



*Responses to 30-Day FRN Public Comments*

N-400, Application for Naturalization

87 FR 47780

08/04/2022-09/06/2022

<https://www.regulations.gov/document/USCIS-2008-0025-0214/comment>

Comment #	Public Comments	USCIS Response
<p><b>Comment 1.</b></p>	<p><b>Commenter: Jean Publiee</b>  <b>USCIS-2008-0025-0220</b>  <a href="https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0220">https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0220</a></p>  <p>USCIS-2008-0025-0                  220_Jean_Publiee_r0E</p> <p>there should be no extension of this form. it is time to send back to their own country all of these foreigners who want to come here. our tax dollars are going up up up paying for all the poor people of the world who want to come here to leach off the people here already. we are being forced into bankruptcy. certainly it isn't Gates who is paying for them it's the everyday person on the street whose taxes are going up up up into poverty for us. shut down this endless stream of foreigners who are altering the USA into a country that none of us love. we didn't sign up for the USA to be so changed. this open border is disgusting. if we wanted to live in central America or Mexico we could go there. we don't need them all coming here. shut down this extension</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Thank you for your comment. This action is an extension, without change, of a currently approved collection. USCIS is required to extend the use of the Form N-400 to comply with legal requirements for public use of the form by individuals seeking to apply for naturalization.</p>
<p><b>Comment 2.</b></p>	<p><b>Commenter: ILRC</b>  <b>USCIS-2008-0025-0221</b>  <a href="https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0221">https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0221</a></p>  <p>USCIS-2008-0025-0                  221_ILRC_r08122022</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Thank you for your comment. This action is an extension, without change, of a currently approved collection to keep the N-400 information collection approved for use. USCIS is currently engaged in a separate N-400 revision project looking at ways to reduce the burden on respondents and revise content into plain language. We will take your suggestions into consideration as part of that revision.</p>



*Responses to 30-Day FRN Public Comments*

N-400, Application for Naturalization

87 FR 47780

08/04/2022-09/06/2022

<https://www.regulations.gov/document/USCIS-2008-0025-0214/comment>

Comment #	Public Comments	USCIS Response
<p><b>Comment 3.</b></p>	<p><b>Commenter: Sylvia Miller</b>  <b>USCIS-2008-0025-0223</b>  <a href="https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0223">https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0223</a></p>  <p>USCIS-2008-0025-0                  223_Sylvia_Miller_r08</p> <p>The 21 page application is burdensome and overly time consuming for applicants and USCIS. It requests information that is not relevant such as the current employer of the spouse of the applicant. Further the wording of some of the eligibility questions is repetitive or not closely aligned with the actual law. Finally, USCIS officers at the interview stage in some offices, waste time re-asking every single question on the 21 page application. The applicant has already answered all of the questions and signed a statement of truthfulness when applying. If it were more relevant and less burdensome it could be less costly to applicant and less costly for time and resources for USCIS and maybe then it would not take over one year to get an application approved.</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Thank you for your comment. This action is an extension, without change, of a currently approved collection to keep the N-400 information collection approved for use. USCIS is currently engaged in a separate N-400 revision project looking at ways to reduce the burden on respondents and revise content into plain language. We will take your suggestions into consideration as part of that revision.</p>
<p><b>Comment 4.</b></p>	<p><b>Commenter: Mari Matsumoto</b>  <b>USCIS-2008-0025-0222</b>  <a href="https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0222">https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0222</a></p>  <p>USCIS-2008-0025-0                  222_Mari_Matsumotc</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Thank you for your comment. This action is an extension, without change, of a currently approved collection to keep the N-400 information collection approved for use. USCIS is currently engaged in a separate N-400 revision project looking at ways to reduce the burden on respondents and revise content into plain language. We will take your suggestions into consideration as part of that revision.</p>

*Responses to 30-Day FRN Public Comments*

**N-400, Application for Naturalization**

**87 FR 47780**

**08/04/2022-09/06/2022**

**<https://www.regulations.gov/document/USCIS-2008-0025-0214/comment>**

Comment #	Public Comments	USCIS Response
	<p>I have been practicing immigration law for the past fifteen years. During this period, the N-400 has grown from a relatively short and straight-forward application (03/22/12 version was 10 pages long) that the vast majority of lawful permanent residents could handle on their own without the assistance of an attorney to a lengthy form with duplicative, confusing questions that are irrelevant to most applicants.</p> <p>For instance, Qs. 38-43 should be indented and expressly ONLY apply to individuals who answered "yes" to Q. 37 ("Have you ever served in the U.S. armed forces?") All other applicants should be directed to skip Qs. 38-43.</p> <p>Question 13 should be taken off entirely, those who were at least 18 years old in 1945 would be 95 years old now. Continuing to have these questions on the application causes a greater likelihood of typographical error leading a box to be checked as they apply to almost no one.</p> <p>Part 11 should be shortened. While including the applicant's children's information on the application is fine, their street addresses are not relevant to statutory eligibility and give rise to potential privacy concerns for the children. Information on children should be limited to names, dates of birth, alien numbers, if known, and location (country only).</p> <p>Part 10, Question 8 should not be on the application. It</p>	

*Responses to 30-Day FRN Public Comments*

**N-400, Application for Naturalization**

**87 FR 47780**

**08/04/2022-09/06/2022**

**<https://www.regulations.gov/document/USCIS-2008-0025-0214/comment>**

Comment #	Public Comments	USCIS Response
	<p>is ultra vires and and irrelevant to an Applicant's statutory eligibility for naturalization. There is no eligiblity ground relevant to being able to list your current spouses' prior spouses' name and date of birth. This can be particularly challenging where an Applicant is in a domestic violence situation and may not feel comfortable asking their current spouse/abuser this information about the abuser's prior spouse.</p> <p>Applicants should only be required to list detailed spouse information if applying on the basis of the three-year rule of living in marital union with a U.S. citizen spouse. If an applicant is applying on the basis of the five-year residence rule, his or her spouse's date of birth, address and employer are completely irrelevant.</p> <p>Finally, as with the former four-page I-485 application form around 2007, the N-400 should exclude minor traffic infractions from the questions about prior criminal history. Because the instructions request detailed information about each incident, my clients and I have wasted hundreds of hours over the years trying to track down old tickets for traffic infractions and proof of payment from out of state jurisdictions.</p>	
<b>Comment 5.</b>	<p><b>Commenter: BakerRipley Immigration and Citizenship Program</b>  <b>USCIS-2008-0025-0224</b>  <a href="https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0224">https://www.regulations.gov/comment/USCIS-2008-0025-0224</a></p>	<p><b>Response: Response:</b> Thank you for your comment. This action is an extension, without change, of a currently approved collection to keep the N-400 information collection approved for use. USCIS is currently engaged in a separate N-400 revision project looking at ways to reduce the burden on respondents and revise content into</p>

**Commented [FMR1]:** New comment. Used language from 60-day responses. Please determine if more content is needed.


*Responses to 30-Day FRN Public Comments*

**N-400, Application for Naturalization**

**87 FR 47780**

**08/04/2022-09/06/2022**

**<https://www.regulations.gov/document/USCIS-2008-0025-0214/comment>**

Comment #	Public Comments	USCIS Response
	 USCIS-2008-0025-0 224_BakerRipley_r09(	<p>plain language. We will take your suggestions into consideration as part of that revision.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment suggesting Form I-912 and Form I-942 be accessible online. The online capabilities of the Form I-912 and I-942 are not necessarily tied to this information collection and therefore beyond the scope. As this comment does not provide specific suggestions to revise this information collection, no changes will be made to the N-400 based on this comment. USCIS notes that it continues to implement its plan working toward expanding electronic filing for applications and petitions for immigration benefits which was developed pursuant to Section 4103 of the Emergency Stopgap USCIS Stabilization Act, Title I, Div. D of Public Law (P.L.) 116-159 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note).</p>