

## Comment Submitted by Jennifer Rodriguez, Rodriguez Immigration Law Firm

- **Docket ID:** USCIS-2009-0020
  - **Document Type:** Public Submission
  - **Document Subtype:** Comment(s)
  - **Status:** Posted
  - **Received Date:** May 17, 2016
  - **Comment Start Date:** Mar 31, 2016
  - **Comment Due Date:** May 31, 2016
- 

### Comment

This form is absurdly long. Do not incorporate the G325A into the application for adjustment.

Page 10, Question 25: "Have you ever used illegal drugs or abused legal drugs?" The wording of this question goes far beyond the scope of the grounds of inadmissibility it purports to cover. INA 212(a)(1)(A)(iv) speaks to someone who is determined to be a drug abuser or addict. Past use is not determinative and will have a chilling effect. The issue is whether someone is presently a drug abuser or addict. This should be a question on the I-693 for the civil surgeon to determine.

Page 10, Question 27, et seq: have you ever committed a crime of any kind? The form then goes on to ask many repetitive questions about crimes (drug trafficking, money laundering, prostitution, killing anyone, arms dealing, sexual assault, for example). This needlessly contributes to the 18-page form. Pro se applicants will not understand many of the nuances of these questions. These are questions that should be addressed in an interview.

Page 15, Part 10, Certification. Applicants swear to the truth of the application when it is

filed and again after it is reviewed at the interview. It is pointless to have them swear to the truth of it at the biometric appointment. The workers there are not even Immigration Service Officers, but contractors. Furthermore, if the applicant does not speak English, how can they attest to it? Will the ASC's be equipped with translators? This is superfluous and potentially could add additional cost for applicants who insist on having their attorney attend the biometric appointment as well.

---