

<b>Document ID</b>	<b>Agency ID</b>	<b>Posted Date</b>	<b>Title</b>
USCIS-2025-0502-0007	USCIS	3/10/2026	Comment Submitted by Anonymous
USCIS-2025-0502-0008	USCIS	3/23/2026	Comment Submitted by jack jude
USCIS-2025-0502-0009	USCIS	3/26/2026	Comment Submitted by Anonymous
USCIS-2025-0502-0010	USCIS	4/16/2026	Comment Submitted by Anonymous

USCIS-2025-0502-0011 USCIS

4/16/2026

Comment Submitted by Anonymous

## Comment

On Form I-140-G, at Part 8, "Attestation of Corporate Petitioner's Authorized Official", consider adding doc the Standard Form 328, "Certificate Pertaining to Foreign Interests" (OMB Control Number 0704-0579) and Department of Commerce can require when examining the truth of the statements being made on Form I-140-G. I support the proposed revisions to the Gold Card Program because the changes in how information is being collected is a useful process when applying for a gold card. So, by changing the effectiveness, the application process will be a more efficient collection.

What I am concerned about surrounding the revisions is that the application process may be too time consuming. In the notice, it is stated that the process may take more than several hours to complete. This could be a problem for the program works especially if they have limited English proficiency. If the application process were more streamlined, it would make the application process equal for all individuals and allows them the opportunity to work. If USCIS could somehow shorten the application process for individuals who may not have the ability to communicate in English to the individuals then the completion of the forms would become more accessible to people who need it.

Can somebody in the United States file an adjustment of status at same time as submitting I-140G (or after I-140G approval?)

The proposed "gold card" presents serious unresolved legal and statutory deficiencies that independent of each other are not well structured. Even apart from legality, the revised form contains substantial operational defects that will contribute to inconsistent outcomes. The form lacks internal coherence, clear sequencing, and basic explanatory text. It is irrelevant, relies on inconsistent cross references, and deviates from established immigration processes.

\*The form sends conflicting signals regarding processing pathways. It requires designation of a consular processing location about U.S. admission and current status, without clarifying whether consular processing or adjustment of status is contemplated, the form offers no guidance on how adjustment cases are handled.

\*The form collects extensive information about spouses and children but provides no explanation of how this information is used together, or what steps follow approval of the principal.

\*Internal cross references frequently do not align, directing filers to incorrect parts or items. Question sections lack a substantive explanation of relevant options.

\*Several questions lack any articulated adjudicative purpose, including requests for a "commemorative" card and physical addresses, without guidance on evaluation or use.

\*The form omits basic and customary information, including the petitioner's physical address, business information, and assessment of business legitimacy or sponsorship rationale. It also fails to clarify whether adverse response is possible.

\*Provisions allowing reuse of funds from prior petitions lack explanation of how transfers function or how they are tracked, creating ambiguity. Cryptocurrency evidentiary standards are vague and less rigorous than prior drafts.

\*The form introduces inadmissibility questions typically assessed at later stages, without clarifying their relevance.

\*The payment structure is fragmented and departs from standard USCIS intake, requiring multiple payments and fee recovery, increasing the risk of error and delay.

\*Finally, the form contains numerous quality control deficiencies, including inconsistent terminology for petition types, reinforcing concerns that it is not ready for implementation.

1. Part 1, unexplained, unsubstantiated questions (e.g., commemorative plaque requests and foreign government requests).
2. Part 2, no clear field or instructions for identifying the corporate entity supplying funds.
3. Part 3, allows transfer of funds from a previously approved petition without explanation of how that would be done, and allows a visa number in one year for another person in a different year.
4. Instructions contain incorrect and inconsistent internal cross-references, particularly Part 3.
5. Part 4, conflicting guidance regarding consular process v. adjustment pathways.
6. Part 5 and 6 lacks explanation on derivative processing.
7. Cryptocurrency section identifies broad documentation categories but omits clear traceability standards.
8. Part 7, admissibility questions typically resolved at the visa or adjustment stage, without relevance to the petition.
9. Omits basic information about the petitioner (e.g., physical address, business classification) and the beneficiary.
10. sloppy typos throughout the form and instructions.