

Author Full Name : Anonymous**Received Date :** 02/22/2025 08:17 PM**Comments Received :**

The binary F and M designations on this form are exclusionary of people born with both sex characteristics, putting the State in violation of the injunction put on it by the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado in the Zzyym v. Blinken case (formerly Zzyym v. Pompeo, Zzyym v. Tillerson, and Zzyym v. Kerry). This has already been litigated in court and the State risks wasting time and money on additional litigation by committing this violation. Regarding the requirement to apply sex assigned at birth: The purpose of a passport is identification during travel. Knowing someone's sex assigned at birth is only helpful in identifying them if they still present that way. It is more helpful to be able to identify the person in the way they present themselves, whether that is more masculine, feminine or somewhere in between. Sex designation has only been on passports for a handful of decades, and has potentially created more of a burden on the state, leaving it open to cases such as Zzyym v. Blinken. This form change creates a burden on the state, a burden on applicants who do not present as the gender assigned at birth and are unable to fill the form out correctly, a burden on travelers who have their private information exposed at border crossings, and ultimately a burden on the taxpayers, whose dollars will be wasted invading travelers' privacy. Personally, this change will not affect me, but it does affect members of my immediate and extended family who do not present as the gender they were assigned at birth. Their current passports reflect their gender presentation and no harm or burden has been caused to the State or anyone else by this alignment. Bringing their passports out of alignment with their gender presentation when they go to renew them will help nothing and no one. My family should be able to travel internationally just as easily and safely as I can.