and researchers who may be eligible to file Form 1-539. We offer several specific suggestions that we believe will improve the proposed revised form and instructions.

Abandon the burdensome, complicated, and expensive "bridge application" policy or revise Form 1-539 and the Form Instructions to address the policy adequately

In late 2017 and early 2018, with its published 1-539 processing times approaching one year, USCIS published guidance instructing certain change of status applicants to file "bridge applications" while waiting for USCIS to approve their original application. On April 5, 2017, USCIS published guidance instructing those seeking a change of status from B-1 or B-2 status to F-1 or M-1 status to file a "bridge application" to extend their B status if their SEVIS record was deferred to a date more than 30 days beyond the expiration of their B status¹. On February 6, 2018, USCIS expanded this guidance to changes of status from any

¹ The April 5, 2017 version of USCIS' bridge application guidance has been archived by the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine at <https://web.archive.org/web/20170626001853/https://www.uscis.gov/working-united-states/students-and-exchange-visitors/students-and-emploment/special-instructions-b-1b-2-visitors-who-want-enroll-school>

nonimmigrant category (not just B) to F-1 or M-1². Applicants who fail to file a "bridge application" risk having their change of status application denied.

This is not a reasonable means for an agency to address its own challenges in accomplishing its work in a timely manner. The "bridge application" policy exacerbates the uncertainty caused by USCIS' extreme processing times, further complicates an already complicated application process, and financially penalizes applicants with additional filing fees, rendering change of status virtually unavailable for many prospective applicants. All or at least most applicants for change to F-1, M-1, or J-1 status will require deferral of their SEVIS record and be required to file "bridge applications"³

NAFSA recommends that USCIS abandon its policy requiring "bridge applications" to be filed when start dates in SEVIS are deferred, and change the F, M, and J notes to read along the lines of, "You must maintain your current, or other, nonimmigrant status up to 30 days before the report date or start date listed on the Form 1-20 or Form DS-2019 you submitted as initial evidence in support of your application to change to F-1, M-1, or J-1 status, or your requested change of status may not be granted." If USCIS insists on continuing to require "bridge applications," Form 1-539 and the Form 1-539 instructions should be revised to describe the policy adequately and account for the policy. A thorough review of form instructions is essential since a form's instructions "are incorporated into the regulations requiring its submission." [8 CFR 103.2(a)(1)]. It is not sufficient simply to post guidance on the USCIS web site concerning the "bridge application" policy.

We offer the following specific recommendations:

Revise the F-1, M-1, and J-1 notes in the 1-539 instructions

The following items in the "Who May File Form 1-539" section of the Form 1-539 instructions contain inadequate notice on the complexity of USCIS' change of status bridge policy. The current language at items 6 (p. F-1, Academic Student), 13 (p. 6, M-1, Vocational or Non Academic Student), and 11 (p. 5, J-1, Exchange Visitor), each contain an identical Note, varying only as to whether the applicant is requesting F-1 or M-1 student status or J-1 exchange visitor status:

"NOTE: A change of status may be granted for a period of up to 30 days before the report date or start date of the [course of study] [approved program] listed on [Form 1-20] [Form DS-2019]. You must maintain your current, or other, nonimmigrant status up to 30 days before the report date or start date of the [course of study] [approved program] listed on [Form 1-20] [Form

Response: USCIS is not making changes to the bridge application. Guidance has been available on the USCIS website for many months and has not been a policy change. We will consider these suggestions in a future revision.

DS-2019] or your requested change of status may not be granted."

z USCIS' current, expanded bridge application guidance is at <https://www.uscis.gov/working-united-states/students-and-exchange-visitors/students-and-employment/changing-nonimmigrant-f-or-m-student-status>

³ Since SEVIS is programmed to cancel an F-1, M-1, or J-1 record automatically if it is not registered or validated in SEVIS within a certain amount of time beyond the intended start date, the Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVP) and the Department of State have instructed Designated School Officials (DSOs) and Responsible Officers (ROs) to defer the start date in SEVIS rather than register or validate the record.

The notes in this section should be revised to explain the "bridge application" policy adequately. Among the issues to be addressed are these:

- The notes do not adequately describe the need for a bridge application or sequence of bridge applications.
- The notes do not adequately distinguish between the start date on the paper Form I-20 or DS-2019 submitted as initial evidence with the Form I-539, and the start date in the SEVIS system.
- The notes do not reflect the "Catch-22" that some applicants will face. For example, an H-4 dependent who applies for a change of status to F-1 student and approaches "aging out" (turning age 21) due to extreme USCIS processing times will not be eligible to file a bridge application to extend her H-4 status beyond age 21. If this applicant files a bridge application to change status to H-2 to bridge the gap, he or she would have to stop studying, because B-2 visitors are not permitted to study.

Clarify that a "bridge application" serves as an independent basis for filing a subsequent "bridge application" after expiration of applicant's original nonimmigrant status

Given USCIS' extremely long I-539 processing times, an applicant for change of status to F-1, M-1, or J-1 may be required to file a sequence of "bridge applications" while awaiting adjudication of the initial change of status application. Since the first "bridge application" will likely also still be pending in many cases, the applicant will be required to file a second and possibly subsequent "bridge applications." The applicant's original nonimmigrant status will have expired while awaiting USCIS adjudication of the change of status application, so a "bridge application" should serve as an independent ground for filing a subsequent "bridge application." In other words, an applicant should not be further penalized by having his or her initial change of status application denied simply because USCIS was also extremely slow in adjudicating any "bridge applications" that it required of the applicant.

This should be clearly stated by adding a new paragraph in the "When Should I Use Form I-539" section of the Form I-539 instructions, along the lines of: "You are filing a 'bridge' application in connection with a prior bridge application already filed in connection with a change of status application to F-1, M-1, or J-1 status."

Add a "bridge application" box to Form I-539, Part 3. Processing Information

As noted, neither the Form I-539 nor the Form I-539 Instructions adequately explain or provide for the complexity of USCIS' "bridge application" policy for changes to F-1, M-1, or J-1. If USCIS insists on maintaining this policy, it should add sufficient "bridge application" boxes to Form I-539 in "Part 3. Processing Information," and provide adequate instructions to

NAFSA comment - Re: U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Proposed Revision of Form I-539; DHS Docket ID Number USC/S-2007-0038; OMB Control Number 1615-0003

accommodate the variety of circumstances applicants might face in complying with the "bridge application" policy.

Clarify the instructions on change of status effective date

Item 7 (Instructions, p. 13), reads:

..Change of Status. Part 2., Item Number 2.b. of the application, select the date you want your change of status to occur on. If approved, your change of status will occur on

the date your current nonimmigrant status ends, the date of approval, or the requested date, whichever occurs later."

Revise the instructions to reflect USCIS policy on *mmc pro tunc* approvals

The cascade of change of status effective dates described in this instruction is not consistent with USCIS policy for applications approved after the expiration of the applicant's current nonimmigrant status. These USCIS documents describe a *mmc pro tunc* approval policy for such applications:

- [USCIS Customer Guide for change of status applicants \[Form M-5778\]](#)⁴: "If your application for a change of status is approved, the change of status will relate back to the date your Form 1-94 expired, and your status during the pendency of your application will then be considered to have been lawful."
- [USCIS Customer Guide for extension of status applicants \[Form M-579\]](#)⁵

"If your

application for an extension of status is approved, the extension of status will relate back to the date your Form 1-94 expired, and your status during the pendency of your application will then be considered to have been lawful."

Clarify how the requested change of status date relates to the program start date for changes of status to F-1, M-1, and J-1

The instructions should clarify how the date requested at Part 2., Item 2.b. should relate to:

- the program start date on the Form 1-20 or DS-2019 submitted as initial evidence in an application to change status to F-1, M-1, or J-1; and
- the program start date in the applicant's SEVIS record if that date must be deferred to

Response: USCIS is not making changes to include *nunc pro tunc* approvals in this revision because it is in internal adjudication policy and is not appropriate for the public facing form instructions. We may consider your suggested changes in a future form or revision or applicable policy guidance.

avoid automatic system cancellation of the SEVIS record.

The requested change of status effective date also relates to USCIS' policy regarding "bridge applications" in general (see our comment above, "Bridge applications" filed in sequence as

⁴ <https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/C2en.pdf>

⁵ <https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/C1en.pdf>

an independent basis for filing a Form I-539 after expiration of an applicant's original nonimmigrant status"). The I-539 instructions should be revised to reflect the manner in which USCIS actually adjudicates changes of status to F-1, M-1, and J-1.

Revise the I-539 Instructions to clarify that F-1 students entering to study at a public secondary school should be admitted for Duration of Status (D/S) like other F-1 students

The I-539 instructions under "Who May File Form I-539/F-1 Extensions" (p. 3) read:

"Only use this application to request an extension if you were admitted for a limited duration as a student entering to study at a public secondary school. All other students seeking information concerning extensions should contact their DSO."

This implies that F-1 public secondary school students are admitted for a date-specific period, which is not in accord with current DHS practice. F-1 public secondary school students should be (and are) admitted for duration of status (DIS) just as other F-1 students, even though their study is limited to an aggregate of 12 months. Extensions of stay, changes of level, and transfers to another public school within that 12 months, as well as transfers to private schools or to institutions of higher education, should be handled through regular SEVIS procedures. [See, e.g., NAFSA's [January, 2008 SEVIS Liaison Call](#)].⁶

NAFSA recommends that USCIS remove this paragraph from the I-539 instructions. Alternatively, the paragraph should be replaced with text that instructs F-1 students who have been admitted for a 30-day date-specific period on Form I-515A that they should contact their DSO and follow the procedures outlined on Form I-515A to extend their stay, rather than file Form I-539.

Response: Students-
USCIS notes that page 3 instructs the secondary school applicant to use the I-539 only if admitted for a limited duration, and otherwise directs the

Clarify the use of Form 1-539 when filed to extend M-1 stay in connection with a Form 1-765 filed for M-1 practical training.

The 1-539 Instruction at "Who May File Form 1-539, Item 13, M-1, Vocational or Non Academic Student, M-1 Extension," Paragraph C (p. 6), states that an applicant should file Form 1-539 when: "You are applying for post-completion optional practical training." NAFSA recommends that USCIS revise paragraph C to reflect the relationship between Form 1-765 and Form 1-539 in the M-1 practical training process. The [instructions to Form 1-765](#)⁷ state that Form 1-539 must be submitted with Form I-765 when applying for M-1 OPT:

"File Form 1-765 with a completed Form 1-539, Application to Change/Extend Nonimmigrant Status, according to the filing instructions for Form I-539. You must also include Form I-20 M-N, Certificate of Eligibility for Nonimmigrant (M-1) Student Status-- For Vocational Students endorsed by the Designated School Official within the past 30 days, with your application."

⁶ <http://www.1af.c:a.org/Ejle/ /sev js call summary 2008 Ol.pdf>

⁷ <https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/files/fonn/i-765instr.pdf>

NAFSA comment - Re: U.S. Citizens/zip and Immigration Services Proposed Revision of Form

The I-539 instructions should have complementary language, such as:

"File Form 1-539 with a completed Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization and a Form I-20 M-N reflecting a practical training recommendation made by the Designated School Official in SEVIS no more than 30 days before USCIS receives your practical training application."

Include all DIS categories and specify that nonimmigrants with "DIS" should leave the expiration date field blank

Item 6 (Instructions, p. 13), reads:

applicant to the DSO.

USCIS will consider additional clarifying language that will address the concerns in your comment in a future revision of Form I-539.

Response: M status-
USCIS is not making changes to the current M practical training instruction text at this time, but would refer applicants to the SEVP requirements for additional information.

"Duration of Status. If you are currently in F or J status and granted Duration of Status (*DIS*), select the box in Part 1., Item Number 16 of the application."

NAFSA suggests:

- Revise this instruction to reference all "duration of status" nonimmigrant categories, including F and J nonimmigrants, as well as I (media representatives and dependents), A (diplomats and their dependents), and G (employees of international organizations and their dependents).
- Specify what the applicant should do with the Expiration Date field at Part 1., Item 5.b. NAFSA suggests that the instructions tell applicants to leave the Expiration Date field at Part 1., Item 5.b. blank if they select the *DIS* box at Part 1., Item 16.

Item 8 (Instructions, p. 13), reads:

"F or J Nonimmigrant. If you were granted D/S as an For J nonimmigrant and are seeking reinstatement or are requesting a change of status to an F or J nonimmigrant then you should select the box in Part 3., Item Number 2. Of the application to indicate a duration of D/S."

NAFSA suggests:

- Changes to other *DIS* categories like I, A, and G, should also be referenced.
- Specify what the applicant should do with the Expiration Date field at Part 1., Item 5.b. NAFSA suggests that the instructions tell applicants to leave the Expiration Date field at Part 1., Item 5.b. blank if they select the *DIS* box at Part 1., Item 16.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed revision of Form 1-539.

Sincerely,

Response: The instructions state that applicants should use "N/A or "none" in fields that do not apply. USCIS cannot determine whether the applicant overlooked a question if the field is left blank.

Response: D/S applicants -USCIS will

Sheila K. Schulte
Deputy Executive Director
Leadership and Professional Development Services

include I, A, and G instructions How to Fill Out Form I-539 #6.

Response: D/S in date menu- USCIS appreciates that not all names fit in the spaces provided on our Adobe Acrobat fillable forms. We are not making changes to the form field lengths at this time because adding character limits would require updates to the I-539 data system which would require significant time and resources. If additional space or explanation is needed to provide completely information, Part 8. Additional Information can be used. Part 8 contains free text space that does not have the same character limitations. We will consider increasing the character limits in the future.

Comment 14.	American Immigration Lawyers Association	
	<p>April 16, 2018 Department of Homeland Security U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Office of Policy and Strategy Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20529-2140 Submitted via www.regulations.gov Docket ID No. USCIS-2007-0038</p> <p>Re: OMB Control Number 1615-0003 USCIS 60-Day Notice and Request for Comments: Form I-539, Application to Extend/Change Nonimmigrant Status</p>	

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA) submits the following comments in response to the above-referenced 60-Day Notice and Request for Comments on proposed revisions to Form I-539, Application to Extend/Change Nonimmigrant Status, published in the Federal Register on February 15, 2018.¹

AILA is a voluntary bar association of more than 15,000 attorneys and law professors practicing, researching, and teaching in the field of immigration and nationality law. Our mission includes the advancement of the law pertaining to immigration and nationality and the facilitation of justice in the field. AILA members regularly advise and represent businesses, U.S. citizens, lawful permanent residents, and foreign nationals regarding the application and interpretation of U.S. immigration laws. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to Form I-539, the Supplement A associated with Form I-539, and the instructions for these forms.

Proposed Instructions for Form I-539

Validity of Signatures

On page 11, the proposed instructions state, “USCIS will consider a photocopied, faxed, or scanned copy of the original, handwritten signature valid for filing purposes. The photocopy, fax, or scan must be of the original document containing the handwritten, ink signature.” We applaud USCIS for allowing submission of Form I-539 with a photocopied, faxed, or scanned copy of an

1
83 Fed. Reg. 6874 (Feb. 15, 2018).
Comments: Form I-539
April 16, 2018
Page 2

original handwritten signature. Such a change is long-awaited, in line with modern practices, and will streamline filing procedures for applicants, attorneys, accredited representatives, translators, and other parties.

USCIS Resources to Conduct Interviews

Response: Thank you for your comment.

	<p>The proposed instructions indicate that USCIS may require an I-539 applicant to appear for an interview or provide biometrics. We note that the possibility of an interview is the latest in a trend of USCIS imposing new and unnecessary burdens on beneficiaries of immigration benefits.</p> <p>Form I-539 applications are processed by USCIS Service Centers. These are regional, remote locations that are not accessible to the public. Almost three decades ago, legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service consolidated jurisdiction for adjudication of nonimmigrant petitions and applications with the regional service centers to create a cadre of officers with subject-matter expertise and to enhance the consistency of adjudications. USCIS Field Offices do not adjudicate nonimmigrant petitions or applications of any kind. Referral of I-539 applicants to such offices for an interview would mean either review by officers without expertise in the nuances of the benefit sought or the need to train a new set of officers on all of the various nonimmigrant classifications covered by Form I-539, including F, M, J, H-4, O-3, T, and U. In addition, requiring field office interviews for I-539 applications would add significant costs and administrative burdens to both USCIS and the individual applicants, all of whom are already subject to background and security checks. Therefore, interviews should be limited to those instances where there is a true need to speak to the applicant in-person, and should not be instituted across the board.</p> <p><i>Translations</i></p> <p>The General Instructions on page 12 state, “DHS recommends the certification contain the translator’s printed name, the signature date, and the translator’s contact information.” We note that a recommendation can be ignored with no detriment while ignoring a requirement would result in a potential request for evidence or denial of the benefit sought. If the requested information from the translator is in fact a requirement, it should be clearly stated as such in the instructions.</p> <p><i>Biometrics Fee</i></p>	<p>Response: interview/biometrics/fee-</p> <p>The form instructions were revised to add notice of the possibility of an interview, as has been authorized by 8 CFR 103.2(b)(9) for many years. While USCIS can require an I-539 applicant to appear or an interview, USCIS only plans to require biometric submission at this point, and plans no increase in For I-539 related interviews.</p> <p>We agree that the instructions were ambiguous. We have revised the instructions to state that any applicant on Form I-539 or Form I-539, supplement A must pay the \$85 fee and appear at an ASC to provide biometrics.</p> <p>USCIS will also provide notice to all applicants who are required to appear for biometrics or interview appointments.</p>
--	--	---

The proposed instructions at page 14 include a requirement that all applicants (except for certain A and G nonimmigrants) pay an additional biometrics service fee of \$85. It is not clear from the form instructions, however, whether I-539 applicants may be required, or will be required to provide biometrics. The proposed instructions indicate on Page 11 that USCIS “may” require the applicant to appear for an interview or provide biometrics, whereas the proposed revisions to

Comments: Form I-539
April 16, 2018
Page 3

Form I-539 mandate on Page 4 that the applicant acknowledge that “I understand that USCIS will require me to appear for an appointment to take my biometrics (fingerprints, photograph, and/or signature)...” The biometric fee should not be required for all I-539 applicants. Instead, the fee should only be required for those applicants who are required to provide biometrics, and both the form and the instructions need to be clear in this regard.

Fee Waiver

USCIS is proposing to eliminate information about fee waivers from page 14 of the instructions. The current text regarding the ability to apply for a fee waiver should remain in the instructions so that T and U visa applicants are aware of their ability to seek a fee waiver in accordance with 8 CFR §103.7(c)(3)(xviii).

Passport and Travel Document Numbers

On page 12, the proposed instructions indicate that if an applicant “used a passport or travel document to travel to the United States,” the applicant should “enter either the passport or travel document information in the appropriate space on the form, even if the passport or travel document is currently expired.” If USCIS is asking applicants to provide the number of the passport or travel document that they utilized at the time they last entered the United States, this should be made more explicit, by modifying the instructions as follows (suggested language underlined):

Passport and Travel Document Numbers. If you used a passport or travel document to travel to the United States, enter the number of either the passport or travel document you

We have re-inserted the instructions stating that T or U visa applicants may request a fee waiver.

Response: Translations-

We have edited the translation instruction to read:
If you submit a document with information in a foreign language, you must also submit a full English translation. The translator must sign a certification that the English language

	<p>utilized for your last entry to the United States in Part 1. Question 12 or 13, even if the passport or travel document is currently expired.</p> <p>If more than one person is included in this application, have each person enter the number of either the passport or travel document they utilized for their last entry to the United States in Question 9 and/or 10 of Supplement A, even if the passport or travel document is currently expired.</p> <p>Failure to clarify the instructions could result in applicants providing the number of their most recent passport or travel document, which may be different from the number of the passport or travel document they utilized to last enter the United States.</p> <p><u>Proposed Form I-539</u></p> <p><i>Current Passport Information</i></p> <p>Comments: Form I-539 April 16, 2018 Page 4</p> <p>As the passport information provided by the applicant in Part 1 of Form I-539 may be different than the applicant’s current passport information (i.e., passport has been renewed since applicant last entered the United States), Part 4 of Form I-539 should provide an opportunity for the applicant to list the number of their current passport.</p>	<p>translation is complete and accurate, and that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English. The certification must also include the translator’s signature, printed name, the signature date, and the translator’s contact information.</p> <p>The translator’s contact information is needed in enforcement actions when the applicant/defendant disavows misrepresentations and attributes a false statement to a translation issue. This is an extremely common defense which can be very difficult to rebut. When this defense is raised, prosecutors need to be able to interview the translator and hopefully use them as a witness</p> <p>Response: This language, which is standard on all USCIS forms since 2016, provides that USCIS will only release and share</p>
--	---	---

	<p><i>Applicant's Declaration and Certification</i></p> <p>We are concerned with the addition of language that would authorize the release of “information contained in this application, in supporting documents, and in my USCIS records, to other entities and persons where necessary for the administration and enforcement of U.S. immigration law.” From a privacy perspective, it is concerning that the proposed authorization extends to “other entities and persons” without specifically enumerating which entities or persons might have access to this information. We are also concerned that this could make it easier for the general public to access confidential information as well as compromise applicants’ personally identifiable information, through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request or similar means.</p> <p><i>Preparer's Certification</i></p> <p>We are concerned with the addition of the following language in the preparer’s certification: “I completed this application based only on information that the applicant provided to me or authorized me to obtain or use.” This language is too narrow and fails to take into consideration the many resources and tools that attorneys may consult and utilize in order to effectively</p>	<p>information as permitted by the Privacy Act and obtain information necessary to adjudicate the application .</p> <p>Response: We believe this language is consistent with the services provided by an attorney in preparing of this form for a client and what the preparer should attest to.</p> <p>Response: Fee Waiver This item has been added back into the instructions.</p> <p>Response: Passport and Travel Doc USCIS made</p>
--	--	--

represent a client, including but not limited to the Immigration and Nationality Act, federal regulations, case law, the applicant's immigration history, individualized research, etc.

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to Form I-539, the Supplement A associated with Form I-539 and their instructions, and we look forward to a continuing dialogue with USCIS on these issues.

Sincerely,
THE AMERICAN IMMIGRATION LAWYERS ASSOCIATION

edits to the instructions to clarify.

<p>Comment 15.</p>	<p>Jessica Anlauf (received Dec. 30, 2017)</p>	
	<p>USCIS, DHS - Are currently refusing to maintain ANY FILES on US Citizens, therefore placing ALL US Citizen RECORDS, which contain US Citizen personal identifying information into alien files, in other words "irretrievable format." (THIS APPLIES to ANY INFORMATION COLLECTION ACTIVITIES, that could possibly contain USC personal identifiers, incl. supporting docs).</p> <p>The Department of Justice has warned against the abuse of agencies that refuse to maintain files in retrievable formats, so as to deny them access to their own information: "Indeed, a major criticism of the Privacy Act is that it can easily be circumvented by not filing records in name-retrieved formats. See Privacy Commission Report at 503-04 & n.7, available at http://epic.org/privacy/ppsc1977report. Recognizing this potential for abuse, some courts have relaxed the "actual retrieval" standard in particular cases. Moreover, certain subsections of the Act have been construed to apply even to records not incorporated into a 'system of records.'" Found Here: https://www.justice.gov/opcl/definitions#record</p> <p>The OMB Guidelines state that the term "record" means "any item of information about an individual that includes an individual identifier," OMB Guidelines, 40 Fed. Reg. 28,948, 28,951 (July 9, 1975), available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/inforeg/implementation_guidelines.pdf (emphasis added), and "can include as little as one descriptive item about an individual," id. at 28,952 (quoting legislative history appearing at 120 Cong. Rec. 40,408, 40,883 (1974), reprinted in Source Book at 866, 993, available at http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/LH_privacy_act-1974.pdf. The Second Circuit found the Third Circuit's test to be supported by the legislative history of the Privacy Act and by the guidelines issued by OMB, id. at 61-62. Emphasizing that "the legislative history makes plain that Congress intended 'personal information' . . . to have a broad meaning," the Second Circuit held that the term "record" "has 'a broad meaning encompassing,' at the very least, any personal information 'about an individual that is linked to that individual through an identifying particular.'" Id. at 62 (quoting Quinn and holding that letter containing Bechhoefer's name and "several pieces of 'personal information' about him, including his address, his voice/fax telephone number, his employment, and his membership in [an association]," was a record covered by Privacy Act).</p> <p>USCIS has claimed that once a record is placed into the alien's file, it is no longer considered "about" the US Citizen. This, however, is erroneous in multiple ways:</p>	<p>Response: USCIS thanks the commenter for the comment. Per USCIS Records Policy, a Receipt File (R File) is created by the Lock box contractor for "most immigration benefits require [ing] payment." In the case of immigration benefit requests submitted by a petitioner on behalf of a beneficiary, the R-File can be retrieved by the name of the petitioner or beneficiary. R-Files are then forwarded to appropriate USCIS office for adjudications. Depending on the nature of the requested benefit, the contents are interfiled into an A-File under the name of the petitioner. Remaining R-Files are retained pursuant to the approved NARA schedule</p>

<p>Contracts, between the federal government and the U.S. Citizen (ie. I-864) are just that, between the US Citizen and Federal Government. Yet, USCIS places I-864 contracts into the alien's file, and then claims the contract between the US Citizen and Federal Government, no longer pertains to the US Citizen, and therefore the US Citizen is denied access to the status of that contract, and even a copy of their own contract. They are denied the ability to even have knowledge of whether the Federal Government is performing, failing to perform, breach, etc. while at the same time, all such personal information regarding the US Citizen contractual/business relationship with the federal government, is granted to the alien, not only denying US Citizens access to own information, but releasing US Citizen personal information to a 3rd party.</p> <p>USCIS also utilizes all of the information contained within the alien's file, when determining whether to grant the US Citizen the ability to sponsor all future aliens. The truth is, everything within the alien's file pertains to the US Citizen, because the US Citizen is his/her sponsor, and such information is relied upon, when making future determinations for the US Citizen's own applications.</p> <p>USCIS' unlawful policies much change. USCIS MUST either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(1) maintain files on US Citizens;(2) grant US Citizens access to ALL of their own information, pertaining to them, which USCIS chooses to maintain and RELY UPON, in whatever file they choose to maintain it in, & allow them to correct errors. <p>It is the mission of the Department of Homeland Security to protect the American people. This is a PUBLIC POLICY issue, as the entire policy is contrary to its original design, granting ALL individuals access to their own information maintained by USCIS, AND the ability to correct errors.</p> <p>The ONLY INDIVIDUALS currently denied the ability to correct errors regarding information USCIS maintains, are U.S. Citizens. This discrimination and abuse of the Privacy Act must come to an end. US Citizens must be granted access to their own information REGARDLESS of where USCIS chooses to maintain it, as the information pertains to them, when it is "about them." Anything speaking "about" a US Citizen, containing their personal identifiable information, is therefore "about them."</p>	<p>pertaining to the form type.</p>
--	-------------------------------------