

Title	Comment
Comment Submitted by Victoria Wilkinson	As an immigration attorney, I have seen over the years how discretionary immigration decisions truly are. Clients with very similar fact patterns frequently receive very different outcomes - the only significant variable being the attitudes of the officers reviewing their respective cases.
Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Social media was not created with this intent. This is an infringement of free speech. This data collection constitutes government overreach of the highest degree, and normalizing it in the immigration context will empower the government to extend that kind of surveillance to citizens. First, it will come for those seeking passports, then it will extend to those seeking other government benefits, like drivers' licenses or marriage certificates. This is Big-Brotherism to the extreme, and we must stop it before it is too late.</p> <p>As a First Amendment lawyer and a social media user, I know both first- and second-hand how essential anonymity can be to empowering people to speak online--especially when their speech touches on issues of national debate. The history and respect for anonymous speech stretches back even before the founding, including the Federalist papers and many other anonymous publications that allowed our country to reach consensus and negotiate some of the most foundational debates imaginable. Since then, the Supreme Court has consistently recognized the importance of anonymous speech and the rights of individuals to speak without identifying themselves. (See, e.g., Talley v. California, McIntyre v. Ohio, Americans for Prosperity v. Bonta).</p> <p>Noncitizens who are already in the United States have the same rights to speak anonymously--rights that the social media identification requirement flatly denies them. And even when individuals speak from abroad, American listeners have a right to hear that speech (Lamont v. Postmaster General, TikTok v. Garland).</p>
Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I understand the government's interest in keeping the country safe from those who would do violence if we let them in. But that interest is not a trump card, and it does not justify this massive infringement of free speech. First, there is no evidence at all that collecting these social media handles helps the government to ferret out would-
Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an infringement on free speech, even for those who are not yet citizens. It is also allowing a discriminatory element to be added, as reviewing officers may determine cases based on their own views, rather than whether the person is legally eligible. This is also fundamentally a safety risk -- officers and the government
Comment Submitted by Naw Chue Wai Wai Zin	I am writing to express concern about the Department of Homeland Security's decision to terminate the 2021 Temporary Protected Status (TPS) designation for Venezuela, effective November 7, 2025. While I understand the Department's responsibility to review country's conditions, I believe that sudden termination of TPS creates extreme hardship for families, students and workers who have built their lives in the United States under this program. If TPS ends without a responsible transition plan, many people will face impossible choices. Should college students stop their education in the middle of a term? Should high school or even kindergarten children be forced to leave their schools suddenly? What will happen to someone who just married a U.S citizen, or to a family who just opened a small business to
Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose the proposed Social Media Identifier collection. The definition is vague, and no definitive list of platforms is provided, leaving applicants to guess what must be disclosed. The stated timeframe to list all accounts used over the past five years underestimates the burden, as many people cannot realistically reconstruct all their accounts quickly.
Comment Submitted by Immigrant Legal Resource Center	Please see attached from the Immigrant Legal Resource Center. https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1264/attachment_1.pdf

Comment Submitted by Jenny Delgado	<p>Collecting social media identifiers when evaluating whether or not to provide immigration-related benefit is a misuse of time and resources, a violation of individuals' privacy, and an ineffective means of evaluating someone. Collecting and looking into information related to social media could be misleading, as people may present one persona online that differs from who they are or may not be representative of them as a person. This is common among users. Posts and information could be misinterpreted by officials reviewing the platform (who likely would not have training or knowledge on the constantly changing trends, language, and expressions on social media) and who may not understand the context of a post or interaction. It further violates the privacy of anyone whose photo or information is also posted on the person's platform and likely would not consent to this being shared with government officials. People may disclose very personal information on social media about themselves or others which would not be appropriate to have in the hands of government officials. People also have accounts for various reasons, some to stay connected with others, some for making money through influencing, some just to watch random videos; it is not a reliable tool to review for the purpose of determining if someone is a threat to the government given its random usage. Officials would likely also get caught up looking through accounts, searching for some evidence of a</p> <p>1615-NEW; Department of Defense; Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003</p>
Comment Submitted by Ashley Kulp	<p>It seems to me that this is simply an excuse to further limit the abilities of immigrants, tourists, and even current, legal residents to express themselves, make protected speech criticizing the American government, promote science-based information, and more. Rather than spending 3,209,930 hours each year on social media, I'd As a social media user and a Public Policy student at the University of Virginia, I know how important online anonymity can be in allowing people to express themselves freely and safely. The Supreme Court recognized this in Talley v. California (1960), affirming that the First Amendment protects the right to anonymous speech. The social media identification requirement of this rule is a clear example of government overreach as it denies this right. Normalizing this kind of surveillance in the immigration system sets a dangerous precedent and is Big Brother in the extreme.</p> <p>This proposal also punishes people for protecting their privacy or for choosing not to engage on social media at all. It ignores the many legitimate reasons why someone might want to limit their online presence, from concerns about safety to professional boundaries.</p>
Comment Submitted by Rachel Mulvaney	<p>Requiring social media identifiers as part of immigration applications is invasive, ineffective, and unnecessary. USCIS resources could be far better spent on meaningful security measures instead of combing through people's personal lives online. Policies like this erode trust in U.S. institutions and undermine the privacy and rights of</p> <p>Thank you for letting us provide feedback on USCIS's proposal to collect social media identifiers across multiple immigration forms. If this becomes law, we're especially concerned about the impact on Forms I-485 and N-400, as those are used widely by applicants, which will in turn add more hours to adjudicating officers' already full workloads. While I support strong vetting standards, I respectfully question your current proposal about asking applicants for their social media handles. Said proposal is unnecessary, inefficient, and risks undermining the agency's mission.</p> <p>1. Necessity and utility: Collecting social media handles isn't necessary for USCIS to perform its core adjudication functions. Usernames are unreliable identifiers: they can be spoofed, abandoned, or misattributed. I want CIS officers to do their jobs with clarity, not dealing with noise of determining which immigrant or intending-immigrant has what name on recreational socials. For high volume forms like the I-485 and N-400, this means millions of extra data points with little practical value for determining eligibility. How is collecting such fluff useful towards our national security?</p> <p>2. Burden and accuracy of estimates: The burden estimates seem understated. Applicants must recall years of accounts, including inactive or forgotten ones, which takes far longer than the "minutes per form" assumption. How much time will this actually take? Adjudicators will face a flood of irrelevant or unverifiable data. Don't create that hidden costs in staff time and storage.</p> <p>3. Quality and clarity: If USCIS insists on collecting this information, it should narrowly define what counts as a "social media identifier." Limit the scope to current, verifiable accounts. Without such clarity, applicants will over report, and it'll be up to officers to do the manual labor of sorting through unusable information. Let's rather their time be spent on efficiently and easily making decisions on cases. Please don't waste their time.</p>
Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>4. Minimizing burden and alternatives: A better approach is triggered enhanced vetting: reserve social media checks for cases with specific, articulable risk indicators,</p>

Comment Submitted by Theo Allen	See attached file(s) https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1269/attachment_1.pdf
Comment Submitted by Mary Kelleher, PhD, MLS	I am writing today to say that the U.S Citizenship and Immigration Services Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms (OMB Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003) (the "Social Media Collection") should not be passed or implemented. I won't repeat the obvious, which has been stated much better than I can in other comments, that this collection violates the First Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Privacy Act. Instead I would like to comment on the hours needed to collect this information. At over 3,000,000 hours, it would take over 144 people 10 years to accomplish this collection. The current administration is cutting staff in all agencies and departments; there simply isn't the staffing that could be devoted to this task. If the necessary staff were hired to accomplish this task, the cost of implementing the proposal would definitely not be \$0. Therefore, the only way of possibly implementing the "spirit" of the proposal is to gather the social media presence of someone already presumed to be guilty. If there are suspicions that an individual is a threat to national security, social media To Whom It May Concern:
Comment Submitted by Brennan Center for Justice	Please see the attached file for comments from the Brennan Center and Knight First Amendment Institute regarding "Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms [OMB Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-PROPIN CONFIDENTIAL USCIS-2025-0003 OMB: 1615-New DHS: GC-2025-0003; USCIS Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms Title: Generic Clearance for Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms The Petition to remove social media ties to Immigration forms are necessary for this type of application process and appears to be many violations of sensitive information collected, i.e., Conditions on Residence, and other aspects. This agency collection should be researched further for possible criminal activity and prosecution of individuals for involving physical property harm, financial loss and damages, including the use of personal identification for their own purposes. This type
Comment Submitted by Anonymous	
Comment Submitted by The Identity Project (IDP)	See attached comments of the Identity Project (IDP) and Restore The Fourth (RT4). https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1273/attachment_1.pdf
Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is discrimination disguised as policy as evidenced by the numerous and vile attacks on free speech, including the stripping of green cards and resident status for comments that, while critical of the administration, organizations, or other nations, do not harm nor incite violence against anyone. Allowing for this arbitrary invasion of
Comment Submitted by Center on Race, Inequality, and the Law at NYU Law	
Comment Submitted by Colorado Legal Services	See attached file(s) https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1275/attachment_1.pdf
	See attached file(s) https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1276/attachment_1.pdf

I oppose the collection of social media data for use in immigration vetting. The collection of this data, as offered by this proposal, is too vague to be enacted fairly. I believe that without a more complete understanding of what information is to be supplied and or gathered, this proposal opens itself up to unequal enforcement and non-standard collection and effectiveness.

I also question who is given access and how securely this information is to be processed?

Social Media Content is often personal and/or private and I wonder if those Agencies and personnel that we would ask to assess this information would have the consistent and moral maturity to professionally engage with such private data.

I also object to the proposal with regards to the public cost estimate. If collecting this data stands to add millions of hours a year to immigration vetting, how can it proceed at a 0\$ cost? I question if this is fully in the realm of the US Government or does a private interest stand to profit from the collection and "processing" of this social media data, neither is disclosed within this proposal.

There are too many questions left unanswered for this proposal to be fairly enacted.

Comment Submitted by Anonymous Lastly, this proposal appears to be put forth with a purpose to more easily deny applicants on a technicality, than it is to be about public safety.
