

Author Full Name : Patrick Mitchell**Received Date :** 02/21/2025 02:05 PM**Comments Received :**

The revision to add "to add an applicant statement, affirming that he or she is not required to register as a sex offender, in accordance with International Megan's Law" is valuable, for the reasons detailed in the link provided immediately after, 34 U.S.C. 21501, (<https://www.govinfo.gov/link/uscode/34/21501>); this helps disseminate information about individuals who, demonstrably, can be dangerous to children and others in the area, and thus prevent further harm.

However, replacing the term "gender" with "sex" provides no true additional information---the letters next to this term will not change, they will still be M, F, or in rarer cases, X (see Zzyym v. Blinkin, formerly Zzyym v. Pompeo, Zzyym v. Tillerson & Zzyym v. Kerry, https://legacy.lambdalegal.org/sites/default/files/legal-docs/downloads/zzyym_co_20180919_decision.pdf , also attached below). Though I'm not intimately familiar, I've also heard credible suggestions that this change would be in violation of several legal precedents and/or laws, potentially like the attached decision.

Presumably, this change in terms would be at cost to the government. Given that it doesn't provide new information, it's effectively useless, a waste of resources. This is contrary to the current administration's stated aim of reducing government waste. If we are to assume these changes aren't, in fact, illegal, the issue of their wastefulness remains. I'm confident there are other issues that would be a better use of government time and resources than putting the word "sex" in passports.