UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. AISSATOU DIALLO, [redacted], a.k.a. AISSATOU DIALLO, [redacted], Defendant.	)	Civil Action No. 2:26-cv-1197 **COMPLAINT TO REVOKE NATURALIZATION**

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The United States of America brings this civil action against Aissatou Diallo ("Defendant") to revoke her naturalized United States citizenship under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a). As alleged in this Complaint, Defendant procured her naturalization unlawfully and willfully misrepresented and concealed material facts in her naturalization application.

Before becoming a naturalized United States citizen on March 29, 2013, Defendant sought immigration benefits and was ordered deported from the United States. Specifically, in 1996, Defendant filed an application for benefits with the Immigration and Naturalization Service ("INS")[1] and was assigned an A number.

[1] On March 1, 2003, the INS ceased to exist as an independent agency within the Department of Justice, and many of its functions were transferred to the newly formed Department of Homeland Security. *See* Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, §§ 441, 451, 471, 116 Stat. 2135 (Nov. 25, 2002). The INS was divided into several separate agencies, including United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS"), Customs and Border Protection, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

She claimed to be from Mauritania. After an interview, INS charged her as deportable under the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") and referred her to an immigration judge for removal proceedings. In the fall of 1997, Defendant withdrew her application with prejudice, and the immigration judge granted her the privilege of voluntary departure until March 8, 1998, with an alternate order of deportation to Mauritania, or Senegal. The government has no record that Defendant departed the United States pursuant to the voluntary departure order.

A few years later, however, Defendant, under the same name Aissatou Diallo, filed a second application for an immigration benefit with INS and was assigned a second A number. In that application, she changed, among other things, her date of birth, her nation of origin, her family history, and her criminal history. Defendant also never disclosed her prior immigration history under her first A number in any of her immigration applications under the second A number. In June 2007, Defendant became a permanent resident. Six years later, after filing a naturalization application, Defendant became a naturalized United States citizen.

Defendant's actions and conduct statutorily barred her from becoming a United States citizen and render her naturalization unlawfully procured. With the Affidavit of Good Cause attached as Exhibit 1, the United States brings this civil action to revoke and set aside the order admitting Defendant to citizenship and to cancel her certificate of naturalization.

USCIS assumed naturalization authority from the INS. This Complaint will refer to INS where appropriate.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is an action under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) to revoke and set aside the order admitting Defendant to United States citizenship and to cancel Certificate of Naturalization No. [redacted], issued March 29, 2013.

2. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1345 for a cause of action under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

3. Venue is proper in this district under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because Defendant resides in Columbus, Ohio, within this Court's jurisdiction and venue.

III. PARTIES

4. Plaintiff is the United States of America.

5. Defendant is a naturalized United States citizen and purports to be a native of Guinea. Aissatou Diallo, A# [redacted], and Aissatou Diallo, A# [redacted], are the same person.

IV. FACTS

6. The affidavit of Martha E. Mendoza-Valencia, Immigration Services Officer, USCIS, within the Department of Homeland Security, showing good cause for this action, as required by 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a), is attached as Exhibit 1.

A. Defendant's Immigration Proceedings Under Identity Associated with [redacted]

7. In February 1996, Defendant filed an application for an immigration benefit. In that application, Defendant represented under penalty of perjury that:

a. Her name was Aissatou Diallo;

b. She last arrived in the United States at JFK International Airport on February 12, 1994, as a B1/B2 visitor;

c. She was born in 1968 in Mbahe, Mauritania;[2]

d. Her father's name was Ibrahim Diallo, and her mother's name was Kardiatou Diallo, both from Mauritania;

e. She had been arrested in Mauritania.

8. INS assigned Defendant [redacted].

9. In connection with her application for an immigration benefit, Defendant provided fingerprints on or about January 25, 1996.

10. On March 7, 1996, Defendant appeared for an interview at an INS Office in New York City where an immigration officer interviewed her in connection with her application. Defendant signed her application again at the interview, affirming that her answers were true to the best of her knowledge.

11. After the interview, INS referred her case to an immigration judge.

12. On March 21, 1996, INS personally served Defendant with a Form I-221, Order to Show Cause and Notice of Hearing, charging her as deportable under Section 241(a)(1)(A) of the INA because, at the time of her entry, she was excludable under Section 212(a)(7)(B)(i)(II) for not having a valid nonimmigrant visa or border crossing card. She was ordered to appear for an initial hearing in mid-April 1996.

13. At a later hearing in May 1996 where she appeared with counsel, Defendant was given a Notice of Hearing for October 10, 1996.

---

[2] The month and day have been omitted due to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(a)(2), but the United States can supply the date of birth upon request or under seal.

14. Defendant failed to appear at the October hearing, and the immigration judge ordered her deported to Mauritania *in absentia*.

15. On November 15, 1996, Defendant filed a Motion to Reopen Deportation Proceedings and Stay of Deportation, which the immigration judge granted.

16. At a later hearing on September 9, 1997, Defendant withdrew her application with prejudice. The immigration judge granted her the privilege of voluntary departure in lieu of deportation until March 8, 1998, with an alternate order of deportation to Mauritania, and if Mauritania was unwilling to accept her, Senegal.

17. The government has no record that Defendant departed the United States pursuant to the judge's September 9, 1997, voluntary departure order. Her deportation order became final on March 9, 1998.

B. Defendant's Adjustment Application Under Identity Associated with [redacted]

15. Three years later, in March 2001, Defendant filed another application with INS for an immigration benefit, also under the name Aissatou Diallo. INS assigned her A Number [redacted].

16. In this application, which she signed under penalty of perjury, she represented that:

a. Her name was Aissatou Diallo;

b. She was born in 1966 in Pita Guinea;[3]

c. Her last entry into the United States was at JFK International Airport in New York on March 9, 1991, on a B-1 nonimmigrant visa, with a Form I-94 in support;

d. Her father was El-Hadj Dioubairou Diallo, born in Guinea; and

e. Her mother was Hadja Salimatou Bah, also born in Guinea.

17. In connection with this application, Defendant provided fingerprints on or about March 23, 2001.

18. On April 5, 2001, Defendant appeared for an interview at an INS office in New York City and signed her application again. INS approved the application five days later.

19. Two years later, on April 7, 2003, Defendant filed a Form I-485 Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status with USCIS.[4]

20. In the Form I-485, which Defendant signed under penalty of perjury, she represented that:

a. Her name was Aissatou Diallo;

b. She last arrived in the United States on September 3, 2001;

---

[3] The month and day have been omitted due to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(a)(2), but the United States can supply the date of birth upon request or under seal. Defendant listed this different birth date in all applications submitted under the second A number.

[4] The Form I-485 includes confidential information about Defendant's immigration history. Therefore, the United States has not attached it to this Complaint. Before filing any such documents, the United States will seek leave of Court by motion consistent with Local Rule 5.2.1(a).

c. She was born in 1966 in Guinea;[5]

d. Her father's first name was El Hadj Dioubairou, and her mother's first name was Salimatou;

e. She had never been arrested;

f. She had never, by fraud or willful misrepresentation of material fact, sought to procure, or procured, a visa, other documentation, entry into the United States or any immigration benefit;

g. She was not now in exclusion or deportation proceedings.

21. On March 20, 2007, Defendant submitted a Form G-325A, Biographic Information (attached as Exhibit 2) in support of her adjustment application. In it, she represented, under "severe penalties for knowingly and willfully falsifying or concealing a material fact," that she was born in 1966 in Guinea.[6] She also represented that her father was El Hadj Dioubairou Diallo and her mother was Salimatou Diallo, both born in Guinea.

22. USCIS approved the Form I-485 on June 7, 2007, and Defendant became a permanent resident.

---

[5] *See supra* footnote 3.

[6] *See supra* footnote 3.

C. Defendant's Form N-400 Application for Naturalization

25. On November 9, 2012, Defendant filed a Form N-400 Application for Naturalization (attached as Exhibit 3). In that application, she represented that she was born in 1966 in Guinea and that she had never been arrested.[7]

26. In her naturalization application, Defendant also answered "no" to the following questions:

a. "Have you **ever** been arrested, cited, or detained by any law enforcement officer (including USCIS, or former INS and military officers) for any reason?" (emphasis in original);

b. "Have you **ever** given false or misleading information to any U.S. Government official while applying for any immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion, or removal?" (emphasis in original);

c. "Have you **ever** lied to any U.S. Government official to gain entry or admission into the United States?" (emphasis in original);

d. "Have you **ever** been ordered to be removed, excluded, or deported from the United States?" (emphasis in original); and

e. "Have you **ever** applied for any kind of relief from removal, exclusion, or deportation?" (emphasis in original).

---

[7] *See supra* footnote 3.

27. Defendant signed her naturalization application under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, thereby certifying that the application and the evidence submitted with it were all true and correct.

28. In connection with this application, Defendant provided fingerprints on or about December 19, 2012.

D. Defendant's Naturalization Interview Before an Immigration Officer

29. On March 6, 2013, a USCIS Immigration Services Officer ("ISO") orally interviewed Defendant regarding her naturalization application to determine her eligibility for naturalization.

30. Before the interview, the ISO placed Defendant under oath.

31. During the interview, Defendant testified to the contents of her Form N-400 Application, and consistent with the written answers, represented that:

a. She was born in 1966 in Guinea;[8]

b. She had never been arrested, cited, or detained by any law enforcement officer for any reason;

c. She had never given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for any immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion or removal;

d. She had never lied to any U.S. government official to gain entry or admission into the United States;

[8] *See supra* footnote 3.

e. She had never been ordered to be removed, excluded or deported from the United States; and

f. She had never applied for relief from removal, exclusion, or deportation.

32. After her interview, Defendant signed her naturalization application again under penalty of perjury, thereby attesting that the information it contained was true and correct.

33. Based on the written answers in the Form N-400 and Defendant's testimony during the naturalization interview, USCIS approved Defendant's N-400 that same day.

34. Three weeks later, on March 29, 2013, Defendant took the oath of allegiance and became a naturalized United States citizen.

35. USCIS issued Certificate of Naturalization No. [redacted] to Defendant.

E. Fingerprint Analysis Confirms that Aissatou Diallo, [redacted] and Aissatou Diallo, [redacted], Are the Same Person.

36. As alleged above, Defendant provided fingerprint submissions in connection with the applications she filed under both [redacted] and [redacted].

37. Analysis and comparison of these fingerprint submissions confirm that the same individual provided the fingerprint impressions.

V. GOVERNING LAW

A. Congressionally Imposed Prerequisites to the Acquisition of Citizenship

38. No alien has a right to naturalization "unless all statutory requirements are complied with." *United States v. Ginsberg*, 243 U.S. 472, 474–75 (1917). Indeed, the Supreme Court has underscored that "[t]here must be strict compliance with all the congressionally imposed prerequisites to the acquisition of citizenship." *Fedorenko v. United States*, 449 U.S. 490, 506 (1981); *see also id.* ("An alien who seeks political rights as a member of this Nation can rightfully obtain them only upon the terms and conditions specified by Congress[.]") (quoting *Ginsberg*, 243 U.S. at 474)).

39. Congress has mandated that an individual may not naturalize unless that person "during all periods referred to in this subsection has been and still is a person of good moral character . . . ." 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a)(3). The required statutory period for good moral character begins five years before the date the applicant files the application for naturalization, and it continues until the applicant takes the oath of allegiance and becomes a United States citizen. *Id.*

40. Congress has defined the term "lawfully admitted for permanent residence" to mean "the status of having been lawfully accorded the privilege of residing permanently in the United States as an immigrant in accordance with the immigration laws." *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(20).

41. The term "lawfully" in 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(20) requires "compliance with substantive legal requirements for admission, and not mere procedural regularity."

Monet v. INS, 791 F.2d 752, 753 (9th Cir. 1978) (citation omitted).

42. An individual who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided for in the INA is inadmissible. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i).

B. The Denaturalization Statute

43. Recognizing that there are situations where an individual has naturalized despite failing to comply with all congressionally imposed prerequisites to the acquisition of citizenship or by concealing or misrepresenting facts that are material to the decision on whether to grant his or her naturalization application, Congress enacted 8 U.S.C. § 1451.

44. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a), this Court must revoke a United States citizen's naturalization and cancel his Certificate of Naturalization if naturalization was either:

(a) illegally procured, or

(b) procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation.

45. Failure to comply with any of the congressionally imposed prerequisites to the acquisition of citizenship renders the citizenship "illegally procured." *Fedorenko*, 449 U.S. at 506.

46. Naturalization was procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, where: (i) the naturalized citizen misrepresented or concealed some fact during the naturalization process; (ii) the misrepresentation or

concealment was willful; (iii) the fact was material; and (iv) the naturalized citizen procured citizenship as a result of the misrepresentation or concealment. *Kungys v. United States*, 485 U.S. 759, 767 (1988).

47. Where the government establishes that a defendant's citizenship was procured illegally or by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, "district courts lack equitable discretion to refrain from entering a judgment of denaturalization . . . ." *Fedorenko*, 449 U.S. at 517.

VI. CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT ONE

ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION NOT LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE (Inadmissible Based on Fraud or Misrepresentation)

48. The United States realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth previously in this Complaint.

49. To qualify for naturalization, an applicant must have been "lawfully admitted" to the United States for permanent residence. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1427(a)(1), 1429.

50. The term "lawfully" means compliance with substantive legal requirements, not mere procedural regularity. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(20); *Monet*, 791 F.2d at 753.

51. Among the INA provisions applicable when Defendant adjusted her status to permanent resident was the requirement that Defendant be admissible to the United States.

52. Under the law in effect at the time Defendant adjusted her status, an individual who by fraud or by willfully misrepresenting a material fact was seeking to procure (or had sought to procure or had procured) a visa, other documentation, admission into the United States, or other benefit provided under the INA, was inadmissible. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i).

53. Defendant was never lawfully admitted to the United States as a permanent resident and cannot satisfy the requirements of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1427(a)(1), 1429, because she was inadmissible at the time of her adjustment to permanent resident status.

54. Defendant sought to procure admission into the United States and other benefits provided for in the INA by fraud or willfully misrepresenting material facts. Specifically, at the time Defendant adjusted her status to permanent resident, she made numerous misrepresentations of fact described throughout this complaint, including but not limited to, her date of birth, country of birth, family history, criminal history, and immigration history.

55. Defendant made sworn statements in immigration benefit applications that cannot be simultaneously true. She was therefore inadmissible.

56. Defendant's false statements, including those regarding her date of birth, country of birth, family history, criminal history, and immigration history were material to determining her eligibility for the immigration benefits for which she applied. Defendant's false statements had the natural tendency to influence a decision by the immigration officer(s) to approve her application(s). Defendant thus

sought to procure an immigration benefit by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact.

57. Because Defendant was inadmissible at the time she adjusted to permanent resident status, she was never lawfully admitted for permanent residence in accordance with the substantive legal requirements to obtain that status.

58. Because Defendant was never lawfully admitted for permanent residence, she was and remains ineligible for naturalization under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1427(a)(1), 1429.

59. Because she was ineligible to naturalize, Defendant illegally procured her citizenship, and this Court must revoke her citizenship under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

COUNT TWO

ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION LACK OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER (Unlawful Acts with No Extenuating Circumstances and False Testimony)

60. The United States realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth previously in this Complaint.

61. To be eligible for naturalization, Congress has mandated that an applicant must show that he or she has been a person of good moral character during the applicable statutory period before filing his or her naturalization application until the time the applicant becomes a naturalized United States citizen. 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(a)(1).

62. Defendant filed her application for naturalization on November 9, 2012. Accordingly, she had to establish that she was a person of good moral character during her "statutory period" from November 9, 2007, until March 29, 2013.

63. Defendant completed and filed her naturalization application during her "statutory period."

64. Defendant violated 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(1)-(3) by knowingly and willfully concealing in her naturalization application—a matter within the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government of the United States—that she had previously been ordered deported from the United States.

65. Defendant violated 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(1)-(3) when she completed and filed her naturalization application by answering "no" to Question 23 in Part 10, which asked: "Have you **ever** given false or misleading information to any U.S. Government official while applying for any immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion, or removal?" (emphasis in original);

66. Defendant violated 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(1)-(3) when she completed and filed her naturalization application by answering "no" to Question 24 in Part 10, which asked: "Have you **ever** lied to any U.S. Government official to gain entry or admission into the United States?" (emphasis in original);

67. Defendant violated 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(1)-(3) when she completed and filed her naturalization application by answering "no" to Question 27 in Part 10,

which asked: "Have you **ever** been ordered to be removed, excluded, or deported from the United States?" (emphasis in original).

68. Defendant violated 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(1)-(3) when she completed and filed her naturalization application by answering "no" to Question 28 in Part 10, which asked: "Have you **ever** applied for any kind of relief from removal, exclusion, or deportation?" (emphasis in original).

69. No extenuating circumstances exist that would palliate Defendant's guilt for violating 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(1)-(3).

70. Further, as alleged previously, Defendant provided false testimony during her naturalization interview. Such false testimony included, but was not limited to, her date of birth, her country of birth, that she had never been arrested, that she had never lied to a government official to gain entry or admission, that she had never given false or misleading information when applying for an immigration benefit, that she had never been ordered removed, excluded, or deported from the United States, and that she had never applied for any relief from removal, exclusion, or deportation.

71. Because Defendant committed unlawful acts and gave false testimony during the statutory period during which she was required to maintain good moral character, she was and remains ineligible for naturalization under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1427(a)(1), 1429.

72. Because she was ineligible to naturalize, Defendant illegally procured her citizenship, and this Court must revoke her citizenship under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

COUNT THREE

PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION BY CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL FACT OR WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION

73. The United States realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth previously in this Complaint.

74. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a), this Court must revoke Defendant's citizenship and cancel her Certificate of Naturalization because she procured her naturalization by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation.

75. Throughout the naturalization process, Defendant willfully misrepresented or concealed, among other things: (i) her use of another identity, including a different date of birth, different country of birth, and family history; (ii) her prior application for an immigration benefit; (iii) her prior arrest; (iv) that she had given false or misleading information to a U.S. Government official while applying for any immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion, or removal; and (v) that she had been ordered deported from the United States.

76. Defendant made such misrepresentations voluntarily and deliberately, despite knowing that such representations were false and misleading. Accordingly, Defendant made these misrepresentations willfully.

77. Defendant's misrepresentations were material to her naturalization because the disclosure of her multiple identities, her prior application for an

immigration benefit, prior order of deportation, and prior representations to U.S. Government officials while applying for an immigration benefit would have had a natural tendency to influence USCIS's decision whether to approve Defendant's application for naturalization. Indeed, had USCIS been aware of this information, it would have denied her naturalization application.

78. Defendant thus procured her naturalization by willful misrepresentation and concealment of material facts, and this Court must revoke her citizenship under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, the United States of America, respectfully requests:

(1) A declaration that Defendant illegally procured her citizenship;

(2) A declaration that Defendant procured her citizenship by concealment of material fact and by willful misrepresentation;

(3) Judgment revoking and setting aside the order admitting Defendant to citizenship and canceling Defendant's Certificate of Naturalization, effective as of the original date of the certificate;

(4) Judgment forever restraining and enjoining Defendant from claiming any rights, privileges, benefits, or advantages under any document which evidences United States citizenship obtained as a result of her naturalization;

(5) Judgment requiring the Defendant, within ten (10) days of the entry of judgment against her, to surrender and deliver her Certificate of Naturalization and any copies thereof in her possession or control (and to make good faith efforts to

recover and then surrender any copies thereof that she knows are in the possession or control of others), to the Attorney General, or his designated representative, including undersigned counsel;

(6) Judgment requiring the Defendant, within ten (10) days of the entry of judgment, to surrender and deliver any other indicia of U.S. citizenship (including, but not limited to, United States passports and passport cards, Enhanced Drivers License, and other relevant documents), whether current or expired, and any copies thereof in her possession or control—and to make good faith efforts to recover and then surrender any copies thereof that she knows are in the possession or control of others—to the Attorney General, or his representative, including undersigned counsel; and

(7) Judgment granting the United States any other relief that may be lawful and proper in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DOMINICK S. GERACE II
United States Attorney

/s/Christopher G. Wilson
CHRISTOPHER G. WILSON (0092705)
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorney for Plaintiff
303 Marconi Blvd. Ste. 200
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Tel: (614) 469-5715
Fax: (614) 469-2769
Email: Christopher.wilson4@usdoj.gov

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
In the Matter of the Revocation) AFFIDAVIT OF GOOD CAUSE
of the Naturalization of)
)
Diallo, Aissatou [redacted])
a/k/a Diallo, Aissatou [redacted])
)

I, Martha E. Mendoza-Valencia, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

I am an Immigration Services Officer (ISO) with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), Department of Homeland Security (DHS).[1] In this capacity, I have access to the official records of DHS, including the immigration files of Aissatou Diallo, [redacted] (hereafter Diallo), a/k/a Aissatou Diallo, [redacted].

I have examined records relating to Diallo, including but not limited to, her immigration files. Based upon my review of records relating to Diallo, I state, on information and belief, that the information set forth in this Affidavit of Good Cause is true and correct.

Based on the facts and law contained herein, good cause exists to institute proceedings pursuant to section 340(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a),[2] to revoke the citizenship of Diallo and to cancel her Certificate of Naturalization.

The last known place of residence for Diallo is [redacted].

[1]Pursuant to the Department of Homeland Security Reorganization Plan, Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002), 6 U.S.C. §§ 101-557, as of March 1, 2003, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) was abolished and its functions were transferred to USCIS within the DHS. This Affidavit will refer to INS or USCIS as appropriate.

[2] While some provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as contained in the United States Code, have been renumbered throughout the years, not all provisions have undergone such renumbering. Where necessary, this Affidavit of Good Cause lists the applicable year for a United States Code reference. If no year is included within the citation, it means that the United States Code citation is the same today as it was during the time in question.

BACKGROUND

DHS records, including fingerprint comparison, establish that the person who naturalized as Aissatou Diallo, with a date of birth of [redacted], 1966, is the same person who was previously ordered deported under the name Aissatou Diallo, with a date of birth of [redacted], 1968.

Immigration History as Aissatou Diallo
D.O.B. [redacted] 1968, [redacted]

1. On or about February 1, 1996, the individual in question, using the name Aissatou Diallo and a date of birth of [redacted] 1968, filed an application for an immigration benefit with the former Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). She was assigned Alien number [redacted]. On this application, signed under penalty of perjury, she represented that:
   - She was born on [redacted] 1968, in Mbahe, Mauritania.
   - Her last arrival into the U.S. was at JFK on February 12, 1994, as a B1/B-2 Visitor.
   - Her father's name was Ibrahim Diallo, and his nationality was Mauritanian.
   - Her mother's was Kardiatou Diallo, and her nationality was Mauritanian.
   - She was previously arrested in Mauritania.
2. On March 7, 1996, she appeared for an interview at an INS Office in New York. She signed her application again at the interview, affirming that its contents were true to the best of her knowledge.
3. INS referred her case to an Immigration Judge, and on March 21, 1996, she was personally served with a Form I-221, Order to Show Cause and Notice of Hearing, which charged her as deportable under former INA § 241(a)(1)(A), in that at the time of her entry to the United States she was excludable under INA § 212(a)(7)(B)(i)(II) for not being in possession of a valid nonimmigrant visa or border crossing card and not exempted therefrom. Form I-221 ordered her to appear for an initial hearing before an Immigration Judge at 26 Federal Plaza, Room 13130, New York, New York 10278-0000 on April 12, 1996, at 9:30 AM.

4. Diallo appeared for her hearing on April 12, 1996. She also appeared for her next hearing on May 31, 1996, with her attorney of record, Francois Au, Esquire. At that hearing, she was given a Notice of Hearing for her next hearing to take place on October 10, 1996.
5. On October 10, 1996, Diallo failed to appear for her hearing. The Immigration Judge ordered her deported to Mauritania in absentia.
6. On November 15, 1996, she filed a Motion to Reopen Deportation Proceedings and Stay of Deportation which the Immigration Court granted.
7. On September 9, 1997, she appeared before an Immigration Judge, she withdrew her application with prejudice, and was granted the privilege of voluntary departure in lieu of deportation until March 8, 1998, with an alternate order of deportation to Mauritania, and if Mauritania is unwilling to accept her, then Senegal.
8. There is no evidence that she departed the United States pursuant to the Immigration Judge's September 9, 1997, voluntary departure order. Her deportation order became final on March 9, 1998.

Immigration History as Aissatou Diallo
D.O.B. [redacted], 1966, [redacted]

9. On or about March 7, 2001, the same individual, using the name Aissatou Diallo, filed a second application for an immigration benefit with the INS. She was assigned [redacted]. On this application, signed under penalty of perjury, she represented that:
   - She was born on [redacted] 1966, in Pita, Guinea.
   - Her last entry into the U.S. was at JFK, New York on March 9, 1991, on a B-1, nonimmigrant visa. She provided a copy of Form I-94 in support.
   - Her father was El-Hadj Dioubairou Diallo born in Guinea.
   - Her mother was Hadja Salimatou Bah born in Guinea.
10. On April 5, 2001, she appeared for an interview at an INS Office in New York and signed her application again. Her application was approved on April 10, 2001.
11. On or about April 7, 2003, Diallo filed a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status with USCIS. On her Form I-485, signed under penalty of perjury, Diallo represented that:

- She was born on [redacted] 1966, in Guinea;
- She last arrived in the U.S on September 3, 2001.
- Her mother's first name was Salimatou.
- Her father's first name was El Hadj Dioubairou.
- She had never been arrested.
- She had never, by fraud or willful misrepresentation of a material fact, sought to procure, or procured, a visa, other documentation, entry into the U.S. or any immigration benefit.
- She was not now in exclusion or deportation proceedings.

12. On March 6, 2007, USCIS issued Diallo a Request for Evidence to submit a Form G-325A, Biographic Information in support of her Form I-485. Thereafter, Diallo submitted a Form G-325A, signed on March 20, 2007, wherein she reported that she was born on [redacted] 1966, in Guinea. She further reported that her father was El Hadj Dioubairou and her mother was Salimatou Diallo, both born in Guinea.
13. USCIS approved Diallo's Form I-485 on June 7, 2007, and she became a permanent resident.
14. On November 9, 2012, Diallo filed Form N-400, Application for Naturalization. On her Form N-400, signed under penalty of perjury, Diallo represented that:
    - She was born on [redacted] 1966, in Guinea.
    - She had never been arrested.
    - She had never given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for any immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion, or removal.
    - She had never lied to any U.S. government official to gain entry or admission to the United States.
    - She had never been ordered removed, excluded, or deported from the United States.
    - She had never applied for any kind of relief from removal, exclusion, or deportation.
15. On March 6, 2013, she appeared before USCIS for a naturalization interview. She testified under oath to the information in the paragraph above and signed her N-400 application again under penalty of perjury. Based on her written application and the

testimony she provided during her naturalization interview, USCIS approved Diallo's application for naturalization that same day.

16. On March 29, 2013, Diallo took the Oath of Allegiance and became a naturalized citizen of the United States. USCIS issued her Certificate of Naturalization No. [redacted].

ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION

Illegal Procurement of Naturalization
Not Lawfully Admitted for Permanent Residence
Inadmissible Based on Fraud or Misrepresentation

17. To be eligible for naturalization, an applicant must have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence in accordance with all applicable provisions of the INA. INA § 318, 8 U.S.C. § 1429.
18. Among the INA provisions applicable at the time of Diallo's adjustment of status to permanent resident was the requirement that she be admissible to the United States.
19. Under the law then in effect, an individual who by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact was seeking to procure (or had sought to procure or had procured) a visa, other documentation, admission into the United States, or other benefit provided under the INA was inadmissible. INA § 212(a)(6)(C)(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i).
20. Based on the information contained above, Diallo willfully misrepresented material facts, specifically, her identity, familial history, immigration history, and arrest history.
21. Because Diallo misrepresented material facts, she was inadmissible to the United States at the time of her adjustment of status and was not lawfully admitted for permanent residence; accordingly, she illegally procured her naturalization.

Illegal Procurement of Naturalization
Lack of Good Moral Character
Unlawful Acts

22. As an applicant for naturalization under section 316(a) of the INA, Diallo was required to establish that she was a person of good moral character during the period beginning five years prior to the filing of her application for naturalization and continuing until the time of admission to citizenship. This period is generally referred to as the "statutory period."

23. Diallo filed her application for naturalization on November 9, 2012; accordingly, she was required to establish that she was a person of good moral character from November 9, 2007, until the time of her admission to citizenship on March 29, 2013.
24. Under the law then in effect, an individual could not establish good moral character if, during the statutory period, she committed unlawful acts that adversely reflected on her moral character, unless she could establish extenuating circumstances. INA § 101(f); 8 U.S.C. §1101(f); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(3)(iii).
25. Based on the facts contained above, during the statutory period Diallo committed unlawful acts that adversely reflected on her moral character. Specifically, Diallo provided false information regarding her identity, family history, immigration history, and arrest history. Diallo could not establish extenuating circumstances; accordingly, she was not eligible for naturalization and illegally procured her naturalization.

Illegal Procurement of Naturalization
Lack of Good Moral Character
False Testimony

26. As an applicant for naturalization under section 316 of the INA, Diallo was required to establish that she was a person of good moral character during the period beginning five years prior to the filing of her application for naturalization and continuing until the administration of the naturalization oath of allegiance. This period is generally referred to as the "statutory period."
27. Diallo filed her application for naturalization on November 9, 2012; accordingly, she was required to establish that she was a person of good moral character from November 9, 2007, until the time of her admission to citizenship on March 29, 2013.
28. Under the law then in effect, an individual who, during the statutory period, provided false testimony for the purpose of obtaining an immigration benefit could not establish good moral character. INA § 101(f)(6); 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(6).
29. Based on the facts contained above, Diallo provided false testimony while under oath during her naturalization interview. Specifically, Diallo provided false testimony regarding:
    - Her date of birth, country of birth, familial history, and arrest history.

- Never having given false or misleading information to any U.S. Government official while applying for any immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion, or removal.
- Never having lied to any U.S. government official to gain entry or admission to the United States.
- Never having been ordered removed, excluded, or deported from the United States.
- Never having applied for any kind of relief from removal, exclusion, or deportation.

30. Because Diallo provided false testimony to obtain an immigration benefit during the statutory period, she was not eligible for naturalization; accordingly, she illegally procured her naturalization.

PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION BY WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION OR CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

31. A naturalized citizen is subject to revocation of naturalization if she procured naturalization by willfully misrepresenting or concealing material facts.
32. Based on the facts contained above, Diallo willfully misrepresented her identity, her familial history, immigration history, and arrest history throughout the naturalization process.
33. The misrepresentations made by Diallo during the naturalization process were material to determining her eligibility for naturalization because they would have had the natural tendency to influence the decision whether to approve her naturalization application. In fact, Diallo misrepresented and concealed facts that would have shown that she was not lawfully admitted for permanent residence in accordance with all applicable provisions of the INA and thus was ineligible for naturalization under INA § 318, 8 U.S.C. § 1429.
34. Diallo procured her naturalization by concealing or misrepresenting material facts regarding her identity, familial history, immigration history, and arrest history.

DECLARATION IN LIEU OF JURAT
(28 U.S.C. § 1746)

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 1, 2026 at Reno, NV.

MARTHA E MENDOZA-VALENCIA Digitally signed by MARTHA E MENDOZA-VALENCIA Date: 2026.09.01 10:47:42 -07'00'

Martha E. Mendoza-Valencia
Immigration Services Officer
United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Department of Homeland Security