9 FAM 40.63 NOTES

(CT:VISA-1740; 10-06-2011)
(Office of Origin: CA/VO/L/R)

9 FAM 40.63 N1 APPLICATION OF INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i)

9 FAM 40.63 N1.1 Intent of Congress

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) constitutes a ground of inadmissibility which was not included in legislation prior to 1952. The adoption of this provision expresses the concern with which Congress viewed cases of aliens resorting to fraud or willful misrepresentations for the purpose of obtaining visas or otherwise effecting an unauthorized entry into the United States. The section is intended to prevent aliens from attempting to secure entry into this country by fraudulent means and then, when the falsity is discovered, proceeding with an application as if nothing had happened. An amendment contained in Public Law 99-639 of November 10, 1986, removed the former distinction between past attempts to procure documentation and past attempts to enter by fraud or misrepresentation. Effective with the date of enactment, all of the prohibited acts carry the same penalty ineligibility for a visa and inadmissibility.

9 FAM 40.63 N1.2 Not a Substitute for Other INA 212(a) Inadmissibility

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) was not intended by Congress, on the other hand, to be a substitute for the other grounds of

inadmissibility provided by the INA nor for grounds that do not exist in the INA. It should not be used to accomplish indirectly that which cannot be accomplished directly. The section was not intended to permit and must not become a device for entrapment of aliens whom you might suspect to be ineligible on some other ground(s) for which there is not sufficient evidence to sustain a finding of inadmissibility. You should always assess an applicant's eligibility for a visa in accordance with all INA provisions governing the eligibility for a visa or inadmissibility of certain specifically described classes. Bear in mind that aliens may not be denied visas simply because they do not seem particularly desirable individuals as either immigrants or nonimmigrants.

9 FAM 40.63 N1.3 Nature of Penalty

(CT:VISA-1516; 09-14-2010)

In applying the provisions of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), keep in mind the severe nature of the penalty the alien incurs: lifetime inadmissibility, unless a waiver is obtained. (See 9 FAM 40.63 N9.) When considering whether to impose such a dire penalty, keep in mind the words quoted by the Attorney General in his landmark opinion on this matter. (The Matter of S- and B-C, 9 I & N Dec. 436, at 447): "Shutting off the opportunity to come to the United States actually is a crushing deprivation to many prospective immigrants. Very often it destroys the hopes and aspirations of a lifetime, and it frequently operates not only against the individual immediately but also bears heavily upon his family in and out of the United States."

9 FAM 40.63 N2 CRITERIA FOR FINDING OF INADMISSIBILITY

(CT:VISA-1740; 10-06-2011)

In order to find an alien inadmissible under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), it must be determined that:

(1) There has been a misrepresentation made by the applicant (see 9 FAM 40.63 N4);

(2) The misrepresentation was willfully made (see 9 FAM 40.63 N5); and

(3) The fact misrepresented is material (see 9 FAM 40.63 N6); *and*

(4) The alien *by using* fraud *or misrepresentation* (see 9 FAM 40.63 N3) *seeks* to procure, has sought to procure, or has procured a visa, other documentation*,* admission into the United States (see 9 FAM 40.63 N7), or other benefit provided under the INA (see 9 FAM 40.63 N7).

9 FAM 40.63 N3 DIFFERENT STANDARDS FOR FINDINGS OF "FRAUD" OR "WILLFULLY MISREPRESENTING A MATERIAL FACT"

(CT:VISA-1516; 09-14-2010)

a. The fact that Congress used the terms "fraud" and "willfully misrepresenting a material fact" in the alternative indicates an intent to set a lower standard than is required in making a finding of what is known in the law as fraud. The distinction between the two terms is not readily apparent. For the purposes of this section, the Board of Immigration Appeals has determined that a finding of "fraud" requires a determination that the alien made a false representation of a material fact with knowledge of its falsity and with the intent to deceive a consular or immigration officer. Further, the representation must have been believed and acted upon by the officer. (See Matter of G, 7 I & N 161, 1956.) On the other hand, "material misrepresentation" includes simply a willful misrepresentation, which is relevant to the alien's visa entitlement. It is not necessary

that an "intent to deceive" be established by proof, or that the officer believes and acts upon the false representation. (See Matter of S and B-C, 9 I & N 436, 448-449 (A.G. 1961) and Matter of Kai Hing Hui, 15 I & N 288 (1975)).

b. Most cases of inadmissibility under this section will involve "material misrepresentations" rather than "fraud" since actual proof of an alien's intent to deceive may be hard to come by. As a result, the Notes in this section will deal principally with the interpretation of "material misrepresentation."

9 FAM 40.63 N4 INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM MISREPRESENTATION

9 FAM 40.63 N4.1 "Misrepresentation" Defined

(TL:VISA-175; 01-15-1998)

As used in INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), a misrepresentation is an assertion or manifestation not in accordance with the facts. Misrepresentation requires an affirmative act taken by the alien. A misrepresentation can be made in various ways, including in an oral interview or in written applications, or by submitting evidence containing false information.

9 FAM 40.63 N4.2 Differentiation Between Misrepresentation and Failure to Volunteer Information

(TL:VISA-175; 01-15-1998)

In determining whether a misrepresentation has been made, it is necessary to distinguish between misrepresentation of information and information that was merely concealed by the alien's silence. Silence or the failure to volunteer information does not in itself constitute a misrepresentation for the purposes of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i).

9 FAM 40.63 N4.3 Misrepresentation Must Have Been Before U.S. Official

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

For a misrepresentation to fall within the purview of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), it must have been practiced on an official of the U.S. Government, generally speaking, a consular officer or a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) officer.

9 FAM 40.63 N4.4 Misrepresentation Must Be Made on Alien's Own Application

(TL:VISA-175; 01-15-1998)

The misrepresentation must have been made by the alien with respect to the alien's own visa application. Misrepresentations made in connection with some other person's visa application do not fall within the purview of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i). Any such misrepresentations may be considered with regard to the possible application of INA 212(a)(6)(E).

9 FAM 40.63 N4.5 Misrepresentation Made by Applicant's Attorney or Agent

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

The fact that an alien pursues a visa application through an attorney or travel agent does not serve to insulate the alien from liability for misrepresentations made by such agents, if it is established that the alien was aware of the action being taken in furtherance of the application. This standard would apply, for example, where a travel agent executed a visa application on an alien's behalf. Similarly, an oral misrepresentation made on behalf of an alien at the port of entry by an aider or abettor of the alien's illegal entry will not shield the alien in question from inadmissibility under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), irrespective of what penalties the aider or abettor might incur, if it can be established that the alien was aware at the time of the misrepresentation made on his or

her behalf.

9 FAM 40.63 N4.6 Timely Retraction

(CT:VISA-1670; 08-09-2011)

A timely retraction will serve to purge a misrepresentation and remove it from further consideration as a ground for INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) and INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) inadmissibility. Whether a retraction is timely depends on the circumstances of the particular case. In general, it should be made at the first opportunity. If the applicant has personally appeared and been interviewed, the retraction must have been made during that interview. If the misrepresentation has been noted in a "mail-order" application, the applicant must be called in for an interview and the retraction must be made during the course thereof. For this reason, aliens must be warned of the penalty imposed by INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) and INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) at the outset of every initial interview. Guidance may be sought through the advisory opinion process (CA/VO/L/A).

9 FAM 40.63 N4.7 Applying the 30/60 Day Rule

(CT:VISA-1740; 10-06-2011)

a. In determining whether a misrepresentation has been made, some of the most difficult questions arise from cases involving aliens in the United States who conduct themselves in a manner inconsistent with representations they made to the consular officers concerning their intentions at the time of visa application or to immigration officers when applying for admission. Such cases occur most frequently with respect to aliens who, after having obtained visas as nonimmigrants, either:

    (1) Apply for adjustment of status to permanent resident; or

    (2) Fail to maintain their nonimmigrant status (for

example, by engaging in employment without authorization by DHS).

b. To address this problem, the Department developed the 30/60-day rule. This rule is intended to facilitate adjudication of these types of cases consistent with the statutory mandates.

c. Aliens who apply for adjustment *or change* of status pursuant to the INA are within the jurisdiction of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) unless the application is abandoned upon the departure of the alien from the United States. If you become aware of derogatory information indicating that an alien who has applied to USCIS to adjust *to immigrant status or change* nonimmigrant status in the United States may have misrepresented his or her intentions to you at the time of visa application or to the immigration officer at the port of entry, you should bring the derogatory information to the attention of the appropriate USCIS office that has jurisdiction over the *adjustment or* change of status application. Do not request an advisory opinion from the Advisory Opinions Division (CA/VO/L/A) in these cases, because it would not be binding on USCIS.

d. With respect to the second category referred to above, the fact that an alien's subsequent actions are other than as stated at the time of visa application or entry does not necessarily prove that the alien's intentions were misrepresented at the time of application or entry. As to those who fail to maintain status, you should also recognize that the precise circumstances under which the change in activities or the overstay arose have an important bearing on whether a knowing and willful misrepresentation was made. The existence of a misrepresentation must therefore be clearly and factually established by direct or circumstantial evidence sufficient to meet the "reason to believe" standard. Although indeed more flexible than the judicial "beyond reasonable doubt" standard demanded for a conviction in court, a "reason to believe" standard requires that a probability exists, supported by evidence which goes beyond mere suspicion.

9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-1 Applying 30/60 Day Rule When Alien Violates Status

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

You should apply the 30/60-day rule if an alien states on his or her application for a B-2 visa, or informs an immigration officer at the port of entry (POE), that the purpose of his or her visit is tourism, or to visit relatives, etc., and then violates such status by:

(1) Actively seeking unauthorized employment and, subsequently, becomes engaged in such employment;

(2) Enrolling in a program of academic study without the benefit of the appropriate change of status;

(3) Marrying and taking up permanent residence; or

(4) Undertaking any other activity for which a change of status or an adjustment of status would be required, without the benefit of such a change or adjustment.

9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-2 Inconsistent Conduct Within 30 Days of Entry

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

If an alien violates his or her nonimmigrant status in a manner described in 9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-1 within 30 days of entry, you may presume that the applicant misrepresented his or her intention in seeking a visa or entry.

9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-3 After 30 Days But Within 60 Days

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

If an alien initiates such violation of status more than 30 days but less than 60 days after entry into the United States, no presumption of misrepresentation arises. However, if the

facts in the case give you reasonable belief that the alien misrepresented his or her intent, then you must give the alien the opportunity to present countervailing evidence. If you do not find such evidence to be persuasive, submit a comprehensive report to the Advisory Opinions Division (CA/VO/L/A) for the rendering of an advisory opinion. (See 9 FAM 40.63 N7.2).

9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-4 After 60 Days

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

When violative conduct occurs more than 60 days after entry into the United States, the Department does not consider such conduct to constitute a basis for an INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) inadmissibility.

9 FAM 40.63 N4.8 Evidence of Violation of Status

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

a. To find an alien inadmissible under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), there must be evidence that, at the time of the visa application or entry into the United States, the alien stated orally or in writing to a consular or immigration officer that the purpose of the visit to the United States was other than to work or remain indefinitely. Ordinarily, such evidence would be in the form of an admission, from information taken from the alien's nonimmigrant visa (NIV) application, or a report by an immigration officer that the alien made such a statement (e.g., as would be found on the DHS Form I-275, Withdrawal of Application/Consular Notification). Additionally, all findings of inadmissibility under the 30/60-day guidelines described in 9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-1 through 9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-4 would require the Department's concurrence following submission of an advisory opinion (AO) request.

b. The burden of proof falls on the alien to establish that his or her true intent was to visit, tour, etc. In the absence of

any further offering of proof by the alien to rebut the presumption, a finding of ineligibility will result. You must give the alien the opportunity to rebut the presumption by presentation of evidence to overcome it. If you are satisfied that the presumption is overcome, and the alien is otherwise eligible, process the case to conclusion. If the presumption is not overcome, submit a description of the evidence submitted by the alien in a report to CA/VO/L/A. The report must include evidence of the actual representation; e.g.:

(1) Evidence that the alien violated status within 30 days (see 9 FAM 40.63 N4.7-2);

(2) Evidence of such misrepresentation from the actual visa application or application for entry; or

(3) The consul's statement that the applicant has admitted that he or she misrepresented the purpose of his or her visit on the visa application or to the immigration officer.

9 FAM 40.63 N5 INTERPRETATION OF TERM "WILLFULLY"

9 FAM 40.63 N5.1 "Willfully" Defined

(TL:VISA-175; 01-15-1998)

The term "willfully" as used in INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) is interpreted to mean knowingly and intentionally, as distinguished from accidentally, inadvertently, or in an honest belief that the facts are otherwise. In order to find the element of willfulness, it must be determined that the alien was fully aware of the nature of the information sought and knowingly, intentionally, and deliberately made an untrue statement.

9 FAM 40.63 N5.2 Misrepresentation is

Alien's Responsibility

(TL:VISA-4; 11-19-1987)

An alien who acts on the advice of another is considered to be exercising the faculty of conscious and deliberate will in accepting or rejecting such advice. It is no defense for an alien to say that the misrepresentation was made because someone else advised the action unless it is found that the alien lacked the capacity to exercise judgment.

9 FAM 40.63 N6 INTERPRETATION OF TERM "MATERIAL FACT"

9 FAM 40.63 N6.1 "Materiality" Defined

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

Materiality does not rest on the simple moral premise that an alien has lied, but must be measured pragmatically in the context of the individual case as to whether the misrepresentation was of direct and objective significance to the proper resolution of the alien's application for a visa. The Attorney General has declared the definition of "materiality" with respect to INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) to be as follows: "A misrepresentation made in connection with an application for a visa or other documents, or with entry into the United States, is material if either:

(1) The alien is inadmissible on the true facts; or

(2) The misrepresentation tends to shut off a line of inquiry which is relevant to the alien's eligibility and which might well have resulted in a proper determination that he or she be inadmissible." (Matter of S- and B-C, 9 I & N 436, at 447.)

9 FAM 40.63 N6.2 Independent Ground of Inadmissibility

(CT:VISA-1516; 09-14-2010)

The first part of the Attorney General's definition of materiality comprises those cases where the material facts disclose a situation rendering the alien ineligible for a visa as a matter of law. These are known as independent or objective grounds of inadmissibility. Objective grounds of inadmissibility are those encompassed within the provisions of INA 212(a)(1) through (10). Special circumstances are as follows:

(1) There are few circumstances under which the concealment of the possible applicability of an independent ground of inadmissibility may not be deemed to be material to the applicant's eligibility for a visa. There are a few grounds of inadmissibility which contain provisions under which some aliens may be relieved of ineligibility by operation of law.

(2) This is true, for example, of INA 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) and 212(a)(3)(B). In judicial and administrative decisions about the applicability of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), a distinction has been drawn between those other provisions of INA 212 which grant relief from ineligibility as a result of an evaluation of all relevant factors pro and con, on the one hand, and those which provide relief automatically by standard operation of law. The essence of these decisions, according to the Attorney General, is that:

(a) The fact in question is material if the final determination of relief would depend on an exercise in judgment (i.e., one cannot predicate immateriality on the possibility that the exercise of judgment would have erased the ground of inadmissibility when it is also possible that the judgment could have gone the other way);

(b) The fact is not material under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) if the relief stems from the automatic operation of law; and

(c) Although there is an element of the "rule of probability" in subparagraph (1) of this section, essentially the determination relies on the "true facts" aspect of the Attorney General's definition of materiality. That is, if the true facts disclose a ground of inadmissibility and relief there from is problematic, the facts are material; if not, the facts are not material, as reflected in subparagraph (2) of this section.

FAM 40.63 N6.3 "Rule of Probability" Defined

(TL:VISA-4; 11-19-1987)

The second part of the Attorney General's definition is directed to those cases when the alien's misrepresentation tended to shut off a line of inquiry which is relevant to visa eligibility. These are cases where the exercise of further consular judgment is required. Past judicial and administrative decisions concerning this part have evolved into what has become to be known as the "rule of probability."

9 FAM 40.63 N6.3-1 "Tends" Defined

(CT:VISA-1740; 10-06-2011)

The word "tends" as used in "tended to cut off a line of inquiry" means that the misrepresentation must be of such a nature as to be reasonably expected to foreclose certain information from your knowledge. It does not mean that the misrepresentation must have been successful in foreclosing further investigation by *you in* order to be deemed material; it means only that the misrepresentation must reasonably have had the capacity of foreclosing further investigation.

(1) If an alien's eligibility for a visa is resolved against the alien on the known circumstances of the case, a subsequent discovery that the alien had misrepresented certain aspects of the case would not

be considered material since the misrepresented facts did not tend to lead you into making an erroneous conclusion. For example, an applicant for a nonimmigrant visa (NIV) falsifies the visa application by claiming to have a well-paying job in order to show that the applicant has a residence abroad, but before the misrepresentation was discovered, the visa was refused because the alien could not, on the known facts, qualify as a nonimmigrant. The subsequent ascertainment of the false statement would not support a finding of materiality because it had no objective significance to the finding that the alien was not a nonimmigrant.

(2) If the truth of the fact being misrepresented is available to you through the visa lookout system, or through reference to the post's own files, it cannot be said that the alien's misrepresentation tended to cut off a line of inquiry since the line of inquiry was readily available to you. While the availability of the true facts does not support the "materiality" of the misrepresentation under the "rule of probability" (part two of the Attorney General's definition), if those facts disclose an independent ground of ineligibility, then the misrepresentation is material under the first part of the Attorney General's definition. (See 9 FAM 40.63 N6.1).

9 FAM 40.63 N6.3-2 Questionable Cases

(CT:VISA-1334; 10-05-2009)

Frequently, a question arises concerning the effect on ineligibility of a false document presented in support of an application, or a false statement made to you, each of which purports to establish a fact which is material to the application for a visa, but which, in the case of the document, is so poorly crafted, or in the case of the statement is so unbelievable as to lack credibility. Despite the lack of credibility, if the document or statement is offered for the purpose of establishing a fact which would be material if the information in the document or statement were to be accepted as truthful,

you may consider that the document or statement "tends" to cut off a line of inquiry.

9 FAM 40.63 N6.3-3 Facts Considered Material

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

a. Residence and Identity: At one time the facts of residence and identity were considered to be material in themselves. The Board of Immigration Appeals, however, has held that misrepresentations of residence and identity are on the same footing as other misrepresentations. They can be material for purposes of 212(a)(6)(C)(i), but only if the alien is inadmissible on the true facts or the misrepresentation tends to cut off a relevant line of inquiry which might have led to a proper finding of ineligibility. Misrepresentations regarding identity, however, could also involve an independent ground of ineligibility if they involve a false identity in a passport. INA 212(a)(7)(B) makes inadmissible any alien not in possession of a valid passport. The definition of a passport in INA 101(a)(30) requires that the document show the bearer's "identity." Therefore, an alien who applies using a passport issued in a clearly false identity would not have a valid passport as defined under the INA and would be inadmissible under 212(a)(7)(B). This does not apply, however, where the alien uses a nickname, some other reasonable variant of a name, a legally changed name, or any other name for which the alien has some legitimate entitlement. While use of a passport issued in an identity to which the visa applicant has no legitimate entitlement will often lead to a 212(a)(6)(C)(i) finding of inadmissibility, in order to ensure uniformity in these cases, always submit misrepresentations involving identity to CA/VO/L/A for an advisory opinion (AO) pursuant to the instructions in 9 FAM 40.63 N7.

b. Misrepresentations Concerning Previous Visa Applications:

    (1) Registration for immigration does not render an alien ineligible for a nonimmigrant visa (NIV) in itself, but it does raise questions about the nonimmigrant

intent of the applicant. Because a misrepresentation with respect to such a registration might tend to cut off the proper line of inquiry into the nonimmigrant intent of the alien, such a misrepresentation is normally considered to be of material importance. However, there may be factors, including events intervening between the registration and the nonimmigrant visa (NIV) application (DS-156-Nonimmigrant Visa Application) that must render a prior registration for an immigrant visa (IV) immaterial in connection with the NIV application at hand. Although no list of exemplary intervening events may be all-inclusive, one might include:

(a) A marriage;

(b) A purchase of a new home;

(c) A substantial investment in the local economy; and

(d) Business or familial emergencies in the United States.

(2) A misrepresentation concerning a previous immigration registration on the part of an immigrant visa (IV) applicant would not be considered to be material unless the misrepresentation also concealed the existence of an independent ground of inadmissibility;

(3) A misrepresentation concerning a previous application for a nonimmigrant visa made on the part of an (IV) applicant is not in itself considered to be material; and

(4) A nonimmigrant visa (NIV) applicant's misrepresenting the fact that the applicant was previously refused an NIV is not, in itself, a material misrepresentation, even though you may feel that knowledge of the previous visa refusal might have been useful. In the absence of anything to the contrary, assume that the previous refusal was

predicated on the previous interviewing officer's finding that the alien was not a qualified nonimmigrant at the time of that interview. Such an opinion is necessarily limited to the circumstances of the alien's case at the time of that particular application. Since circumstances change, eligibility must be decided in light of the current situation on each application. Consequently, a misrepresentation which conceals only the fact of a previous refusal is not material. Naturally, where the misrepresentation conceals not only the fact of the previous refusal, but also objective information not otherwise known or available to you, there is a basis for finding that the absence of such facts tended to cut off a line of inquiry and thus rendered the misrepresentation material.

9 FAM 40.63 N6.3-4 Application of Phrase "Which Might Have Resulted"

(CT:VISA-1334; 10-05-2009)

In order to sustain a finding of materiality, it must be shown that the information foreclosed by the misrepresentation was of basic significance to the alien's eligibility for a visa. The information concealed by the misrepresentation must, when balanced against all the other information of record, have been controlling or crucial to a final decision of the alien's eligibility to receive a visa. For example, if an alien was trying to establish ties abroad by submitting false evidence of particular employment in an effort to establish nonimmigrant status and it appeared that the alien had other ties meriting favorable consideration, the misrepresentation would not be considered to be material unless you can state categorically that, if the true state of affairs had been known, no visa could properly have been issued.

9 FAM 40.63 N6.3-5 Application of Phrase "In a Proper Refusal If the Truth Had Been Known"

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

a. In most cases, in order for a fact to be considered material, the truth of the matter must lead to a proper finding of inadmissibility. With the exception of the types of cases discussed in 9 FAM 40.63 N6.2-1, if the facts support a finding that the alien is eligible for a visa, the misrepresented fact is not material:

   (1) If an alien were to make a misrepresentation to establish an advantageous immigrant visa (IV) status and it were discovered that the alien was, in truth, entitled to another equally advantageous status, the misrepresentation would not be considered to be material. For example, if the son or daughter of a U.S. citizen were to misrepresent marital status as being unmarried for the purpose of qualifying for first preference status, and was, in fact, married and thus qualified for only third preference consideration, but the third preference was currently available for the alien's state of chargeability, the misrepresentation should not be considered material. If, however, there were a waiting period for third preference applicants in the state of the alien's chargeability or world-wide, the alien must then be found to have sought an unwarranted advantage by means of a willful misrepresentation and the misrepresentation would, therefore, be material;

   (2) If an alien were to make a misrepresentation in order to enhance or exaggerate the alien's qualifications for a visa, but the facts alone were sufficient to establish qualifications, the misrepresentation would not be considered to be material. For example, if an alien were to misrepresent employment prospects in the United States as a means of establishing qualifications for a visa under INA 212(a)(4), and it were discovered that, in truth, the alien had other comparable employment or other satisfactory prospects, the misrepresentation is not considered material.

b. Once it has been established that a misrepresentation was made in securing a visa, the burden is on the person

making the misrepresentation to establish that the facts support eligibility or that, had you known the truth, a refusal of a visa could not properly have been made. Be receptive to any further evidence the alien may provide in order to ensure that a proper finding has been made. To quote further from the Attorney General's opinion:

"The law recognizes numerous situations in which one who, by his intentional and wrongful act, has prevented or restricted an inquiry into relevant facts bears the burden of establishing the true facts and the risk that any uncertainties resulting from his own obstruction of the inquiry may be resolved against him." (9 I & N Dec. 449N Dec. 449.)

9 FAM 40.63 N6.4 Cases Not Involving the "Rule of Probability"

(CT:VISA-1334; 10-05-2009)

Do not submit cases of the following types to the Department for an advisory opinion (AO) since they do not involve the "rule of probability."

(1) Cases where the alien has expressly admitted to you that, at the time the alien applied for a visa or entry into the United States as a visitor, it was the alien's intention to accept unauthorized employment in the United States or to reside indefinitely in the United States. A written confession is not required if:

(a) The alien admitted under oath to the misrepresentation;

(b) You have accurately recorded the statement in the notes of the interview;

(c) You have signed and dated the notes; and

(d) You have filed in the Category I file under the alien's name.

(2) Cases where DHS has reported to you that an alien attempted to enter or procured entry into the United States by presenting to the inspecting officer at the port of entry (POE) forged or materially altered entry documentation. Such documentation may include a U.S. visa, a foreign passport, or a U.S. passport; if such documentation was required under the INA or other laws of the United States for the alien's entry, or, in the case of the U.S. passport, if the alien was posing as a U.S. citizen for the purpose of gaining illegal entry.

9 FAM 40.63 N7 SEEKING ADVISORY OPINIONS (AO)

9 FAM 40.63 N7.1 Cases Involving the Rule of Probability

(CT:VISA-1516; 09-14-2010)

In view of the judicial and administrative uncertainties surrounding the rule of probability, and in order to achieve uniformity in the application of the rule throughout the world, certain cases falling under that rule in which you decide against the interests of the applicant must be submitted to the Department for an AO. Although you may submit any difficult cases, no AO is required for:

(1) Cases decided in the applicant's favor;

(2) Cases involving use of fraudulent documentation related to establishing qualification for a particular nonimmigrant category in order to overcome the presumption of intending immigration in INA 214(b). Such documents would include:

(a) Fraudulent primary documentation, such as job letters;

(b) School enrollment records;

(c) Deeds; or

(d) Bank or business statements relating to personal financial stability or to business ownership and activity, or similar documents, other than tax records, considered to be critical to the visa qualification of an applicant;

(3) Cases in which the DHS has revoked a petition submitted to you for review on the basis of fraud;

(4) Diversity visa (DV) cases, where there is a misrepresentation of the education or work requirements needed to qualify for the visa, or where it is established in accordance with existing guidance that multiple lottery entries were filed by the applicant, or on the applicant's behalf if the applicant is aware of the additional entry or entries at the time of visa application; or

(5) Cases based on evidence developed at the port of entry (POE). (See 9 FAM 40.63 N8.)

9 FAM 40.63 N7.2 Request for an Advisory Opinion

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

A request for an advisory opinion (AO) must include:

(1) An explanation of the nature of the misrepresentation showing what facts were misrepresented and, if the issue is in question, evidence showing that the misrepresentation was willfully made;

(2) The alien's explanation, if available, as to why the misrepresentation was made;

(3) Your statement concerning the materiality of the misrepresentation with your finding of whether a visa would have been issued if the facts of the matter had

been known; and

(4) Your statement that the alien was offered an opportunity to present additional evidence that he or she is otherwise eligible in order to overcome the effect of the misrepresentation and a statement that:

(a) The alien refused the opportunity or failed to take advantage of it; or

(b) A statement by the officer describing the evidence submitted by the alien.

9 FAM 40.63 N8 CASES BASED ON EVIDENCE DEVELOPED AT PORT OF ENTRY (POE)

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

DHS may provide post with evidence that a port-of-entry (POE) official denied an alien admission on the grounds of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i). We consider these statements to reflect only the officer's opinion at the time. No entry by DHS should be found in the Consular Lookout and Support System (CLASS) unless the alien has formally been found inadmissible under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) either through formal removal proceedings, summary removal under amended INA 235(b), or otherwise. However, if DHS has made a "6C1" entry in the lookout system, the post may assume that a formal finding of inadmissibility was made, and you should refuse the visa application under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i). If a CLASS check reveals no "6C1," or other entry by DHS, or only a P6C1 entry, the notation on the Form I-275, Withdrawal of Application/Consular Notification, alone, is insufficient to justify a determination of inadmissibility. However, you may use the factual evidence cited in the Form I-275 as the basis for a rule of probability determination if you believe that the evidence is sufficient to justify a finding of inadmissibility.

9 FAM 40.63 N9 INTERPRETATION OF *THE* TERMS "OTHER DOCUMENTATION" OR "OTHER BENEFIT"

9 FAM 40.63 N9.1 Other Documentation

(CT:VISA-1740; 10-06-2011)

a. The "other documentation" mentioned in the text of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i), in addition to visas, refers to documents required at the time of an alien's application for admission. This includes such documents as:

   (1) Reentry permits;

   (2) Border crossing identification cards;

   (3) U.S. Coast Guard identity cards; and

   (4) U.S. passports.

b. Such documents as applications for parole into the United States or extensions of stay are not considered to be entry documents under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i). Other types of documents, such as Form I-20, Certificate of Eligibility for Nonimmigrant (F-1) Student Status for Academic and Language Students, petitions, and labor certification forms are documents in support of a visa application. You must judge these documents in the light of their effect on a visa application. In themselves, they are not "other documentation" within the meaning of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i).

c. As stated in 9 FAM 40.63 N4.3, in order for a misrepresentation to be considered within the purview of this section, the misrepresentation must have been made to an official of the U.S. Government. Counterfeit documents or documents obtained by fraud or willful misrepresentation presented to foreign government officials or other individuals are relevant under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) only at the time of entry.

9 FAM 40.63 N9.2 Other Benefit

(CT:VISA-1740; 10-06-2011)

The term "other benefit" refers to any immigration benefit or entitlement provided for by the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and may in a given case include:

(1) Requests for extension of stay, change of NIV status, permission to re-enter, waiver of INA 212(e) requirement, alien employment certification, advance authorization to re-enter, voluntary departure, adjustment of status, stay of deportation;

(2) Application for Forms I-20, Certificate of Eligibility for Nonimmigrant (F-1) Student Status for Academic and Language Students, and DS-2019, Certificate of Eligibility for Exchange Visitor (J-1) Status; and

(3) All petitions applicable only to misrepresentations made by the petition's beneficiary or by an agent representing such beneficiary, (referring e.g., to marriage fraud).

9 FAM 40.63 N9.3 Advisory Opinion (AO) Requests

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

You should request an advisory opinion (AO) from the Department (CA/VO/L/A) in those cases where you believe that some other item constitutes an "Other Benefit" under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

9 FAM 40.63 N10 MISCELLANEOUS

9 FAM 40.63 N10.1 Misrepresentation in Family Relationship Petitions

(CT:VISA-1030; 09-22-2008)

Pursuant to 8 CFR 205, invalidation of a labor certification for fraud in accordance with the instructions of USCIS or the Department of State automatically revokes an employment-based immigrant visa (IV) petition. On the other hand, USCIS retains exclusive authority to disapprove or revoke family-relationship IV petitions. Thus, a misrepresentation with respect to entitlement to status under a family-relationship petition, e.g., document fraud, sham marriage, or divorce, etc., cannot be deemed material as long as the petition is valid. Upon discovery of a misrepresentation, you must return the petition to the appropriate USCIS office. If the petition is revoked, the materiality of the misrepresentation is established.

9 FAM 40.63 N10.2 Attempts to Obtain Visa by Bribery

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

An attempt by an unqualified applicant to obtain a visa or entry to the United States through bribery of a U.S. Government employee is an attempt to perpetrate fraud on the U.S. Government. The bribe must be directed to a consular officer, a member of post's Locally Employed Staff, or an immigration officer. Ordinarily, no advisory opinion is required, but posts should report the circumstances of all such cases to the appropriate Departmental offices; e.g., CA/VO/L/A, the Office of Fraud Prevention Programs (CA/FPP), and the Visa Fraud Branch (DS/CR/VF).

9 FAM 40.63 N11 INADMISSIBILITY UNDER INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii)

(CT:VISA-1516; 09-14-2010)

Section 344(a) Public Law 104-208, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), added a new inadmissibility ground to INA 212. In general, the inadmissibility ground permanently bars an alien who has falsely claimed U.S. citizenship in order to obtain a U.S.

passport, entry into the United States, or any other benefit under State or Federal law.

9 FAM 40.63 N12 INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) NOT RETROACTIVE

(CT:VISA-1740; 10-06-2011)

The provisions of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) are not retroactive. It applies only to aliens who have made false *claims to U.S. citizenship* on or after September 30, 1996. An alien who has attempted or achieved entry to the United States before September 30, 1996, on a false claim of U.S. citizenship is not inadmissible under the terms of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii). They are, however, inadmissible under 212(a)(6)(C)(i), provided such claim was made before a U.S. Government official. This is a significant difference because the waiver provisions of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(iii) apply to aliens inadmissible under (6)(C)(i), but not to aliens inadmissible under (6)(C)(ii). (See 9 FAM 40.63 N9.)

9 FAM 40.63 N13 SCOPE OF INA 212(A)(6)(C)(II)

(CT:VISA-1516; 09-14-2010)

The provisions of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) expand the scope of the inadmissibility related to false claims to U.S. citizenship. Inadmissibility under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) applies not only to an alien who makes false claims to U.S. citizenship in order to obtain:

(1) A U.S. passport;

(2) Entry into the United States; or

(3) Other documentation or benefit under the INA (provided such claim was made before a U.S. Government official);

but also applies to an alien who made false claims to U.S. citizenship for any purpose or benefit under any other Federal or State law. For example, an alien who made a false claim to U.S. citizenship to obtain welfare benefits or for the purpose of voting in a Federal or State election would be inadmissible under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii). (See also 9 FAM 40.104 regarding unlawful voters.)

9 FAM 40.63 N14 FALSE CLAIMS TO U.S. CITIZENSHIP UNDER INA 274A

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) also applies for the purposes of INA 274A, which makes it unlawful to hire an alien who is not authorized to work in the United States. Thus, an alien who makes false claims to U.S. citizenship to secure employment in violation of INA 274A would be inadmissible under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii).

9 FAM 40.63 N15 CITIZENSHIP CLAIMS MADE TO OTHER THAN U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(CT:VISA-1516; 09-14-2010)

There is nothing in the language of INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) that would require that the false claim to U.S. citizenship be made to a U.S. official implementing the provisions of the INA. INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) specifically says "under this Act (including section 274A) or other Federal or State law." Thus, the language presupposes that the false claim may have been made to a State or Federal Government official outside the Department of State or DHS, or even to a prospective employer to circumvent INA 274A. You should request an advisory opinion (AO) from the Department (CA/VO/L/A) in those cases involving a false claim to U.S. citizenship or nationality to an employer on a Form I-9, Employment Eligibility Verification.

9 FAM 40.63 N16 WAIVER OR EXCEPTION FOR INA 212(a)(6)(C) INADMISSIBILITY

9 FAM 40.63 N16.1 INA 212(d)(3)(A) Waiver for Nonimmigrants

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

You may, in your discretion, recommend that DHS grant a waiver under INA 212(d)(3)(A) for an alien inadmissible under either INA 212(a)(6)(C)(i) or (ii) provided the alien meets the criteria specified in 9 FAM 40.301 N2.

9 FAM 40.63 N16.2 INA 212(i) Waiver for Immigrants

(CT:VISA-1385; 12-11-2009)

a. An applicant for an immigrant visa (IV) who is inadmissible under provision (i) of INA 212(a)(6)(C) may seek a waiver under INA 212(i) if:

   (1) The alien is the spouse, son, or daughter of a U.S. citizen or a lawful resident alien; and

   (2) The Secretary of Homeland Security is satisfied that the refusal of the alien's admission to the United States would result in extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen or lawful resident spouse or parent of such alien.

b. You should note that INA 212(i), as amended by Public Law 104-208, eliminated the waiver for the parents of a U.S. citizen or lawful resident alien and no longer permits a waiver for misrepresentations solely on the basis that the misrepresentation occurred 10 or more years ago.

9 FAM 40.63 N16.3 Alien Inadmissible

Under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii)

9 FAM 40.63 N16.3-1 Exception from Inadmissibility Under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii)

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

The Child Citizenship Act of 2000 (section 201(b) of Public Law 106-395) added an exception for inadmissibility under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii) for an alien who voted in violation of any Federal, State, or local constitutional provision, statute, ordinance, or regulation if:

(1) Each parent is or was a U.S. citizen by birth or naturalization;

(2) The alien resided permanently in the United States prior to the age of 16; and

(3) The alien reasonably believed at the time of such violation that he or she was a U.S. citizen.

9 FAM 40.63 N16.3-2 No Waiver for Inadmissibility Under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii)

(CT:VISA-998; 08-26-2008)

There is no waiver available for an alien who is inadmissible under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii). Given the different waiver rules, it is critical that a false claim to U.S. citizenship has been properly categorized. If you have any doubts regarding an alien's inadmissibility under INA 212(a)(6)(C)(ii), you should refer the case to the Department (CA/VO/L/A) for an advisory opinion (AO).