**ASYLUM RULE TEMPLATE COMMENT - INSTRUCTIONS**

Attached is a template to help immigration services organizations draft a public comment in response to the administration’s proposed Asylum Rule that would eliminate asylum for the vast majority of asylum seekers (Read more about the proposed rule [here](https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EOIR-2020-0003-0001).)

**Why submit a public comment?** When the government proposes a new rule, it is required (by the Administrative Procedures Act) to give the public an opportunity to read the rule and submit comments. The comment you submit will be public record and available for anyone to read. After the comment period closes, the government agency that proposed the rule must read all of the comments submitted, and take them into consideration when drafting the final version of the rule. If a very large number of people submit comments, and/or the comments identify significant problems with the regulation, then it will take longer for the final rule to be published and take effect, or the agency may make amendments to the rule. Furthermore, if the agency disregards substantive comments, the comments can be helpful to later litigation about the process followed in publishing the rule.

**How do I submit a comment?** You can submit comments online at regulations.gov [click [here](https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EOIR-2020-0003-0001) to go directly to the asylum rule]. Click on the “comment now” button and either enter your comment in the text box (must be fewer than 5,000 characters) or upload your comment as a PDF. CLINIC also has published step-by-step commenting instructions that are available [here](https://cliniclegal.org/resources/step-step-instructions-how-submit-public-comment). Below are some important tips to keep in mind as you are drafting your comment.

**Write comments in your own words.** The template on the following pages is intended to help guide you and give you an example and ideas, but ***the comment should be edited with your original words***. Feel free to delete whole sections or paragraphs and replace them with your organization’s perspective on the issue. The agency will bundle any comments that are too similar to each other, and they will consider this bundle as one comment, rather than as individual submissions.

It may be helpful, prior to drafting your comment, to do some research on your own program and practice, the demographics of your clients, and the local community. Consider what aspects of the rule would be particularly troublesome to your organization and your clients. Gather some numbers and statistics that you can use to demonstrate how many of your clients or people in your community will be affected, how and to what extent, and at what financial cost.

**Attach research and supporting documents.** If you cite to statistics or supporting documents in your comments, we recommend including them as an attachment so that they are clearly part of the administrative record. Another option is to include a live link to cited sources. If you include links, specifically request that the agency read the material at these links.

**If you have experience in an issue area, say so.** If you are a subject matter expert and want to offer comments on your area of expertise, explain why you are qualified to offer this perspective. Feel free to explain your educational and professional background, or attach a copy of your CV to your comment. If you are called to work with immigrants by your faith, feel free to talk about your faith in your comment.

**Provide contact information for a representative of the organization.** Organizational comments should be signed by a representative of the organization, and provide the business contact information of the representative for any follow-up questions or concerns. However, keep in mind that this comment will be publicly available, so do not include personal addresses or cell phone numbers.

Submitted via [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)

DATE

Lauren Alder Reid, Assistant Director,

Office of Policy,

Executive Office for Immigration Review,

5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1800, Falls Church, VA 22041

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs,

Office of Management and Budget,

725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503;

Attention: Desk Officer, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, DHS

**RE: RIN 1125-AA94 or EOIR Docket No. 18-0002, Public Comment Opposing Proposed Rules on Asylum, and Collection of Information OMB Control Number 1615-0067**

Our organization, NAME, submits this comment urging the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to withdraw these proposed rules in their entirety. Asylum is a lifeline for tens of thousands of vulnerable refugees, and these proposed regulations violate the United States’ duties under domestic law and international law. Just as importantly, these rules, which would eliminate asylum for the vast majority of asylum seekers, are morally wrong—if these rules are published as written, the United States will cease to be a leader in providing humanitarian protection and protecting the most vulnerable. We urge you not to allow that to happen.

ORGANIZATION NAME’s mission is . . . [DESCRIBE ORGANIZATION’S WORK WITH IMMIGRATION. IF ORGANIZATION IS FAITH-BASED, DESCRIBE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ORGANIZATION’S FAITH-BASED ROOTS AND ITS WORK WITH IMMIGRANTS AND/OR ASYLUM SEEKERS.

IF POSSIBLE INCLUDE DATA ABOUT THE POPULATION YOU SERVE.

IF POSSIBLE, INCLUDE ANECDOTES ABOUT ASYLUM SEEKERS YOUR ORGANIZATION HAS ASSISTED WHO ARE GRATEFUL FOR THE SAFETY THEY FOUND IN THE UNITED STATES.]

Furthermore, because these regulations cover so many topics, we are not able to comment on every proposed change. The fact that we have not discussed a particular change to the law in no way means that we agree with it—we oppose these regulations in their entirety and call upon the agencies to withdraw them.

**We Object to the Agencies Only Allowing 30 Days to Respond to Comment on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM)**

As discussed below, the proposed regulations would completely eviscerate asylum protections. These regulatory changes seek to rewrite the laws adopted by Congress and would be the most sweeping changes to asylum since the 1996 overhaul of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act (IIRIRA). The NPRM is over 160 pages long with more than 60 of those pages being the proposed regulations themselves—including dense, technical language and sweeping new restrictions that have the power to send the most vulnerable back to their countries where they may face persecution, torture, or death. Any one of the sections of these regulations, standing alone, would merit 60 days for the public to fully absorb the magnitude of the proposed changes, perform research on the existing rule and its interpretation, and respond thoughtfully. Instead, the agencies have allowed a mere 30 days to respond to multiple, unrelated changes to the asylum rules, issued in a single, mammoth document.

Under any circumstances, it would be wrong for the government to give such a short time period to comment on changes that are this extensive, but the challenges to respond to the NPRM now are magnified by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. [FILL IN ANY SPECIFIC COVID RELATED CHALLENGES HERE. ARE YOU STILL PHYSICALLY NOT IN YOUR OFFICE? HAVE STAFF, FAMILY, OR CLIENTS BEEN AFFECTED DIRECTLY BY COVID? IS STAFF FINDING IT DIFFICULT TO WORK BECAUSE OF CHILDCARE DUTIES OR COVID-RELATED NEEDS TO CARE FOR A FAMILY MEMBER?]

For this procedural reason alone, we urge the administration to rescind the proposed rule. If it wishes to reissue the proposed regulations, it should grant the public at least 60 days to have adequate time to provide comprehensive comments.

**We Strongly Object to the Substance of the Proposed Rule and Urge the Administration to Rescind it in its Entirety**

Although we object to the agencies’ unfair 30-day timeframe in which to submit a comment to the proposed rule, we submit this comment, nonetheless, because we feel compelled to object to the proposed regulations which would gut asylum protections. Overall, the proposed rules would result in virtually all asylum applications being denied, by removing due process protections, imposing new bars, heightening legal standards, changing established legal precedent, and creating sweeping categories of mandatory discretionary denials. In a best case scenario, the result of these changes would be to leave a higher percentage of those fleeing harm in a permanent state of limbo, if they are able to meet the higher legal standard to qualify for withholding of removal under INA § 241(b)(3). Since those who qualify for withholding of removal have no ability to petition for derivative beneficiaries, these rules would result in permanent family separations.

As noted above, we may have not covered every topic which we would like to have covered because of the constricted timeframe in which to respond.

**8 CFR § 1208.13 (e)—The Proposed Rule Would Deprive Asylum Seekers of Their Day in Court**

Section 8 CFR § 1208.13 (e) would allow immigration judges to deny asylum to asylum seekers without even allowing them a hearing or chance to testify, if judges determine, on their initiative or at the request of a DHS attorney, that the application form does not adequately make a claim. This radical change would allow judges to “pretermit” asylum claims.

Allowing judges to “pretermit” claims and deprive asylum seekers, many of whom do not have lawyers and do not speak English fluently, at the same time that the administration again changes and further restricts the eligibility criteria for asylum through this proposed rule and prior rules and decisions, would deny them due process and would be an abrupt change from decades of precedent and practice before the immigration court. *See Matter of Fefe*  20 I&N Dec. 116, 118 (BIA 1989) (“In the ordinary course, however, we consider the full examination of an applicant to be an essential aspect of the asylum adjudication process for reasons related to fairness to the parties and to the integrity of the asylum process itself.”)

Many asylum seekers, especially those who are unrepresented and those who are detained, struggle to complete the 12-page asylum application form at all. They may have to use unofficial translators with whom they fear sharing intimate details of their past or their present fears. Asylum seekers who are detained and do not speak English fluently may be unable to secure any assistance in filling out the application. And, in any event, asylum seekers are often not well-versed in the complexities of the U.S. asylum system and cannot be expected to lay out every element of their asylum claims in the application before arriving in court. Allowing immigration judges to deny asylum cases without even taking any testimony or looking beyond the asylum application would inevitably lead to meritorious cases being denied and vulnerable asylum seekers being returned to harm. We oppose this proposed change in the strongest possible terms.

ADD ANY ANECDOTE WHERE THE ASYLUM SEEKER GAVE COMPELLING TESTIMONY

**8 CFR § 208.1(c); 8 CFR § 1208.1(c)— The Proposed Rule Will Make it Virtually Impossible to Prevail on a Particular Social Group Claim**

Applicants for asylum and withholding of removal are legally required to demonstrate that the persecution they fear is on account of a protected characteristic: race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group (PSG), or political opinion. INA § 101(a)(42). Membership in a particular social group in this list was designed to allow the refugee definition to be flexible and capture those who do not fall within the other listed characteristics. “The term membership of a particular social group should be read in an evolutionary manner, open to the diverse and changing nature of groups in various societies and evolving international human rights norms.” United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR) Guidelines On International Protection: “Membership of a particular social group” within the context of Article 1A(2) of the 1951 Convention and/or its 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, May 7, 2002, <https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/publications/legal/3d58de2da/guidelines-international-protection-2-membership-particular-social-group.html>.

These regulations would essentially make it impossible for asylum seekers, especially those from Central America and Mexico, to win protection based on particular social group membership. The section on PSG prohibits a favorable adjudication of a PSG asylum claim based on issues unrelated to its cognizability, such as “presence in a country with generalized violence or a high crime rate”—restrictions that appear calculated to target individuals from these countries.

One of the most unfair aspects of this proposed rule is its requirement that an asylum seeker state with exactness every PSG before the immigration judge or forever lose the opportunity to present the PSG, even after receiving ineffective assistance of counsel.

An asylum seeker’s life should not be dependent on an applicant’s ability to expertly craft arguments in the English language in a way that satisfies highly technical legal requirements; the asylum officer or immigration judge has a duty to help develop the record. It would be unconscionable to send an applicant back to persecution for failure to adequately craft PSG language. Applying this proposed regulation to asylum seekers, including unrepresented individuals, would raise serious due process issues.

ADD ANY ANECDOTE WHERE ORGANIZATION HAS SEEN APPLICANT NOT UNDERSTAND PSG, WHERE IT TOOK TIME WORKING WITH A CLIENT TO FULLY UNDERSTAND THE BASIS OF THE CLAIM, OR WHERE CHANGES IN THE LAW RESULTED IN A CHANGING THEORY OF THE CASE

**8 CFR § 208.1(d); 8 CFR § 1208.1(d)—The Proposed Rule Redefines Political Opinion Contravening Long-Established Principles**

The proposed rule would redefine “political opinion” in contravention of existing law. The proposed rule states that political opinion claims can only be based on “furtherance of a discrete cause related to political control of a state or a unit thereof.” The proposed rule goes on to explicitly reject the possibility that applicants’ expression of opposition to terrorist or gang organizations can qualify as a political opinion, unless the asylum seeker’s “expressive behavior” is “related to efforts by the state to control such organizations or behavior that is antithetical to or otherwise opposes the ruling legal entity of the state or a legal sub-unit of the state.” However, this restriction utterly fails to recognize that many asylum seekers flee their homelands precisely because the government of their country is unable or unwilling to control non-state actors such as international criminal organizations.

 The proposed rule’s redefinition of political opinion in the narrowest possible way contradicts existing case law, and will send many bona fide asylum seekers back to harm’s way. For example, women holding feminist political opinions that men do not have the right to rape them, or indigenous people who oppose gangs’ taking their land would be barred from meeting the political opinion definition under this rule. Rather than following precedent that recognizes political opinion in such circumstances, the agencies seek to erase all precedent that is favorable to asylum seekers through this rule.

INSERT HERE ANY CASE WHERE A CLIENT PREVAILED ON A POLITICAL/IMPUTED POLITICAL OPINION CLAIM WHERE THE AGENT OF PERSECUTION WAS NOT THE GOVERNMENT.

**8 CFR § 208.1(e); 8 CFR § 1208.1(e)— The Proposed Rule Narrowly Defines Persecution, Impermissibly Altering the Accepted Definition**

The most fundamental aspect of asylum law is the obligation of countries to protect individuals with well-founded fears of persecution from being returned to harm. *I.N.S. v. Cardoza-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 428, (1987). The proposed rule would, for the first time, provide a regulatory definition of persecution—a definition that would unduly restrict what qualifies as persecution. The rule emphasizes that the harm must be “extreme” and that threats must be “exigent.” But the proposed rule fails to provide any guidance on adjudicating claims by children who may experience harm differently from adults. It also does not require adjudicators to consider cumulative harm. As a result, applicants who have suffered multiple “minor” beatings or multiple short detentions would likely be disqualified under the proposed rule.

INSERT EXAMPLE OF HARM EXPERIENCED BY A CHILD HERE AND/OR EXAMPLES OF CUMULATIVE “MINOR” HARM

**8 CFR § 208.1(f); 8 CFR § 1208.1(f)—The Proposed Rule Imposes a Laundry List of Anti-Asylum Measures Under the Guise of “Nexus”**

Some of the most restrictive aspects of the proposed rule are laid out in the section titled “Nexus.” Although courts have long held that each asylum application should be adjudicated on a case-by-case basis, the proposed rules would allow blanket denials of claims that have long been found to meet the standard for asylum. This section of the proposed regulation is essentially an anti-asylum wish list, directing adjudicators to deny most claims.

Specifically, this section states that in general, asylum claims should be denied where there is: “(i) Interpersonal animus or retribution.” But asylum is defined as seeking to overcome a characteristic, so virtually *all* asylum involves “retribution,” a word that is generally synonymous with “punishment.

The rule provides a further laundry list of harms that adjudicators generally should not consider in their nexus analysis. Among these harms is “criminal activity.” However, virtually all harm that rises to the level of persecution could be characterized as “criminal activity,” since in virtually every country beatings, rape, and threatened murder is criminalized activity. This blanket rule essentially eliminates the ability to grant asylum based on private actor harm.

The proposed rule would also virtually categorically eliminate gender as a ground for asylum. The NPRM does not explain why gender is listed under nexus rather than under particular social group—maybe because it is clear that gender satisfies the three-prong test for PSG of immutability, particularly and social distinction. In any event, a categorical denial of all cases where gender is part of the nexus is antithetical to the case-by-case analysis required under asylum law. Gender is similar to other protected characteristics like race and nationality, and adjudicators should determine on an individual basis whether the facts of a given case meet the standard.

Finally, the rule in its current form runs contrary to the INA. INA § 208(b)(1)(B)(i) specifically states that a protected ground must be “at least one central reason” for the harm. Federal courts have explicitly held that the “one central reason” continues to allow for a mixed motive analysis. If this rule is published in its current form, asylum seekers who have been harmed, or fear harm, for more than one reason—“retribution” and a protected characteristic—will not be afforded asylum protection in direct violation of the INA.

ADD EXAMPLES OF THOSE WHO STOOD UP TO PRIVATE ACTORS FACING VIOLENCE AND THE GOVERNMENT DOING NOTHING TO PROTECT THEM

**8 CFR § 208.13(b)(3); 1208.16; 8 CFR § 208.13(b)(3); 1208.16—The Proposed Rule Redefines the Internal Relocation Standard, Greatly Increasing the Burden on Those Seeking Protection**

The proposed rule lays out a standard for analyzing the reasonableness of internal relocation that almost no applicant for asylum, withholding of removal or Convention Against Torture (CAT) protection will be able to meet. Under the new rule, the adjudicator must take into consideration “the applicant’s demonstrated ability to relocate to the United States in order to apply for asylum.” 8 CFR § 208.13(3); 8 CFR § 1208.13(3). The clear implication of this language is that if an asylum seeker is able to travel to reach the United States, any testimony about the unreasonableness of relocating within their country of origin can be discounted. But this proposed rule completely ignores the fact that asylum seekers make the journey to the United States because they believe they will be safe here and do not trust their own government to protect them.

The proposed rule also implies that if an asylum seeker comes from a large country, or if the persecutor lacks “numerosity,” the applicant should be able to relocate internally. We strongly oppose this language. Asylum applications should be adjudicated on a case-by-case basis and the regulations should not suggest justifications to deny applications of bona fide asylum seekers.

Significantly, the new rule would remove important considerations that adjudicators must currently take into account. Currently adjudicators must consider numerous factors, including, “whether the applicant would face other serious harm in the place of suggested relocation; any ongoing civil strife within the country; administrative, economic, or judicial infrastructure; geographical limitations; and social and cultural constraints, such as age, gender, health, and social and familial ties.” Existing rule at 8 CFR § 208.13(3); 8 CFR § 1208.13(3). The new rule would force adjudicators to make decisions in a vacuum ignoring the overall context of an applicant’s plight.

The new rule also would require the applicant to prove that they cannot reasonably relocate even if they have already suffered persecution if the persecutor is deemed “non-governmental.” 8 CFR § 208.13(3)(iv); 8 CFR § 1208.13(3)(iv). It is unfair to impose this greater evidentiary burden on asylum seekers who have already undergone persecution and proven that the government is unable or unwilling to protect them.

**8 CFR § 208.13; 8 CFR § 1208.13—The Proposed Rule Imposes a Laundry List of Anti-Asylum Measures Under the Guise of “Discretion”**

In addition to meeting the legal standard, asylum seekers must merit a favorable exercise of discretion. *I.N.S. v. Cardoza-Fonseca,* 480 U.S. 421, 423, (1987)*.* For decades, the United States has recognized the unique situation of asylum seekers and found that “the danger of persecution should generally outweigh all but the most egregious of adverse factors.” *Matter of Pula*, 19 I&N Dec. 467, 474 (BIA 1987). The proposed rule would turn on its head years of jurisprudence to deny most asylum applications on discretionary grounds and severely limiting the actual discretion adjudicators exercise, and must be rescinded.

Under the proposed rules, any asylum seeker who enters or attempts to enter the United States without inspection could be denied asylum as a matter of discretion. Additionally, the rule would add another bar, preventing most refugees who spent 14 days in any country en route to the United States from qualifying for asylum. This change would conflict with the concept of firm resettlement, and would disqualify most asylum seekers who travel through Mexico where the administration blocks asylum seekers, forcing them to wait for months to request protection at ports of entry. These rules place asylum seekers in an impossible position where they will be denied asylum if they wait on the “metering” lists at a ports of entry but will also be denied asylum if they cross the border in order to make their requests for protection.

ADD ANECDOTES OF HARDSHIP AND VIOLENCE ASYLUM SEEKERS FACE AS THEY ARE TRAPPED IN MEXICO AND WHY THEY MAY EWI TO ESCAPE KIDNAPPERS ETC.

Similarly the rule would allow an immigration judge to deny asylum to a refugee who uses or attempts to use fraudulent documents to enter the United States, unless they are arriving to the United States directly from their country of origin. This punitive rule change would deny many legitimate asylum seekers the ability to seek protection. Often those fleeing harm are unable to obtain travel documents because they fear their government. In some countries women cannot apply for passports unless a male family member signs off on the application. The safety of these asylum seekers would now depend on whether the individual was able to obtain a direct flight to the United States.

The proposed rule also contradicts the plain language of INA § 208(a)(2)(d), which explicitly allows an exceptions to the one year filing deadline for asylum based on changed or extraordinary circumstances by barring any asylum seeker who has been in the United States for more than one year without lawful status. This rule change ignores the fact that some individuals are in the United States for many years with no need to seek asylum until there is a changed circumstance in their country of origin or personal circumstances. Likewise, many asylum seekers are prevented by extraordinary circumstances, including mental health issues such as post-traumatic stress disorder often as a result of the persecution they have fled, from filing for asylum within one year of arriving in the United States. The administration cannot eliminate these vital exceptions to the one-year-filing deadline in the guise of “discretion.”

ADD INFORMATION ABOUT CASES WHERE ASYLUM SEEKER HAD AN EXCEPTION TO THE ONE YEAR FILING DEADLINE

The proposed rule would further generally require denial of asylum applications if an asylum seeker did not file taxes prior to applying for asylum. Payment of taxes is in no way related to whether or not a person would suffer persecution in their home country. Moreover, many asylum seekers are forced to work in the informal economy because they are not eligible for work authorization, which the administration is even now further restricting, and may be unable to file taxes until they can obtain an employment authorization document and a social security number. Through recently published regulations, the administration has imposed further limitations on asylum seekers’ ability to obtain work authorization at all, and for those who do qualify, would make them wait for at least a year after filing for asylum to qualify for “asylum pending” work authorization. *See* 8 CFR 208.7(a)(1)(ii).

ADD INFORMATION ABOUT DIFFICULTIES ASYLUM SEEKERS FACE BASED ON NOT BEING ABLE TO WORK LAWFULLY

The government makes many of these “discretionary” bars practically mandatory allowing for the possibility of a positive exercise of discretion only in narrow circumstances for reasons of national security or foreign policy interests, or, if the asylum seeker can show by a preponderance of the evidence that they would suffer exceptional and extremely unusual hardship if denied asylum. Even this extremely limited exception only applies to some of the “discretionary” factors. The combination of the heightened evidentiary standard and the intentionally onerous legal standard will mean that virtually no asylum seeker will be able to qualify for asylum as a matter of discretion.

**8 CFR § 208.15; 8 CFR § 1208.15— The Proposed Rule Redefines “Firm Resettlement” to Include Those Who Are Not Firmly Resettled**

The proposed regulation would expand the definition of firm resettlement. Under the new rule, if the asylum seeker has resided in another country for a year or more, even if there is no offer or pathway to permanent status, the asylum seeker would be considered firmly resettled and barred from asylum. There is no exception based on the asylum seeker’s inability to leave the third country based on being trafficked, based on being unable to leave for financial reasons, or based on fear of remaining in the third country.

**8 CFR § 208.18; 8 CFR § 1208.18— The Proposed Rule Imposes a Nearly Impossible Evidentiary Burden on Those Seeking CAT Protection**

The new rule would also put protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT) out of reach for the vast majority of individuals fleeing torture or the threat of torture. Under the proposed regulation, an applicant would have to prove that a government official who has inflicted torture has done so “under color of law” and is not a “rogue official.” The regulation ignores the actual circumstances under which people flee for their lives. Clearly, if an official claims to be acting in an official capacity, is wearing an official uniform, or otherwise makes it known to the applicant that they are a government official, a CAT applicant would have no reason to know whether the official is acting lawfully or as a “rogue” official. Requiring an applicant for protection to obtain this kind of detailed information from a government official who has tortured or threatened the applicant with torture is unreasonable and, in most cases, impossible.

DESCRIBE SUCCESSFUL CAT CLAIM INVOLVING OFFICIAL WHO MAY HAVE BEEN “ROGUE” OR GOVERNMENT TURNING A BLIND EYE TO TORTURE

**8 CFR § 208.20; 8 CFR § 1208.20—The Proposed Rule Radically Redefines the Definition of Frivolous and May Prevent Asylum Seekers from Pursuing Meritorious Claims**

The proposed rule would also redefine the meaning of a “frivolous” asylum application. Under the new rule an asylum seeker could be charged with filing a “frivolous” application, and thereby be subject to one of the harshest bars in immigration law (*see* INA § 208(d)(6)), and rendered ineligible for any form of immigration relief in the future, if the adjudicator determines that it lacks “merit” or is “foreclosed by existing law.” However, as discussed above, “existing law” in asylum is in a state of constant flux. Moreover, 8 C.F.R. 1003.102(j)(1), specifically states that a filing is not frivolous if the applicant has “a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law, and is not interposed for any improper purpose.” Under the proposed rule, an asylum seeker whose application would likely be denied under a restrictive interpretation of asylum by the BIA or attorney general precedent, who intends to challenge that precedent in federal court, must risk a finding that would forever bar any immigration relief if that appeal is unsuccessful.

**8 CFR § 208.20; 8 CFR § 1208.20—The Proposed Rule Impermissibly Heightens the Legal Standards for Credible and Reasonable Fear Interviews and Will Turn Away Refugees Without Providing Them a Full Hearing**

The proposed rule would also make it significantly more difficult for asylum seekers subject to expedited removal to have their request for asylum fully considered by an immigration judge. When Congress added expedited removal to the INA, it intentionally set the standard for the credible fear interview—significant possibility—low so that genuine refugees are not deported to persecution. Under this rule, the government redefines the broad “significant possibility” standard to mean “a substantial and realistic possibility of succeeding.” This language contradicts the clear language of “significant possibility” that Congress set forth at INA § 235(b)(1)(B)(v) and is therefore *ultra vires*.

The proposed rule would also greatly increase the burden on those who would be eligible for only withholding of removal or protection under CAT to pass an initial interview and pursue their claim before an immigration judge. Under the proposed rule, asylum seekers who would be subject to a bar on asylum, presumably including those recently promulgated by the administration such as the “transit ban” found at 8 CFR § 208.13 (c)(4)(ii) that bar the vast majority of asylum seekers arriving at the southern border, would have to meet this significantly heightened requirement to even be permitted to have their case heard before an immigration judge. With these provisions in the proposed rules, the government would essentially eliminate the “significant possibility” legal standard adopted by Congress in the INA and replace it with a higher “reasonable possibility” standard, which is far more difficult for asylum seekers to meet.

**Conclusion**

These proposed rules represent a radical rewriting of the U.S. asylum system. Each section of these monumental proposed changes merits a full 60-day comment period for the public to adequately prepare comments. Taken together, these proposed rules would eviscerate asylum protections that have been in place in the United States for decades. The vast majority of asylum seekers are likely to be denied asylum under these proposed rules even if they have well-founded fears of persecution. Further, it is difficult to imagine any asylum seeker arriving at the southern border who would not be subject to one of the bars imposed under these, and prior, recent rules, or who would be able to meet the elevated evidentiary burdens, both in preliminary border fear screenings and in asylum interviews and proceedings before immigration judges.

Since World War II, the United States has been a beacon of hope for those fleeing danger and harm. These rules would require immigration officials to slam the door on those seeking safety. We call upon the administration to withdraw these proposed rules in their entirety.

 [Name, position and signature]