

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

Brian P. Carr, Rueangrong Carr, Buakhao Von Kramer, Rujipas Lawichai, and Tanapon Lawichai Plaintiffs versus United States, US Department of Justice, USPS, USPS OIG, USPS BoG, US CIGIE, Department of State, Department of State OIG, USCIS, DHS OIG, IRS, TIGTA, and SSA Defendants	Civil No. 3-23CV2875-S Verified ¹ Second Amended COMPLAINT
---	--

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Due Process Requirements.....	4
USPS Falsifies Delivery Record.....	5
Department of State Denies Non-Immigrant Visa Without Due Process.....	5
Mrs. Von Kramer Receives Survivor Benefits.....	6
USCIS Denies Citizenship Application Based on Falsified Documents.....	6
IRS Improperly Begins Property Seizure.....	6
Jurisdiction and Venue.....	7
Jurisdiction.....	7
Venue.....	7
The Plaintiffs.....	7
The Defendants.....	10
Count 1.....	12
USPS Falsifies Delivery Records, Refuses Credit.....	12
‘Guaranteed Delivery’ Package Delivered Late.....	12
Package Recorded as Delivered While Still at Post Office.....	12
Initial Refund Request Denied Due to Falsified Delivery Time.....	13
After 2 Week Delay, Appeal Granted, Status is ‘Dispute Paid’.....	13
Refund Never Made to Credit Card.....	14
USPS Never Provides Requested Transaction ID of Payment.....	14
Falsified Records Supporting Unwarranted Management Bonuses.....	15
USPS FOIA Requests Pending.....	15
Count 2.....	16

1 The Verification of Complaint is at the end of this document as part of the signature blocks.

USPS OIG Refuses to Investigate or Report Federal Crimes.....	16
USPS BoG Refuses to Require Compliance With the Law.....	16
Count 3.....	18
DoS Denies Mrs. Carr Visa without Due Process.....	18
Count 4.....	22
DoS Denies Mrs. Von Kramer Visa without Due Process.....	22
First Visa Application Denied.....	23
Second Visa Application Denied.....	24
Third Visa Application Denied.....	24
Fourth Visa Application Approved.....	26
SSA Conditionally Grants Survivors' Benefits.....	27
DoS Refuses FOIA Requests.....	27
No Action on DoS FOIA Requests In 2024, Transferred Request in Feb 2025.....	28
Count 5.....	29
DoS OIG Refuses to Investigate or Report Federal Crimes.....	29
Count 6.....	30
CIGIE Takes No Action to Insure Lawful IG Compliance.....	30
Count 7, USCIS Commits Crimes and Ignores Constitution.....	32
USCIS Terrorizes and Denies Travel Thru Illegal Denial of Interview Waivers.....	32
Initial Applications.....	32
Extension Letter Inadequate.....	33
Mrs. Carr's emphatic desire for a permanent green card before citizenship.....	34
Unlawful Restrictions on Travel by USCIS, Stranded in Thailand.....	34
Rescheduling Original Interview.....	34
A-551 Passport Stamp Instead of Green Card.....	35
Improper Application of English Requirement to Older and Poor.....	35
Discriminates Against Buddhist and Islamic Cultures.....	35
USCIS Denies Green Card Through 'False' Claims of Approval.....	35
Joint I-751 and N-400 Interview of 30 Jan 2023.....	35
Both 10 Year Green Card And Citizenship Approved.....	35
USCIS Denied I-751 Through False Statements.....	36
USCIS Unlawful Policies Justified as 'Enforcement'.....	36
USCIS Provides Incomplete or False Estimates of Interview Dates.....	38
Criminal Background Questions Unlawful.....	38
USCIS Informed of Upcoming Travel Plans.....	39
USCIS Denies Citizenship After Approval.....	39
False Notice that N-400 Interview of 30 Jan 2023 Canceled.....	39
N-400 Interview Scheduled for 11 Oct 2023, Insufficient Notice.....	40
Complaint of Falsified Records, 01 Sep 2023 Cancellation.....	41
First Request to Reschedule Interview.....	42
Unsuccessful Call Back on 21 Sep 2023.....	43
Request that Mr. Carr be Mrs. Carr's Authorized Representative.....	43
Denial of Reschedule Request, Not Sent to Authorized Email.....	44
New request to Reschedule Interview.....	45
USCIS Denies N-400 Citizenship Application for Failure to Appear.....	46
USCIS Refuses to Provide New Green Card.....	47

USCIS FOIA Failures.....	49
Access to Case Records Unlawfully Denied.....	49
USCIS FOIA Cumulative N-400 and I-751 Data Request Denied.....	49
Cumulative Data Does not Meet FOIA ‘New Data’ Criteria.....	50
Legal Arguments.....	50
Lack of Jurisdiction.....	50
Lack of Notice to Support Failure to Appear.....	51
Lack of an Independent and Impartial Tribunal.....	51
Additional Federal Crimes by Ms Montgomery.....	51
Right of Appeal Prohibitive / Denied.....	52
Decision Misconstrues 8 CFR 336.2(a).....	52
Automated Phone System Prevents Applicants from Being Heard.....	53
Difficult Appointment of Spouse as Representative.....	53
Inclusive Assumptions for Freedom of Information Act Requests.....	54
Plaintiffs Were Damaged by USCIS’s Unlawful Decisions and Actions.....	54
Count 8.....	54
DHS OIG Takes No Action To Address Criminal Behavior.....	54
Count 9.....	55
DoJ Takes No Action To Address Criminal Behavior.....	55
DoJ Does Not Defend the Constitution or Enforce the Law.....	56
DoJ Commits Crimes to Violate Constitutional Rights.....	56
Count 10.....	57
IRS Violates Due Process and Statutes in Collections Process.....	57
2023 Form 1040 Filed, Minimum of 90% Estimated Taxes Paid.....	57
IRS Sends Tax Penalty Notice Which is Unfounded and Incorrect.....	58
IRS Form 2210 Submitted With Payment of Computed Penalty, \$340.81.....	59
Final Notice and Seizure While Appeal Pending.....	60
Appeal Decision of 18 Nov 2024.....	61
Request to Reconsider Appeals Decision.....	62
Request for Assistance Sent to Defendants.....	62
Apparently IRS Starts Numerous Minor Collections and Ignores Appeals.....	62
Most Taxpayers Pay After Threat to Seize Property then IRS Buries Appeal.....	62
IRS Admits Correct Amount of Penalty Was \$340.81, Initiates Refund.....	64
Explanation of Uneven Income and Estimated Taxes Needlessly Obtuse.....	64
IRS FOIA Requests.....	65
Arguments.....	66
30 Day Notice Before Seizure Required by Statute.....	66
Federal statute requires 30 day notice before property seizure.....	66
18 USC § 1001 Crime To Omit 30 Day Notice.....	67
Seizures must be blocked by Active Appeals.....	67
Relief Sought.....	68
USPS, OIG and DoJ Corrections.....	68
Department of State Corrections.....	69
SSA Order.....	70
CIGIE Corrections.....	71
USCIS Relief.....	71

Credit for Visa Fees when Stranded Overseas.....	71
Credit for Extraneous I-751 and N-400 Fees.....	72
Credit for Delay in Granting Citizenship.....	72
Review of Other I-751 and N-400 Records.....	73
Falsified Records Must Be Corrected.....	74
Adjustments for Language / Cultural Differences.....	74
USCIS Must Correct Time For Legal Notice.....	75
Adjustment of USCIS Fees for Appeal, Reconsideration.....	76
USCIS Must Restore Interview Waivers and Cease Criminal Background Reviews for I-751 Applications.....	76
Required Access Provided to Applicants.....	78
USCIS Must Guarantee Applicants' Right to Representation.....	78
More Expansive FOIA Responses.....	78
DHS OIG Corrections.....	78
DoJ Corrections.....	79
IRS Corrections.....	79
TIGTA and DoJ Corrections.....	80
Conclusion.....	80
Verification of Complaint.....	81
Case, Statute, and Other Alphabetical Index.....	82
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	86
CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES.....	86

The Plaintiffs, Brian P. Carr (hereafter referred to as Mr. Carr), Rueangrong Carr (hereafter referred to as Mrs. Carr) Buakhao Von Kramer (hereafter Mrs. Von Kramer), Rujipas Lawichai (hereafter Tin, his nickname), and appear pro se in this matter, as and for their complaint allege the following:

Introduction

1. This matter concerns the Defendants falsification of government records and, potentially, obstruction of justice through failure to report or correct federal crimes, and the Plaintiffs' [Fifth Amendment](#) right to due process of law.

Due Process Requirements

2. Almost all of the counts raised in this matter center around due process. Since the 70's the U.S. Supreme Court has expounded on the requirements of due process for administrative procedures such that it is not an obscure arcane right, but rather a central pillar of how the

U.S. government must act when dealing with individuals. There is an excellent overview of 'due process' in Cornell Law LII Procedural Due Process which lists the ten key elements required for due process as:

1. An unbiased tribunal.
 2. Notice of the proposed action and the grounds asserted for it.
 3. Opportunity to present reasons why the proposed action should not be taken.
 4. The right to present evidence, including the right to call witnesses.
 5. The right to know opposing evidence.
 6. The right to cross-examine adverse witnesses.
 7. A decision based exclusively on the evidence presented.
 8. Opportunity to be represented by counsel.
 9. Requirement that the tribunal prepare a record of the evidence presented.
 10. Requirement that the tribunal prepare written findings of fact and reasons for its decision
- These elements are derived from Judge Henry Friendly's article titled ["Some Kind of Hearing"](#).

USPS Falsifies Delivery Record

3. In April of 2021, Mr. Carr purchased a guaranteed delivery Express Mail label from the United States Postal Service (hereafter USPS). The package was delivered late but a postal employee falsified the delivery record to indicate that package was delivered on time. As a result, Mr. Carr was unable to get the guaranteed refund of \$26.35. Mr. Carr appealed administratively with USPS and later with USPS Office of the Inspector General (hereafter USPS OIG), the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (hereafter CIGIE), USPS Board of Governors, and Department of Justice (hereafter DoJ) to correct the falsified documents and get the requested refund. No refund has been received.

Department of State Denies Non-Immigrant Visa Without Due Process

4. In 2018 and 2019 Mrs. Carr and her sister, Mrs. Von Kramer, applied for non-immigrant visas which were denied by the Department of State (hereafter DoS) through the Bureau of Consular Affairs (hereafter BCA) without due process. In particular, the denial was a form letter with no reference to the actual evidence and which contradicted the verbal explanations of the denial by the interviewer. This could be construed as falsification of government

records through omission of required information. Further, in each case the denial was based on a rationale that was not supported by the evidence or law in the matter. As there was no administrative appeal available, Mr. Carr sought correction of the injustice through the DoS, CIGIE, and DoJ. Later non-immigrant visas for Mrs. Carr and Mrs. Von Kramer were approved in 2022 but both sisters suffered financial harm from the delay in receipt of the visas.

Mrs. Von Kramer Receives Survivor Benefits

5. Mrs. Von Kramer is the widow of a deceased American veteran and was able to visit the U.S. in 2022 and commenced receiving survivors' benefits from Social Security in May of 2023, but she must return to the U.S. every six months as she was not able to establish her 'lawful presence' in the U.S. in 2019, 2020, and 2021 as she planned.

USCIS Denies Citizenship Application Based on Falsified Documents

6. On 31 Jan 2023 as a result of a joint interview held on 30 Jan 2023 for a permanent green card (I-751) and for citizenship (N-400), the United States Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) approved Mrs. Carr's I-751 application for a permanent green card while not actually providing the green card as her N-400 citizenship application was also approved.
7. However, instead promptly providing Mrs. Carr with a Certificate of Naturalization, on 01 Sep 2023, USCIS updated her N-400 record to note that the interview of 30 Jan 2023 was canceled due to unforeseen circumstances.
8. Mr. Carr complained to USCIS, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and DoJ of falsified records (the interview had been completed and the N-400 had been approved). Even so, USCIS scheduled a 'second' N-400 interview for 11 Oct 2023, a date when USCIS had been informed that Mrs. Carr would be out of the country. Mr. and Mrs. Carr made numerous efforts to reschedule the interview which were refused. USCIS denied Mrs. Carr's N-400 application on 14 Oct 2023 for 'failure to appear'. Mr. Carr has since complained to DHS of 'whistleblower' retaliation for his previous reports of federal crimes and other malfeasance by USCIS.

IRS Improperly Begins Property Seizure

9. On 11 Nov 2024 the IRS began seizure of property (CP504 notice) for penalties of \$753.70 for 'late' estimated payments for 2023 tax year. Sufficient estimated taxes had been paid but

the majority was paid in the second half of the year when the income was received.

However, the IRS had incorrectly assumed the income had been received evenly distributed through the year to compute the disputed amount.

10. The CP504 was sent while an appeal was pending (violating due process) and without the statute mandated 30 days notice ([26 USC § 6331](#)). Mr. Carr paid the disputed amount of \$753.70 to avoid seizure of their car, house, or business assets but the IRS is continuing to ignore the appeal (and the now known facts of the timing of the income received) and, more importantly, not refunding the disputed amount.

Jurisdiction and Venue

Jurisdiction

11. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to [28 USC § 1331](#) and [28 USC § 1367](#), [42 USC Ch. 21B](#), Administrative Procedure Act (APA, [5 USC § 551–559](#), [5 USC § 702](#)), and [28 USC Chap 171 \(FTCA\)](#) as a case arising under [18 USC § 1001](#), [18 USC § 1505](#), [18 USC § 1510](#), [18 USC § 201](#), [18 USC Ch 96 \(RICO\)](#), [18 USC § 1038](#) [18 USC § 10](#), [5 USC § 404 \(IG Act of 1978\)](#), [5 USC § 424 CIGIE](#), [39 USC](#) (Postal Service), [INA 8 USC Ch 12](#), [8 CFR § 216.4](#), [5 USC § 2302\(b\)\(9\)\(D\)](#), [8 USC § 1184](#), [8 USC § 1146](#), [8 USC § 1447](#), [8 USC § 1421\(c\)](#), [8 CFR Part 1292.1](#), [5 USC § 552 FOIA](#), [5 USC § 2302](#), [26 USC Internal Revenue Code](#), [26 USC § 6331](#), [26 USC § 7803](#), [28 USC Part II](#) - Department Of Justice as well as the [Fifth Amendment](#) of the U.S. Constitution right to due process.

Venue

12. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to [28 USC § 1391](#) (b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim have occurred or will occur in this district and Plaintiffs Mr. and Mrs. Carr reside in this District and Mrs. Von Kramer, as a foreign national, receives her U.S. mail care of Mr. Carr.

The Plaintiffs

13. Mr. Brian P. Carr (hereafter Mr. Carr) is a U.S. citizen and resident of Dallas County in the State of Texas and a Plaintiff appearing Pro Se in this matter. Mr. Carr's contact information is:

Brian P. Carr

1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061
carrbp@gmail.com
518-227-0129

14. Mrs. Rueangrong Carr (hereafter Mrs. Carr) is a U.S. Permanent Resident and resident of Dallas County in the State of Texas and a Plaintiff appearing Pro Se in this matter. Mr. Carr is Mrs. Carr's spouse and to the degree that it is legally permissible, Mr. Carr will represent Mrs. Carr. Mrs. Carr's contact information is:

Rueangrong Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061
carrbp@gmail.com
518-227-0129

15. Mrs. Buakhao Von Kramer (hereafter Mrs. Von Kramer) is a citizen and resident of Thailand with a U.S. B-1 / B-2 non immigrant visa (business / tourist). Mrs. Von Kramer's U.S. mailing address is care of Mr. Carr, a resident of Dallas County in the State of Texas. Mrs. Von Kramer is a Plaintiff appearing Pro Se in this matter. Mrs. Von Kramer is the widow of Nikolaus Von Kramer, a German National, U.S. Army veteran (pre 1968), U.S. citizen, married to Mrs. Von Kramer on 12 January 2006, and died 26 April 2014. Mrs. Von Kramer is also Mrs. Carr's sister. Mrs. Von Kramer has also requested that Mr. Carr represent Mrs. Von Kramer to the degree that it is legally permissible. Mrs. Von Kramer's contact information is:

Buakhao Von Kramer
c/o Brian Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061
carrbp@gmail.com
518-227-0129

16. Mrs. Von Kramer's legal residence is:

105 - 3 M 5 T YANGNERNG
SARAPEE, CHIANG MAI 50140
THAILAND

17. Mr. Rujipas Lawichai (hereafter Tin, his nickname) is a citizen and resident of Thailand and Mrs. Carr's oldest son from a prior marriage and is an unmarried adult (over 21 years of

age). Mrs. Carr has completed a USCIS I-130 Petition for Tin to be able to immigrate to the United States (ECF 71-4). Tin's U.S. mailing address is care of Mr. Carr, a resident of Dallas County in the State of Texas. On 15 May 2025 Tin requested to join this suit (ECF 71-10). Tin is a Plaintiff appearing Pro Se in this matter and to the degree that it is legally permissible, Mr. Carr will represent Tin. Tin's contact information is:

Rujipas Lawichai
c/o Brian Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061
carrbp@gmail.com
518-227-0129

18. Tin's legal residence (as registered with the Thai government) is:

Rujipas Lawichai
Ban Tha Sala 1 Moo 7, Si Mueang Chum, Maesai,
Chiang Rai 57130 Thailand

19. Mr. Tanapon Lawichai (hereafter Earth, his nickname) is a citizen and resident of Thailand and Mrs. Carr's youngest son from a prior marriage and is an unmarried adult (over 21 years of age). Mrs. Carr has completed a USCIS I-130 Petition for Earth to be able to immigrate to the United States. Earth's U.S. mailing address is care of Mr. Carr, a resident of Dallas County in the State of Texas. Earth is a Plaintiff appearing Pro Se in this matter and to the that it is legally permissible, Mr. Carr will represent Earth. Earth's contact information is:

Tanapon Lawichai
c/o Brian Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061
carrbp@gmail.com
518-227-0129

20. Earth is a soldier in the Thai Army on active duty military service to a constitutional democratic government recognized by the United States and a military ally of the United States. At this time Earth is deployed in a combat assignment and unable to disclose his location, but he is in a location consistent with his orders from the Thai government.

21. Earth's legal residence (as registered with the Thai government) is:

Tanapon Lawichai
Ban Tha Sala 1 Moo 7, Si Mueang Chum, Maesai,
Chiang Rai 57130 Thailand

The Defendants

22. The United States government is the primary Defendant in this matter and is represented by the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Texas in her professional capacity with contact information:

United States Attorney
Northern District of Texas
1100 Commerce Street, Third Floor
Dallas, Texas 75242-1699

23. The U.S. Department of Justice (hereafter DoJ) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the Attorney General in her professional capacity with contact information:

Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

24. The United States Postal Service (hereafter USPS) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the Postmaster General in his professional capacity with contact information:

Postmaster General
USPS Headquarters
475 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington DC 20260-0010

25. The USPS Office of the Inspector General (hereafter OIG) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the USPS Inspector General in her professional capacity with contact information:

USPS Inspector General
1735 North Lynn Street
Arlington, VA 22209-2005

26. The USPS Board of Governors (BoG) is the governing body of the USPS, an agency of the United States. The USPS BoG is a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the Chairman in her professional capacity with contact information:

USPS Board of Governors Chairman
475 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington DC 20260-0010

27. The U.S. Department of State (hereafter DoS) is an agency of the United States and a Defendant in this matter. Because of the unusual division of authority and responsibility in DoS, DoS is represented by both the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs in their professional capacities with contact information:

The Executive Office
Office of the Legal Adviser, Suite 5.600
600 19th Street Ste 5, Suite 5 600, NW
Washington, D.C. 20522

28. The DoS OIG is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the DoS Inspector General in his professional capacity with contact information:

U.S. Department of State Inspector General
1700 North Moore Street (SA-39)
Arlington, VA 22209

29. The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (hereafter CIGIE) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the Executive Director in his professional capacity with contact information:

Executive Director
Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency
1750 H Street NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

30. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (hereafter USCIS) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the USCIS Director in his professional capacity with contact information:

USCIS Director
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20529

31. The Department of Homeland Security (hereafter DHS) OIG is an agency of the United States which oversees USCIS, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the DHS Inspector General in his professional capacity with contact information:

Department of Homeland Security Inspector General
245 Murray Dr.; Building 410;
Washington, DC 20528

32. The Social Security Administration (hereafter SSA) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the SSA Commissioner in his professional capacity with contact information:

Social Security Administration Commissioner
1300 D. Street SW
Washington, D.C. 20024

33. The Internal Revenue Service (hereafter IRS) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the IRS Commissioner in his professional capacity with contact information:

Internal Revenue Service
1111 Constitution Ave, NW
Room 6329, SE:T:HQ:CPC
Washington, DC 20224.

34. The Office of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (hereafter TIGTA) is an agency of the United States, a Defendant in this matter and is represented by the TIGTA Inspector General in her professional capacity with contact information:

Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration
901 D Street, SW; Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20024

Count 1

USPS Falsifies Delivery Records, Refuses Credit

‘Guaranteed Delivery’ Package Delivered Late

Package Recorded as Delivered While Still at Post Office

35. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 34, as if fully set forth herein.
36. The Plaintiffs refer to the Verified Brief (ECF 75-2) defending Count 1 and Count 2 which

are against USPS and USPS OIG as well the Verified Brief (ECF 67-3) discussing Sovereign Immunity and Executive Discretion.

37. On April 9, 2021 Mr. Carr purchased an 'Overnight Express' click'n'ship for \$26.35 with tracking number 9470103699300057573507 with guaranteed delivery to return his passport from the Thai embassy to his home address (see ECF 18-3). The Thai embassy mailed his passport back and the shipment was accepted by USPS at 8:46PM on 13 April 2021 with guaranteed delivery by 12PM on 15 April 2021. This was longer than overnight as it was received late in the day.
38. However, the package did not arrive at the Irving Post Office until 11:18 AM 15 April 2021 and was 'out for delivery' at 11:29 AM. It was scanned as delivered at 11:35 while the driver was almost certainly still at the Post Office, a common practice for improper 'Stop the Clock' scans (see ECF 18-4).
39. It is virtually impossible to make the drive from the Post Office to Mr. Carr's house in six minutes. Note that while improper 'Stop the Clock' scans have a relatively benign name, they are, in fact, crimes of falsifying government records as per [18 USC § 1001](#) (a) (1).
40. Mr. Carr was anxious to get his passport and checked for the package several times on the morning of 15 April, 2021. When Mr. Carr received notice of the delivery at 11:35 AM via email, the Carrs went out to look for the package but could not find it.
41. Mr. Carr also called the Post Office about the missing package and was advised to not worry as there had been vehicle problems that morning and that his package would arrive soon. Mr. Carr asked if the record of delivery time would be corrected but received a non-committal answer. Mr. Carr also took a time stamped photo of the front porch area with no package present after it had been recorded as delivered.
42. At 12:30PM the package was in Mr. Carr's mail box, delivered after the guaranteed delivery time (contrary to the improper 'Stop the Clock' delivery scan).

Initial Refund Request Denied Due to Falsified Delivery Time

43. That afternoon Mr. Carr initiated an online request for a refund (refund request number 6006595) which was denied in minutes as the package was falsely reported as delivered on time.

After 2 Week Delay, Appeal Granted, Status is 'Dispute Paid'

44. Two weeks later Mr. Carr was permitted to appeal that arbitrary denial and explained about

the illegal 'Stop the Clock' scan and on 5 May 2021 the status of the refund was changed to 'Dispute Paid' (see ECF 18-8). However, the credit card which Mr. Carr used for the online 'click n ship' never posted the refund.

45. On 9 June, 2021, Mr. Scott Hooper, District Manager, Dallas Customer Service and Sales, 951 W. Bethel Rd., Coppel, Texas, 75099-9998 replied to Mr. Carr's queries about the falsified delivery time via Congressman Veasey stating that Mr. Rodney Malone, Postmaster, Irving, TX found that "the guaranteed date and time for delivery of the Priority Express Mail was April 15, 2031, by noon. Mr. Malone retrieved data from the carrier's scanner and was able to confirm the package was scanned as delivered on April 15, 2021 at 11:35 a.m.. Mr. Malone states the carrier has been trained in the proper disposition and scanning of Priority Express Mail. The signature was waived; therefore, allowing delivery directly to Mr. Carr's mailbox. Unfortunately, to be able to correct a scan in our system, it must be within the previous 21 calendar days." (see ECF 11-2)

Refund Never Made to Credit Card

46. Mr. Carr contacted USPS customer service on numerous occasions as there had not been any refund but was only told to wait longer for the refund even though he had already waited far longer than the suggested waiting time.
47. When Mr. Carr complained that the refund was due many months ago, the response was just a generic statement about submitting a new refund request (which would be denied as it was too late to initiate a new refund request).

USPS Never Provides Requested Transaction ID of Payment

48. On 3 September 2021, Ms. Scarpelli of the USPS responded to Congressman Veasey stating that Mr. Carr's refund was paid on 5 May 2021 but on further investigation by Mr. Carr there were no details of the refund.
49. After Mr. Carr made numerous attempts to find the transaction ID of the credit to his bank it became apparent that Ms. Scarpelli had been misled by the numerous falsified documents which resulted from the improper 'stop the clock' scan of his package and faulty USPS business processes to issue credits when a falsified delivery record indicates an 'on time' delivery. (See ECF 18-9)
50. It appears that the Accounting Service Center approved the refund and passed it off to Customer Service to make the actual refund. However, because the tracking record had a

falsified delivery time via the improper 'Stop the Clock' scan which was not corrected by management (a potential crime itself), customer service could not give the refund but referred Mr. Carr back to accounting services or asked Mr. Carr to start a new claim for a refund (which was not permitted at that time due to the delay).

Falsified Records Supporting Unwarranted Management Bonuses

51. There are now numerous documents which are false due to the original falsified delivery time and thousands of others as documented by USPS OIG (see ECF 18-7), to include quality reports to Congress and the U.S. public, profitability reports for individual post offices and regions, and bonuses paid to management of said post offices and regions. This is a prime example of how one uncorrected falsified document multiplies until it becomes hard to find any truthful and correct documents. These problems were referred to USPS management as well other defendants on 3 Mar 2023 in ECF 14-4.

USPS FOIA Requests Pending

52. On 21 Nov 2022 Mr. Carr submitted a personal FOIA request 2022-FPRO-00378 (ECF 70-11) specifically requesting bank transaction ID for credit card refund (item 2). USPS responded on 21 Jan 2023 (ECF 70-12) with delivery results (ECF 70-13) and 'Refund Issued' but no bank transaction ID. The court is asked to confirm that USPS does not have any bank transaction ID for the refund before relief is provided in the form of an actual refund or credit for future services.
53. On 11 Mar 2025, Mr. Carr submitted a cumulative FOIA request (ECF 70-7) to USPS which was accepted as 2025-FPRO-01666. On 1 May 2025 USPS FOIA responded (ECF 70-8) noting cost of \$336.00 which Mr. Carr paid but redacting all cumulative results based on "information of a commercial nature" under Section 410(c)(2)² with the results in ECF 70-9.
54. On 12 Jun 2025, USPS appeals responded to Mr. Carr's appeal denying all requests (ECF 75-3) with a letter explaining (ECF 75-4) that, among other things, this court has jurisdiction to review the appeal.

² Section 410(c)(2) is [39 USC § 410](#) c)(2) which states:

(c) Subsection (b)(1) of this section [(FOIA)] shall not require the disclosure of -
 (2) information of a commercial nature, including trade secrets, whether or not obtained from a person outside the Postal Service, which under good business practice would not be publicly disclosed;

Count 2

USPS OIG Refuses to Investigate or Report Federal Crimes

USPS BoG Refuses to Require Compliance With the Law

55. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 54, as if fully set forth herein.
56. Plaintiffs refer to Verified Brief (ECF 75-7) which discusses the duties and responsibilities of IG's in general and the DoJ with respect to reporting crimes (IG) and enforcing the law (DoJ). It clarifies that the DoJ can rely on the various OIG's and even local management to investigate plausible federal crimes and implement corrections to prevent future violations as long as DoJ monitors the results and insures that the law is enforced.
57. Mr. Carr visited the [USPS OIG web hotline](#) which stated "the USPS OIG Hotline CANNOT assist you with daily mail delivery and tracking problems" but also "the USPS OIG Hotline CAN assist you with ... Employee Misconduct".
58. Mr. Carr made several submissions to the Hotline which includes Submission 167800 on 18 May 2021, Submission 170675 on 27 May 2021, Submission 184761 on 19 July 2021, and Submission 209111 on 22 October 2021. However, even though he cited specific federal crimes of falsifying government records, defrauding postal customers and USPS management uniformly unable to make any corrections, in all cases the complaint was simply referred back to USPS local management and with no correction or action taken. However, each complaint was closed as successfully resolved even though no corrections or actions were taken.
59. On 1 August 2021 Mr. Carr wrote directly to the USPS Inspector General inquiring as to the origin of the policy preventing any USPS OIG investigation of certain crimes of falsifying government records, e.g. improper 'Stop the Clock' scans of packages as delivered prior to actual delivery and, amongst other things, defrauding postal customers (see ECF 11-3).
60. This letter seems to have been referred back to the USPS OIG Hotline where they suggested that Mr. Carr would need to file a Freedom of Information Act request to get the information he required.
61. Mr. Carr submitted the FOIA request and received a statement from Tanya Hefley on 19 October 2021 stating "However, we were advised, during processing, the OIG Hotline determines the best routing (OIG, Inspection Service, Postal Service, other agency, etc.) for

an allegation on a case-by-case basis." (see ECF 11-4)

62. In a 2017 audit ([DR-AR-18-001](#), ECF 18-7) the USPS OIG found there were over 1.9 million improper 'stop the clock' scans out of the 25.5 millions which were analyzed. The result was that over 7 percent of the analyzed scans were improper. Extending this to the over 4 billion scanned packages during 2017, as many as 280 million of such scans defrauded customers by these improper scans preventing 'guaranteed delivery' refunds. Further, the USPS OIG listed over about 1.4 million customer complaints in FY 2017 related to delivery. (see ECF 18-7)
63. In a [2020 Blog report by USPS OIG](#), "Specifically, 38 percent of the more than 1,100 packages that were selected at these units and that were in the facility before the carriers arrived for the day had been improperly scanned."
64. When Mr. Carr reported the details of the falsified delivery time to OIG case workers, it was not only 'likely' that a federal crime had been committed, but, in light of USPS OIG reports on the problem (see ECF 18-7), it was 'beyond reasonable doubt.'
65. However, the reality is that improper 'Stop the Clock' scans are federal crimes and are not ever referred to the Attorney General as required by [5 USC § 404](#).
66. On 1 August 2021 Mr. Carr wrote to the USPS IG (ECF 11-3) directly complaining of an apparent illegal order preventing USPS OIG case workers from reporting known federal crimes (the well documented improper 'stop the clock scans' (a.k.a. falsified government records) to the Attorney General as required explicitly by [5 USC § 404](#) which states in part that the 'Inspector General shall report expeditiously to the Attorney General whenever the Inspector General has reasonable grounds to believe there has been a violation of Federal criminal law'. This was clarified on 17 Nov 2021 to explain that this failure to report federal crimes was malfeasance in USPS OIG (ECF 11-5)
67. The USPS IG made no response but via U.S. Representative Marc Veasey, Ms. Kelly Delaney, Senior Attorney, Government Relations, USPS OIG, replied on 7 June 2022 (ECF 10-1) and stated

The OIG conducts investigations to determine whether evidence exists of misconduct or criminal activity by postal employees and, when appropriate, refers such matters for criminal prosecution. When employee conduct does not meet the threshold for prosecution, we typically refer such matters to Postal Service

management officials for their determination of possible administrative action. ...

We did not identify a violation that warranted referral for criminal prosecution.

68. Thus, the OIG is claiming the authority to decide which cases should be prosecuted while it is clear from [5 USC § 404](#) that Congress intended that the decision to prosecute is reserved solely for the Attorney General (or the DoJ realistically).
69. It is apparent that the USPS OIG has decided to allow the USPS to commit certain federal crimes with impunity thereby defrauding thousands of postal customers each year.
70. On 3 August 2022, Mr. Carr wrote to the USPS Board of Governors (see ECF 10-2 previously provided to relevant Defendants) complaining of apparent illegal orders preventing the USPS IG from properly reporting federal crimes to the DoJ as required by statute, possibly a crime itself of obstruction of justice.
71. There was no response from USPS BoG but on 14 Dec 2022 from Andrew Jones, USPS Government Relations Representative replied via Representative Veasey (see ECF 10-3) stating 'the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) is responsible for investigating complaints about an Inspector General. CIGIE conducts its investigations independently, and it has requested that all inquiries related to its functional responsibilities be referred to CIGIE for reply.' It claims that the complaint was forwarded to CIGIE but no response was forthcoming.
72. There are anecdotal reports of widespread falsification of records of all types within USPS which is the likely result of USPS OIG unlawfully granting USPS the ability to falsify delivery records with impunity. These problems were referred to USPS IG as well other defendants on 3 Mar 2023 in ECF 14-4.

Count 3

DoS Denies Mrs. Carr Visa without Due Process

73. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 72, as if fully set forth herein.
74. The Plaintiffs refer to the Verified Brief (ECF 75-8) defending Count 3, Count 4 and Count 5 against DoS and DoS OIG as well the Verified Brief (ECF 75-5) discussing the right to representation which refers to the Verified Brief (ECF 71-8) concerning pro se self representation. ECF 75-8 also relies heavily of another Verified Brief (ECF 75-6) which has an extensive set of challenges to USATXN's primary defense of DoS, the Doctrine of

Consular Non Reviewability (DoCNR). ECF 75-8 also refers to another Verified Brief (ECF 75-7) which discusses the duties and responsibilities of IG's in general and the DoJ with respect to reporting crimes (IG) and enforcing the law (DoJ). It clarifies that the DoJ can rely on the various OIG's and even local management to investigate plausible federal crimes and implement corrections to prevent future violations as long as DoJ monitors the results and insures that the law is enforced.

75. Mr. and Mrs. Carr had married on 23 June 2018 in Thailand and applied for an immigration visa via an I-130 petition submitted to USCIS on 17 July 2018.
76. However, they learned that the I-130 petition normally takes over a year to be processed. They were concerned that his mother was over 90 years old and her health was failing. It was unlikely that she would survive for more than a year. The couple wanted Mrs. Carr to be able to meet Mr. Carr's mother so they decided to apply for a non-immigration visa.
77. As a result, Mr. Carr completed the application for a non-immigration visa DS-160 for Mrs. Carr with the \$160 fee paid by Mr. Carr with his American credit card.
78. Mr. Carr requested that he be permitted to attend the interview as Mrs. Carr representative as he was more familiar with his mom's health and his finances. However, he was told that was not possible due to security and space concerns at the consulate.
79. As an alternative, Mr. Carr completed an I-864 affidavit of support showing assets of \$2,986,370.28 over 90% of which were in IRA accounts which could not be moved outside of the U.S. without complex and expensive tax implications. He also attached an affirmed statement attached to the I-29F supporting those assets and an explanation that the couple had sufficient assets to live wherever they chose and that it would be incredibly stupid for them to overstay their visa as it would preclude freedom to travel in the future. They were not stupid people. (see ECF 12-3)
80. On 29 Aug 2018 Mrs. Carr had an interview for a B-1 / B-2 non immigrant visa (business / tourist) at the Chiang Mai Consulate in Thailand with appointment AA00843QZW.
81. The interviewer did not review any of the papers which Mr. Carr had prepared but instead did a cursory review of Mrs. Carr visa application record and noted the I-130 application to immigrate. The interviewer then informed Mrs. Carr that she could not get a tourist visa because she had an outstanding immigration visa application. The only way she could get a tourist visa would be to rescind her immigration application first and then reapply for a

tourist visa. This deeply upset Mrs. Carr, presenting her with a sort of Sophie's choice dilemma. Needless to say, the interviewer's verbal claim was totally contrary to the published requirements and the law in these matters.

82. The actual denial letter had no references to any evidence presented or reviewed but simply cited section 214(b)³ and 'you did not overcome the presumption of immigrant intent, required by law, by sufficiently demonstrating that you have strong ties to your home country that will compel you to leave the United States at the end of your temporary stay'.
83. Mr. and Mrs. Carr were unlawfully denied their ability to travel freely due to denial of Mrs. Carr's visa application.
84. Mr. Carr complained to the DoS OIG with complaint H20190052 citing the lack of due process through the denial of the right to representation (Mr. Carr could not attend the interview), the denial of the opportunity for Mrs. Carr to present evidence, and the denial of the right to a written decision based solely on the law and evidence presented. Mr. Carr explained that the requirement that Mrs. Carr rescind her immigration application was not supported by the law and, as such, was unlawful.
85. On 10 October 2018 DoS OIG responded with ECF 10-4.
86. The response was signed by Cristin Heinbeck, Outreach and Inquiries Division, Visa Services of DoS which stated in part:

there is no provision in U.S. law that specifically precludes issuance of a nonimmigrant visa to an applicant with a pending immigrant visa case. However, such an applicant must still demonstrate that he or she has clear ties to a continuing life overseas and evidence that he or she intends only a temporary visit to the United States. Such evidence is required to overcome the provisions of section 214(b) of the INA.⁴
87. The DoS did not address the denial of the right to representation and the right to present evidence. Of course an applicant will not be able to overcome the provisions of section 214(b) if they are not permitted to present the evidence which is required by section 214(b)⁵.
88. As DoS OIG improperly abdicated its responsibility to oversee BCA and referred these

³ INA 214 is [8 USC § 1184](#)

⁴ INA 214 is [8 USC § 1184](#)

⁵ INA 214 is [8 USC § 1184](#)

serious violations of the Fifth Amendment rights of due process to BCA, Mr. Carr continued his efforts to get a just and lawful decision by writing several emails to the Chiang Mai Consulate General.

89. Mr. Carr was able to persuade USCIS to expedite the I-130 immigration petition process and it was approved within four months (likely a record for such petitions in Thailand at that time).
90. Mr. and Mrs. Carr were also subjected to unwarranted stress in getting the I-130 so quickly as was the staff at USCIS who had to deal with the constant concerns raised by Mr. Carr about every delay.
91. Mrs. Carr was able to meet Mr. Carr's mother and that was a source of joy for all parties. Mr. Carr's mother died within a week of their arrival so the desire to visit promptly was well founded.
92. Mr. and Mrs. Carr returned to Thailand after a roughly three month visit to the United States (so would not have 'overstayed' a tourist visa in any case).
93. However, four years later USCIS failed in meeting its statutory mandate to allow Mrs. Carr to work and travel freely (see [8 CFR § 216.4](#) (b)) and left Mrs. Carr stranded in Thailand, unable to return to the U.S..
94. As a result, Mr. Carr made and paid for a second application for Mrs. Carr for a tourist visa with DoS BCA with the interview on 12 Dec 2022 at the Chiang Mai Consulate with appointment AA00BCSFIT.
95. Mr. Carr sent an explanatory email to the Chiang Mai Consulate General citing the previous letter from DoS stating that Mrs. Carr's previous visa application was denied unlawfully and explaining that USCIS had unlawfully left Mrs. Carr stranded in Thailand, attaching the supporting documents for this conclusion. Mr. Carr asked that an adequately trained interviewer be assigned to review Mrs. Carr's visa application so that there would not be further unjust and unlawful decisions.
96. The Consulate General responded that all interviewers were properly trained and made their decisions independently of any input from the Consulate General but it is possible that an addendum was made to Mrs. Carr's file explaining the sensitivity of the application.
97. Mrs. Carr's second visa application was approved with no substantial input from Mrs. Carr, only a quick review on the computer (presumably of the status of the application).

98. The cost of this second visa application fee was \$160 which Mr. Carr attributes half to USCIS for leaving Mrs. Carr stranded in Thailand and half to DoS BCA for unlawfully denying the first visa application.

Count 4

DoS Denies Mrs. Von Kramer Visa without Due Process

99. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 98, as if fully set forth herein.

100. Mrs. Von Kramer is the widow of an American veteran who died on 26 April 2014 (born 19 Nov 1944). Mrs. Von Kramer had promptly notified the U.S. embassy and Social Security of his death.

101. A member of the embassy staff had kindly mentioned to Mrs. Von Kramer that if she visited the U.S. regularly she could get survivor benefits from Social Security. She also explained that if Mrs. Von Kramer did not have friends or family in the U.S. it would be prohibitively expensive and not really possible.

102. As a result, after Mrs. Carr (her sister) had become a Permanent Resident of the U.S., Mrs. Von Kramer's younger daughter Yui Montira Moongram submitted a DS-160 visa application for Mrs. Von Kramer and paid the \$160 fee. Her first interview was held on 9 Sep 2019 at the Chiang Mai consulate.

103. Mrs. Von Kramer asked that Mr. Carr attend the interview. Mr. Carr inquired again and was told that only the applicant was permitted in the consulate due to security and space constraints.

104. Mr. Carr helped Mrs. Von Kramer prepare an extensive folder of papers (more than an inch thick) to demonstrate her financial resources and ties to Thailand. It started with dual affirmations for Mr. Carr and Mrs. Von Kramer (see ECF 12-4, affirmed under penalty of perjury) with descriptions of the other 'exhibits' which included:

- Round trip tickets to the U.S. with the first flight on 13 Oct 2019 on the same flight to the U.S. as Mr. and Mrs. Carr were taking and return flights for Mrs. Von Kramer after a 14 day stay (longer than the 1 day minimum requirement and shorter than the 30 day / full month maximum for a 'lawful presence' visit as described in the affirmations). See ECF 16-7.
- An email from Mr. Carr inviting Mrs. Von Kramer to stay at their house during her visit

to the U.S.. See ECF 13-1,

- Previously Mr. Carr had provided Mrs. Von Kramer with a statement from one of Mr. Carr's retirement accounts showing over \$400,000 in assets (signed by Mr. Carr), but as this ran to over ten pages it was decided to not include it in the packet and rely on the substantial savings Mrs. Von Kramer demonstrated below. Instead the focus would be on the accommodations and opportunities for service and volunteering and other 'lawful presence' activities described in attachments to the invitation email. See ECF 13-1,
- A signed copy of Mr. Carr's passport ID page.
- A Thai bank statement showing a roughly \$30,000 balance in Mrs. Von Kramer's name for the last six months (and certified at the bank).
- Deeds to Mrs. Von Kramer's houses in Chiang Mai and Chiang Rai with pictures of the houses (they are nice houses) along with her and her dogs, two daughters, and other sister and brother (in different pictures).
- Deeds to some of her farm land (prime rice paddies in Chiang Rai where Mrs. Von Kramer was born).
- Title to her car along with pictures of her with the car and family members.
- University diplomas for her two daughters.
- Documentation of her daughters' long term employment as a nurse in Chiang Mai and Network Engineer in Bangkok together with pay stubs.
- Documentation of her marriage to Mr. Von Kramer and his death.
- An explanation by Mr. Carr of the requirements to get social security survivors' benefits which include several 'lawful' visits to the U.S. over a five year period (and a stipulation that any overstays would disqualify her from any future benefits).

First Visa Application Denied

105. Surprisingly enough, the interviewer verbally denied Mrs. Von Kramer first visa application based on her not having firm travel plans. This was not based on any evidence as Mrs. Von Kramer had copies of her flight tickets and invitation as described above.

106. Further, the written denial letter was functionally identical to the one Mrs. Carr had received with no references to any evidence presented or reviewed but simply cited INA 214(b)⁶ and 'you did not overcome the presumption of immigrant intent, required by law, by sufficiently

⁶ INA 214 is [8 USC § 1184](#)

demonstrating that you have strong ties to your home country that will compel you to leave the United States at the end of your temporary stay’.

107. Mrs. Von Kramer apologized to Mr. Carr at the end of the interview for not presenting her case well, but the real problem was the denial of her right to due process and representation.

108. Mrs. Von Kramer was raised in a very poor family with nine children and a sharecropper father. She had a limited education of only four years before she needed to start working to help support the family.

109. As a girl from a poor family in Thailand she was taught to be polite and not speak out. She was not taught how to persuasively and clearly advocate for her position. However, due process is guaranteed to all persons who deal with the U.S. government and the right to representation is to insure that justice is not provided only to the rich and well educated.

Second Visa Application Denied

110. Mr. Carr completed and paid for a second DS-160 visa application for Mrs. Von Kramer with the interview on 30 Sep 2019 at the Chiang Mai Consulate (appointment AA009APPX1) and Mrs. Von Kramer later repaid the roughly \$160 fee in Thai Baht.

111. Mrs. Von Kramer was able to mention to the interviewer that she wanted to apply for Social Security but the interviewer falsely claimed that she could have her social security claims handled in Manila in the Philippines and did not need a U.S. visa for that. It is unclear if the interviewer was ignorant of Social Security rules and regulation or maliciously told her false information.

112. Mrs. Von Kramer mentioned her contact at the embassy who had explained the U.S. requirements for non citizens to receive Social Security benefits overseas to Mrs. Von Kramer, but the interviewer declined to call her.

113. The interviewer also did not read Mr. Carr’s extensive explanation of Social Security rules and regulations applicable to Mrs. Von Kramer but instead denied her application based on the false claim that she could get her social security benefits in the Philippines.

114. The written denial letter was the same form letter as before with no mention of the actual evidence considered.

Third Visa Application Denied

115. Mrs. Von Kramer again apologized to Mr. Carr for not presenting her case well as she had not given the interviewer the extensive documentation which Mr. Carr had compiled.

116. Mr. Carr completed and paid for a third DS-160 visa application for Mrs. Von Kramer with the interview on 9 Oct 2019 at the Chiang Mai Consulate (appointment AA009BKKHR) and Mrs. Von Kramer later repaid the roughly \$160 fee in Thai Baht.
117. Before the interview, Mrs. Von Kramer practiced handing the packet of documentation to the interviewer as she had not done that in previous interviews. Mr. Carr also ensured that she called attention to his affirmation which explained all the other attachments as well as the requirements for Social Security benefits paid to foreign nationals overseas.
118. In the actual interview, Mrs. Von Kramer did hand the packet to the interviewer and he did spend a few seconds reading the first few pages, before closing the packet and informing Mrs. Von Kramer that she could not get a visa as she was a widow and too old with insufficient ties to Thailand. If she were to remarry she could reapply and might be eligible for a visa.
119. Of course this verbal rationale is completely contrary to the published rules and laws for non-immigration visas.
120. The written denial letter was the same form letter as before with no mention of the actual evidence considered.
121. It should be noted that if Mrs. Von Kramer were to remarry, she would no longer be eligible for SSA survivors' benefits, the central focus of the first few pages of Mr. Carr's affirmation.
122. It is also apparent that the DoS BCA has unpublished unwritten unlawful policies which are followed by interviewers such as:
- Immigration applicants should not be granted tourist visas irrelevant of the actual facts and circumstances.
 - Widows of deceased American citizens (or more properly surviving spouses) should never be granted tourist / business visas irrelevant of the actual facts and circumstances
- The last item may be intended to reduce drains on the overburdened social security system which could be considered an admirable goal, but it is up to Congress to balance the complex trade offs of such matters.
123. Mr. Carr and Mrs. Von Kramer suffered financial loss due to these unlawful denials of visa applications to include three application fees (\$160 times 3, or \$480) but also the flight tickets she was not able to use. Her round trip fare via Expedia on China Southern Airlines

was \$511.53 which was a bargain for non-refundable tickets, but Expedia was helpful in negotiating with China Southern Airlines due to the extenuating circumstances and was able to get a refund of the entire amount less the stated change fee of \$134. See ECF 16-7.

124. Mrs. Von Kramer was also unable to establish a lawful presence in the United States during the years of 2019, 2020, and 2021 according to SSA policies concerning payments to non-citizens residing outside the United States. An exception is granted to surviving spouses who have established a 'lawful presence' in the United States with five years of legal visits to the United States which demonstrate enduring ties to the United States. The requirements for these lawful presence visits are also complex and ambiguous (to the Plaintiffs) with the unusual requirement that for a visit to count for 'lawful presence' it must be longer than one day and shorter than 30 days (and not a full calendar month). A stay for an entire year also counts. See [SSA POM RS 02610.025](#) 5-Year Residency Requirement for Alien Dependents/Survivors Outside the United States (U.S.).⁷

Fourth Visa Application Approved

125. Mrs. Von Kramer made a fourth application for a tourist visa with DoS BCA with the interview on 12 Dec 2022 at the Chiang Mai Consulate with appointment AA00BCSFIT.

126. Mrs. Van Kramer was able to schedule her interview to be 15 minutes after Mrs. Carr time slot so that the two sisters went in together. It happened that Mrs. Carr was able to introduce Mrs. Von Kramer to Mrs. Von Kramer's interviewer with the statement 'She is my sister' before Mrs. Carr went on to her interview.

127. Mrs. Von Kramer was prepared with a more extensive folder of papers and had practiced presenting the papers with simple and brief explanations (e.g. "Here is an invitation letter from my brother-in-law, here is a picture of me with my sister and brother-in-law, here is a copy of my brother-in-law's passport page which he has signed for me, ...")

128. However, before Mrs. Von Kramer could start her presentation, the interviewer asked if she would be traveling with others. She answered that she would be traveling with her sister and brother-in-law and the interviewer replied 'Let me look into the status of the other members of your group'. He then briefly looked at records on his computer before telling Mrs. Von

⁷ In 2023 Mr. Carr expressed an interest in the 'lawful presence' requirements with some SSA employees and after minimally including SSA in this suit, SSA has substantially improved and clarified the governing rules in SSA POM RS 02610.025 with an increased focus on 'sincere effort to establish enduring ties to the U.S..'

Kramer that her visa application was approved.

129. It is possible that Mrs. Von Kramer's interviewer may have read any notes or concerns about Mrs. Carr's visa application made by the Chiang Mai Consulate General in response to Mr. Carr's previous email.

SSA Conditionally Grants Survivors' Benefits

130. As a result, Mrs. Von Kramer was able to visit the United States briefly in 2022 and 2023, possibly establishing a lawful presence for those years according to SSA standards. See [SSA POM RS 02610.025](#) 5-Year Residency Requirement for Alien Dependents/Survivors Outside the United States (U.S.)

131. After a weekend trip to Cancun Mexico in January of 2023, Mrs. Von Kramer continued the process of applying for SSA survivors' benefits which started in May of 2023 and have continued with the requirement that Mrs. Von Kramer can not continue to receive benefits outside the U.S. if she is outside the U.S. for more than six months.

132. Mrs. Von Kramer has met SSA's requirements for payments and intends to continue her regular visits to the U.S. until SSA determines that she has established a lawful presence in the U.S. for five years.

DoS Refuses FOIA Requests

133. On 11 May 2023 via the DoS FOIA request web page Mr. Carr submitted two FOIA requests along with emails to FOIARequest@state.gov with required release forms for Mrs. Von Kramer and Mrs. Carr seeking all records related to the visa applications cited herein (ECF 70-14 and ECF 70-15). DoS denied access to Mrs. Von Kramer's records (ECF 12-5) and Mr. Carr contested the grounds for denying access to records and expanded the request to include IG complaints (ECF 70-16).

134. On 24 July 2023 responding to Case Number: F-2023-08493 Laura Stein, Deputy Director, Office of Domestic Operations, Directorate for Visa Services (DoS) stated that even with authorizations for release of FOIA information from Mrs. Carr and Mrs. Von Kramer, the DoS would still be required by section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act ([8 USC § 1202](#)(f)) to keep confidential any visa records that were not previously received from or sent to the subject of the request. See ECF 12-5.

135. On 19 Oct 2023, DoS provided only the electronic summaries of the information Mr. Carr had provided when filing Mrs. Carr's two visa applications. DoS excluded all other records

based on their contested interpretation of INA Section 222(f). See ECF 70-17.

136. This misconstrues [8 USC § 1202](#)(f) which states:

(f) Confidential nature of records shall be used only for the formulation, amendment, administration, or enforcement of the immigration, nationality, and other laws of the United States,

137. However, the Fifth Amendment guarantees to all persons (including foreign nationals) the right to due process which certainly includes access to all the evidence presented against them. All such information must be released to the applicant in order to administer the immigration laws and the applicants' due process rights so INA Section 222(f) does not apply to applicants seeking access to records applicable to their case.

138. These requirements on administrative procedures even extend to properly classified information covered by the Classified Information Procedures Act (CIPA) which provides uniform procedures for prosecutions involving classified information.

139. In [Kiareldeen v. Reno 71 F.Supp.2d 402](#), the court ruled in favor of an immigrant applicant facing deportation. On appeal, the court ruled that the reliance on secret evidence violated his due process rights because (1) it deprived him of meaningful notice and an opportunity to confront the evidence against him, and (2) exclusively hearsay evidence could not be tested for reliability. On 20 Jun 2023 Mr. Carr notified DoS and other defendants of these crimes and other problems in ECF 14-2.

140. On 20 Dec 2023 Mr Carr submitted a DoS FOIA request for cumulative non immigration visa results by country and break downs by age and U.S. Social Security Survivor's Benefits eligibility (ECF 13-2) which DoS acknowledged as F-2023-13477 (ECF 13-3) and F-2024-04752 (ECF 70-18).

No Action on DoS FOIA Requests In 2024, Transferred Request in Feb 2025

141. No action was taken on any of the outstanding FOIA requests by DoS in 2024, but on 5 Feb 2025 (just before Mrs. Carr's citizen test) DoS transferred the FOIA request FP-2023-00325 to a different office (ECF 70-19) which put the request into another indefinite hold (ECF 70-20) on 28 Feb 2025 (the date Mrs. Carr became a citizen).

Count 5

DoS OIG Refuses to Investigate or Report Federal Crimes

142. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 141, as if fully set forth herein.
143. In early October 2018 Mr. Carr submitted a complaint via the DoS OIG hotline (a web page) concerning malfeasance in the processing of visa applications as the DoS BCA did not provide due process, particularly the right to representation, lack of a written decision based on the evidence and the law, and right to appeal.
144. On 10 October 2018, he received a response from DoS Heinbeck, which stated 'there is no provision in U.S. law that specifically precludes issuance of a non immigrant visa to an applicant with a pending immigrant visa case' which contradicts the verbal justification for the visa denial (ECF 10-4).
145. On 9 October 2018 he was assigned reference number H20190052 and a response which included 'We have reviewed your complaint and determined that the appropriate office to address your concerns is the Bureau of Consular Affairs, Executive Office. Your information has been forwarded to that office.' (ECF 34-6)
146. This was consistent with The DoS OIG hotline web page at <https://www.stateoig.gov/hotline> which states 'Please note: OIG does not investigate complaints about the denial of U.S. visas.'
147. In April of 2023 Mr. Carr again complained about the lack of due process in processing visa applications and explicitly cited the plausible allegation of falsifying government records (see ECF 34-7) but received the same response (apparently a form email) with H20231749 on 24 April 2023 for Mrs. Carr (see ECF 34-7) and H20231753 on 19 April 2023 for Mrs. Von Kramer where DoS OIG stated that it was forwarding the matter to DoS BCA without taking any action (ECF 39-3).
148. However, in the 2023 complaints Mr. Carr explicitly made a plausible allegation of falsifying government records (a federal crime) from omitting required information from the denial notices as required by due process. Specifically there was no reference to any of the actual evidence presented or considered. See ECF 34-7.
149. The right to a written decision well founded on the evidence is particularly important (perhaps the foundation of due process) and 18 USC § 1001 defines a federal crime (falsification of government records) as:

(a) ... whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive... branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully --

(1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up ... a material fact;

150. This has been held to include the omission of required facts which would include the rationale for a particular visa denial. It would also include having contradictory records, e.g. the video recording which included absurd conclusions such as that Mrs. Carr could not receive a non-immigration visa while she had an outstanding immigration application and a written decision which has no explanation at all.

151. Mr. Carr asked that the matter be forwarded to the DoJ as DoS OIG was required to report all plausible allegations of federal crimes to the Attorney General by statute, i.e. [5 USC § 404](#) which states in part that the 'Inspector General shall report expeditiously to the Attorney General whenever the Inspector General has reasonable grounds to believe there has been a violation of Federal criminal law'

152. Mr. Carr explained that if the DoS OIG did not have sufficient resources to investigate every plausible allegation of a federal crime, it was acceptable to forward the complaints to another department for resolution (perhaps even local management) as long as the complaint was also forwarded to the DoJ. See ECF 34-7, ECF 17-3.

153. Further, on 20 June 2023, Mr. Carr reported this malfeasance and, potentially, obstruction of justice within the DoS OIG to the DoS IG, Secretary Blinken (DoS), DoJ (cc) and CIGIE, ECF 14-2, ECF 34-7, ECF 17-3.

Count 6

CIGIE Takes No Action to Insure Lawful IG Compliance

154. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 153, as if fully set forth herein.

155. The Plaintiffs refer to the Verified Brief (ECF 76-3) defending Count 6 and Count 9 which are against CIGIE and DoJ as well the Verified Brief (ECF 67-3) discussing Sovereign Immunity and Executive Discretion. ECF 76-3 also refers to another Verified Brief (ECF 82, previously ECF 76-4 but with typographical errors in its header information) which discusses the dangers of illegal orders and the importance of supporting the constitution and our government of law.

156. On 20 June 2023, Mr. Carr complained to the CIGIE about DoS IG not reporting federal

crimes to the DoJ as required by statute, ECF 14-2

157. On 9 August 2023 the CIGIE responded that it was closing the case IC23-083 with no action taken (a standard form letter email with no reference other than the date of complaint and case number), ECF 14-3

158. On 9 Oct 2023, Mr. Carr complained to the CIGIE about USPS IG not reporting federal crimes to the DoJ as required by statute, ECF 14-5.

159. On 1 Nov 2023 the CIGIE responded that it was closing the case IC24-010 with no action taken (a standard form letter email with no reference other than the date of complaint and case number), ECF 14-6.

160. Mr. Carr was seeking that the council abide by its charter and insure that all Inspector Generals (IG) and staff under the different IGs are aware of the requirement to report all federal crimes to the Attorney General (AG) or, logically, the Department of Justice (DoJ), whenever they believe a federal crime has been committed within their purview / department(s) which they monitor. See [5 USC § 404](#) which states in part that the "Inspector General shall report expeditiously to the Attorney General whenever the Inspector General has reasonable grounds to believe there has been a violation of Federal criminal law." See ECF 17-3.

161. It appears the United States Postal Service (USPS), Department of State (DoS) and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) IG's have each decided that they can choose not to prosecute certain federal crimes, particularly those crimes which have been integrated into the monitored departments normal procedures and which would be greatly disruptive to the monitored department to correct. They do this by refusing to report these crimes to the DoJ.

162. However, just because criminally illegal processes are integrated into the monitored department does not make them immune from prosecution. The decision to prosecute resides solely with the DoJ and failure of the IG to report federal crimes is at least malfeasance and could be construed to be obstruction of justice (another federal crime).

163. Mr. Carr was not asking for prosecution of any crime but only a directive from the CIGIE that all OIG personnel report all plausible allegations of federal crimes to DoJ even if they do not have sufficient resources to investigate the allegation and can not confirm that the crime is likely, much less prosecutable.

164. Further, it appears that the CIGIE has gone from a council which was intended to develop

and enforce the highest standards and adherence to the law to instead become a group that supports and encourages criminal behavior in their monitored departments and shares ideas and methods for supporting the criminal behavior. This could be construed as going beyond simple obstruction of justice to violating federal RICO criminal statutes, e.g. collusion between the illegal orders of the USPS BoG, USPS senior management, USPS IG, and CIGIE.

[18 USC § 1505](#) - Obstructions of proceedings (OIG Case)

[18 USC § 1510](#) - Obstruction of criminal investigations

Bribery to prevent communication with investigator

[18 USC § 201](#) - Bribery of public officials and witnesses

Illegal order to OIG case worker to not report federal crimes to DoJ,

Case worker (or IG) gets to keep job if they do not report federal crimes to DoJ

[18 USC Ch 96 \(RICO\)](#) -

165. Of course Mr. Carr is not arguing that the RICO charges would be prosecutable or even recommending / asking the DoJ to prosecute any party, only that DoJ insures that all agencies of the U.S. government endeavor to obey all lawful statutes to include reporting all plausible allegations of federal crimes to the DoJ. On 24 Oct 2023 Mr. Carr asked that CIGIE, DoJ and other defendants correct these deficiencies in ECF 30-8.

Count 7, USCIS Commits Crimes and Ignores Constitution

USCIS Terrorizes and Denies Travel Thru Illegal Denial of Interview Waivers

Initial Applications

166. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 165, as if fully set forth herein.

167. The Plaintiffs refer to the Verified Brief (ECF 76-2) defending Count 7 and Count 8 which are against USCIS and DHS OIG as well the Verified Brief (ECF 67-3) discussing Sovereign Immunity and Executive Discretion. ECF 76-2 also refers to the Verified Brief (ECF 75-7) which discusses the duties and responsibilities of IG's in general and the DoJ with respect to reporting crimes (IG) and enforcing the law (DoJ). In addition the USCIS claim concerning denied right to representation is supported by the Verified Brief (ECF 75-5) on the right to representation.

168. On 04 Aug 2020, USCIS received Mrs. Carr's I-751 application for a permanent green card

(remove two year conditions) with receipt MSC2091582908 as Mrs. Carr ‘conditional’ expired after two years on 13 Nov 2020 (ECF 24-1). However, there was no interview with Mrs. Carr receiving an 18 month extension letter and later a 24 month extension letter (thus extending the original expiration of her 'green card' from 13 Nov 2020 to 13 Nov 2022). See ECF 18-6, 12 Dec 2021. This delay in scheduling the I-751 interview is a direct violation of [8 CFR § 216.4\(b\)\(1\)](#) which states:

... The director must either waive the requirement for an interview and adjudicate the petition or arrange for an interview within 90 days of the date on which the petition was properly filed.

169. On July 11, 2022, Mrs. Carr submitted her N-400 application for naturalization as USCIS timetables suggested her I-751 interview was imminent and there was a 9 month delay for N-400 interviews. This would allow her to complete her I-751 interview and get her permanent green card about six months before her N-400 interview. This would allow time for her to study for the English and civics exams without concerns about having an expired green card.

Extension Letter Inadequate

170. Although [8 CFR § 216.4](#) does provide for an extension of the conditional ‘green card’⁸ with:

Upon receipt of a properly filed Form I-751, the alien's conditional permanent resident status shall be extended automatically, if necessary, until such time as the director [of USCIS] has adjudicated the petition.

The actual extension letter (ECF 18-6) was inadequate. INA Section 264(e) is [8 USC § 1304\(e\)](#) which states:

... Every alien... shall at all times carry with him and have in his personal possession any certificate of alien registration or alien registration receipt card issued to him pursuant to subsection (d).

However, the extension letter itself was on 8.5” by 11” paper of particularly low durability (short fiber content). While the ‘green card’ (ECF 24-1) was quite compact and durable, suitable for taking on a swim in the ocean (as required above), the extension (ECF 18-6) letter was not, making compliance with [8 USC § 1304\(e\)](#) impossible.

⁸ The CFR is very restrictive on the conditions when a I-751 can have delayed adjudication and these circumstances did not occur with this application. The interview should have been waived and the matter adjudicated within 90 days.

Mrs. Carr's emphatic desire for a permanent green card before citizenship

171. It is important to understand that Mrs. Carr was absolutely terrified of USCIS. As an older immigrant from a poor family with extremely limited education, only 4 years of schooling, and no formal exposure to English in her childhood, Mrs. Carr feared arbitrary, capricious and unjust actions by USCIS such as deporting her without cause or notice if she failed her citizenship test or leaving her stranded overseas, not able to return to the U.S..
172. Mr. Carr also came from a relatively poor family, but he was born in the U.S. and was very fortunate. Mr. Carr graduated from West Point and later received a graduate degree from M.I.T.. Mr. Carr could not believe that USCIS would take unlawful and illegal actions such as leaving Mrs. Carr stranded overseas unable to return to the U.S.. It turns out in retrospect that Mrs. Carr was more correct than Mr. Carr.

Unlawful Restrictions on Travel by USCIS, Stranded in Thailand

173. In September of 2022, Mrs. Carr returned to Thailand on an emergency basis as her mother's health was failing. Sadly Mrs. Carr arrived just after her mother's death but was able to participate in the funeral ceremonies which extended until December of 2022 as Thai traditions has the ashes from the cremation waiting 100 days before being taken back by the family.
174. Her green card and extensions expired on 13 Nov 2023 while Mrs. Carr was in Thailand on an emergency basis (see ECF 24-1 and 18-6). Even though [8 CFR § 216.4](#) states ... 'Upon receipt of a properly filed Form I-751, the alien's conditional permanent resident status shall be extended automatically, if necessary, until such time as the director [of USCIS] has adjudicated the petition.', USCIS refused to provide Mrs. Carr with any documentation to allow her return to the United States. This is contrary to the above administrative rule.
175. USCIS's suggestion for how Mrs. Carr was to return to the US was via an I-131A (for travelers who have 'lost' their documents to get a one time document allowing their return for a \$575 fee), see ECF 18-6. Instead Mr. Carr got her a \$160 multiple entry B1 / B2, business / tourist visa and was able to return to the USA in late Dec 2022, ECF 45-1.

Rescheduling Original Interview

176. Further, USCIS scheduled Mrs. Carr's N-400 interview for 14 Dec 2022. Mr. Carr explained to USCIS that Mrs. Carr would be unable to attend as she was out of the country and could

not return due to USCIS's refusal to provide her with proof of valid permanent resident status. On 21 Nov 2022 USCIS canceled the 14 Dec 2022 interview and later scheduled her joint interview for I-751 and N-400 for 30 Jan 2023.

A-551 Passport Stamp Instead of Green Card

177. Mrs. Carr was also able to come into a USCIS office on 3 Jan 2023 to get an A-551 stamp in her passport which was valid for one year but does not provide the full ability to travel and work freely of a traditional green card. See ECF 20-2.

**Improper Application of English Requirement to Older and Poor
Discriminates Against Buddhist and Islamic Cultures**

178. Prior to the interview on 30 January 2032, Mr Carr initiated a complaint with the DHS OIG that the English requirements for naturalization were discriminatory based on religion, income, age and culture.

179. It is well established that the appropriate time to learn the sounds of English is soon after birth. Further the appropriate time to learn to recognize the shapes of English characters is before adolescence.

180. For example, in Thai language there is no 'th' sound and the pair of plosive sounds d and t are not in the Thai language. The Thai language includes only the consonant that is between d and t. As an adult, Mr Carr cannot hear the sound that is between d and t nor can he pronounce it. Similarly, as Mrs. Carr was not exposed to English at an early age, she is unable to hear or pronounce the 'th' sound.

181. Further, the time to learn to recognize the characters of the English alphabet is before adolescence. While it is possible to learn to recognize a foreign alphabet during later years, the recognition will never be as quick, accurate or comfortable as if it was learned before adolescence.

182. The actual effect of the English requirement for citizenship is to discriminate against older individuals from poor families from Buddhist and Islamic countries.

**USCIS Denies Green Card Through 'False' Claims of Approval
Joint I-751 and N-400 Interview of 30 Jan 2023**

Both 10 Year Green Card And Citizenship Approved

183. There was a joint I-751 and N-400 application on 30 Jan 2023. The informal results were that Mrs. Carr failed the English and civics tests (ECF 16-4). The interviewer also canceled

the 'final' portion of the I-751 interview which was an undocumented and possibly unlawful review of the 'criminal background' questions from some previous forms (not part of the I-751 application itself) as Mrs. Carr did not understand English and so could not personally answer those questions.

184. The results of the interview were given verbally and informally at the time of the interview. There was also a poorly written and ambiguous form letter with check boxes concerning the N-400 results (similar to ECF 16-4 though the provided copy was hand written).

185. However, the next day (31 Jan 2023) USCIS entered a formal written decision for the I-751 application (ECF 10-5) which stated in part:

We have approved your I-751, Petition to Remove Conditions on Residence. Our records also indicate we have approved your Form N-400 Application for Naturalization. Because we also approved your N-400, you will not receive a new Permanent Resident Card (also known as a Green Card). Instead, once you have taken the Oath of Allegiance, you will receive a Certificate of Naturalization, which will be proof of your U.S. citizenship. If you have questions regarding this process, please contact the USCIS contact center at 800-375-5283.

186. Mr. and Mrs. Carr were elated at this change in fortune as it was a complete reversal of the informal verbal results. They relied on the formal written decision as a final findings of facts, decision, and order (to borrow from judicial terminology which is appropriate for a serious due process matter concerning the ability to vote and work and travel freely).

USCIS Denied I-751 Through False Statements

187. Within a couple of weeks Mr. and Mrs. Carr inquired at the specified contact number as to when the Oath of Allegiance would be scheduled and were told that the normal processing time for such matters was 4 or 5 months and that they should call back after that.

188. Mr. and Mrs. Carr would later learn that her I-751 was actually denied. USCIS would later deny her N-400 in a sham hearing and continue to refuse to provide her with a 10 year green card until after this suit was filed. As more than thirty days had passed since this effective denial based on statements which USCIS believed to be false, there were no avenues within USCIS to actually get the permanent green card.

USCIS Unlawful Policies Justified as 'Enforcement'

189. The US government has had a long history of discriminating against foreign nationals with USCIS and its counterpart for visas in the Department of State each contributing through an

unlawful disregard for due process.

190. However, during the Trump era with the appointment of Director Francis Cissna, confirmed 5 Oct 2017, USCIS went to new heights of illegally mistreating foreign nationals.

191. Specifically, USCIS stopped waiving of the interview for an I-751 application even though these waivers were mandatory in accordance with [8 CFR § 216.4](#) (b) which states:

The director must either waive the requirement for an interview and adjudicate the petition or arrange for an interview within 90 days of the date on which the petition was properly filed.

The unlawful elimination of waivers (previously about 90% had been waived) created an explosion in the unlawful queue for I-751 interviews for USCIS which already had an illegal 1-year backlog of applications. Further, the interviewer was now required to verbally confirm the prior criminal background questions.

192. As most I-751 applicants do not speak English and most USCIS interviewers speak only English, USCIS effectively stopped conducting interviews for I-751 applications. Instead of adding more resources to conduct the expanded interviews with the collected fees, USCIS just illegally stopped conducting interviews which, along with the illegal termination of the mandated waivers, added to the explosion of the illegal queue for I-751 interviews. Executive Discretion gives wide latitude to the executive branch but this does not extend to explicitly prohibited behavior when there are legal options available such as using the collected fees for their specified purpose of granting waivers and conducting interviews. As cited above, USCIS was explicitly required to grant a waiver or schedule the interview and adjudicate the I-751 within 90 days of the acceptance date of the I-751 in [8 CFR § 216.4](#)(b) (1).

193. Instead USCIS simply waited until the applicant later filed an N-400 application for citizenship, though not all applicants later filed N-400 applications. Then the interviews were combined with the verbal review of the criminal background questions conducted in English, assuming the applicant was able to pass the English test. Further, the criminal background questions were already part of the N-400 interview in any case.

194. However, if the applicant was unable to pass the English test, then USCIS was in a bind for the I-751 new criminal background portion of the joint interview. USCIS had to find a creative solution to process this case.

195. It appears that USCIS chose to effectively deny the I-751 application by claiming it was approved along with the N-400 so that no permanent resident card was provided. However, USCIS would then refuse to provide either a permanent resident card or certificate of naturalization by later claiming in future case updates that the N-400 application had not been approved.

196. This meets the criteria of a federal crime because the effective denial of the I-751 application was based on a claim that USCIS believed was false. For future reference, this will be called 'effective denial based on false premises'.

USCIS Provides Incomplete or False Estimates of Interview Dates

197. When USCIS effectively ceased providing separate I-751 interviews, they did not provide notice to applicants nor did they provide accurate estimates for the dates when interviews would be scheduled. The actual scheduling of I-751 interviews was **never** unless the applicant submitted an N-400 application (citizenship) in which case both interviews were scheduled together almost immediately irrelevant of the normal queue for N-400 interviews.

198. This caused great uncertainty and fear for those applicants who were poorly educated with limited English ability and poor understanding of US government procedures such as Mrs. Carr.

199. The phone number provided by USCIS for questions and concerns was answered by an automated phone system which was distinctly unresponsive and would routinely hang up on applicants if they were not able to correctly formulate a request or question which the automated could respond to.

200. For most of the time when the I-751 application was pending scheduling an interview (and in a queue over two years long and growing), there were no requests or questions which the automated system could respond to. It was certain that the automated system would hang up on the applicant after about five minutes of struggling to find a way to speak to an actual person where they could explain their concern. This phone number was the only point of contact for applicants attempting to get information about the status of their application. See ECF 18-6.

Criminal Background Questions Unlawful

201. Just after the interview of 30 January 2023, Mr Carr also initiated an IG complaint

concerning the criminal background questions which were routinely included as part of the USCIS application policy.

202. In particular, there are no exceptions provided about classified information which cannot be released to the interviewer or records sealed by a lawful court order.

203. Further, it is overly broad to not restrict the questions to actual convictions for serious crimes. As stated the questions would include every minor traffic or even parking violation in the state of Texas where such violations are considered crimes. The truth is, no one remembers all the situations where they may have gone over the speed limit or parked a few inches too close or too far from the curb.

204. In fact, the only accurate answer to any of the criminal background questions is 'yes' with an explanation of 'I can neither affirm nor deny the existence of information relating to this question.'. Any other answer could risk violations of the law by providing either classified or sealed information. Further, no one remembers or knows all the circumstances where they may have violated some minor traffic, parking, or zoning regulation.

USCIS Informed of Upcoming Travel Plans

205. In August, Mr. and Mrs. Carr contacted USCIS about scheduling a new A-551 stamp for Mrs. Carr's passport to preserve her limited ability to work and travel based on their travel plans to be out of the country from 10 Oct 2023 to 25 Dec 2023. They were told that they could not get a replacement A-551 stamp as they can only be issued within 30 days of expiration and the applicant must be in the US to get the stamp.

206. On 25 Aug 2023, Mr. Carr also contacted his congressman, Representative Veasey, as well as the USCIS Director and DHS IG, seeking assistance in getting the Oath of Allegiance scheduled as no action had been taken in the matter (ECF 34-2).

USCIS Denies Citizenship After Approval

False Notice that N-400 Interview of 30 Jan 2023 Canceled

207. However, on 01 Sep 2023 USCIS sent a notice which states that "the interview of 30 Jan 2023 was canceled due to unforeseen circumstances" (sent under the N-400 receipt, see ECF 10-6). Of course this is a completely false document (and hence a federal crime) as the N-400 interview was completed and this document contradicts several previous documents and verbal statements as well as the final decision in the I-751 case and later activity in the

N-400 case.

208. On 5 Sep 2023 the Carrs called USCIS at the prescribed number and spoke with Destiny, ID G010590.

They asked that Destiny send an email to the appropriate party to promptly schedule Mrs. Carr's Oath of Allegiance as stated in the cited I-751 approval notice and, in the alternative, if an N-400 was not actually approved, that Mrs. Carr be sent a new 10 year Permanent Resident Card.

Destiny explained that **it is not uncommon for additional interviews to be required even after the I-751 and N-400 are approved** and that Mrs. Carr could not be sent the approved Permanent Resident card. Implicitly her statement indicates that such formal approvals were actually effective denials based on false premises.

At that time Mr. Carr asked that Destiny take notes for details to include in the email she would send on their behalf.

Mr. Carr cited [18 USC § 1001](#) which is one of many criminal codes for falsification of government records and states in part:

(a) ... whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive... branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully --

(1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up ... a material fact; ... or

(3) makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry;

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years

(3) prohibits taking any action based on a false document with the implicit exceptions that actions may be taken to: correct the false document or, if the individual is not authorized to correct the false document, to report the false document to their supervisor and / or the relevant OIG explaining that there is an existing false document and a possible federal crime when the document was created.

N-400 Interview Scheduled for 11 Oct 2023, Insufficient Notice

209. On 06 Sep 2023 USCIS scheduled an interview for 11 Oct 2023 as shown in ECF 10-7, but

the actual notice was not received until 15 Sep 2023 when it was too late to respond until the next week as Mrs. Carr worked Tuesday to Sunday and was not able to respond while she was working.

210. The arrival date of this notice is a critical issue as there must have been timely notice of the interview in order to justify the denial of the N-400 application for failure to appear. In ECF 16-1 is an email from USPS which shows the mail which arrived at their address on 15 Sep 2023. The notice of 06 Sep 2023 seems to have been mailed on 12 Sep 2023 according to the postmark shown in the USPS email. As 30 days notice is required for such interviews, the notice on 15 Sep 2023 was not timely for an 11 Oct 2023 interview and the denial of the N-400 application for failure to appear must be overturned due to lack of notice.

211. In the contested decision (see ECF 10-10, N-400 denied for failure to appear) there is no claim of any notice at all and it appears that USCIS routinely delays mailing documents a few days after the date of the 'notice'. In cases of mailed documents they adjust the 30 days to 33 days to allow for time in the mail, but there is no adjustment for delay in printing and actually mailing the notice. Given that this document took 9 days to arrive, a more realistic adjustment for mailing would be 45 days if mailed without the normal proof of mailing.

Complaint of Falsified Records, 01 Sep 2023 Cancellation

212. On 10 Sep 2023, Mr. Carr contacted the USCIS director, DoJ and DHS IG reporting the contradictory records (was the interview held on 30 Jan 2023 which approved the I-751 and N-400 or was it canceled with no results), ECF 49-3. With contradictory records, one or more of them must be false, the foundation of the federal crime of falsification of government records.

213. Mr. Carr also asked for acknowledgment of the report within 7 days. No such acknowledgment has been received to date.

214. On 06 Oct 2023, Mr. Carr asked that DoJ assist in correcting these serious defects in USCIS and DHS IG, ECF 17-4. (Note: Mr. Carr was unaware of the scheduling of the interview for 11 Oct 2021 on 06 Sep 2023 when he first reported the crime).

215. On 12 Sep 2023 Mr. and Mrs. Carr called USCIS at the prescribed number and spoke with Umika, ID G20028112.

They complained of the 1 Sep 2023 I-797 Notice of the canceling of the 30 Jan 2023 N-400 interview due to unforeseen circumstances (described previously). They

explained that the interview was held on that date and the 01 Sep 2023 document is a false record (and federal crime) which also contradicts the I-751 final decision of 31 Jan 2023 which stated that the N-400 application was approved at that interview. They advised Umika that she must either correct the false record or, if she did not have the authority to correct the record, she must contact either her supervisor or the IG or both to report the crime. Failure to do so on her part would itself be a crime under [18 USC § 1001](#), part 3, which Mr. Carr read to her after asking her to take notes.

Mr. and Mrs. Carr also asked that Mrs. Carr immediately be sent the new 48 month extension letter which was publicly authorized by USCIS on 23 Jan 2023, one week before the interview (so USCIS was required to have mailed her a copy of the extension letter before the interview). The USCIS announcement was also about two months after they had complained to USCIS and the DHS OIG that USCIS had unlawfully left Mrs. Carr stranded in Thailand due to the absence of such a 48 month extension letter.

They also asked that USCIS send Mrs. Carr a permanent green card as soon as possible as there was now a record in the N-400 case indicating that her N-400 application had not been approved and so there was no basis for withholding the approved green card.

They also asked that the local representative contact the USCIS director in order to get copies of the emails which properly explained their complaints to date as that was the only method of sending written documents to USCIS for their consideration.

They also asked that the local representative call them back on Monday 18 Sep 2023 at 9AM as Mrs. Carr would be working during normal business hours on Tuesday through Sunday and unable to take calls. No such callback was made. (Note: At this time, Mr. Carr was unaware of the scheduling of the interview for 11 Oct 2021 on 06 Sep 2023 and did not receive notice until 15 Sep 2023.)

First Request to Reschedule Interview

216. On 19 Sep 2023, Mr. and Mrs. Carr called USCIS at the prescribed number and spoke with David, ID G009845. (Note: this request was timely as Mr. Carr only learned of the

scheduled interview date on 15 Sep 2023)

They requested that the interview scheduled for 11 Oct 2023 be rescheduled as they had prior plans to be out of the country from 10 Oct 2023 to 25 Dec 2023.

Mrs. Carr asked if the interview could be scheduled for only a day or two earlier but they were told that it could not be scheduled earlier.

Their request to reschedule the interview was assigned ID T1B2622391513DAL.

Upon a lengthy description of the purpose of the ten week trip, David incorrectly summarized the reason for the trip as 'leisure' which raised concerns for Mr. Carr that their trip was not being given appropriate gravity. They asked that David request that USCIS reschedule for after the completion of their trip on 25 Dec 2023. It turned out that David was restricted to 80 characters in his request and so described the reason for rescheduling as Mrs. Carr will be out of the country from 10 Oct 2023 to 25 Dec 2023 to increase the likelihood that the individual who responded would be aware of the duration of their trip.

They also asked that Mrs. Carr be provided with a 12 month extension letter as her A-551 stamp would expire on 03 Jan 2023 and if there were health or other problems which delayed their return, she would no longer have proof that she was authorized to work and travel freely. David assigned sn 30214416 to a request that a local USCIS representative call Mrs. Carr from 2028382104 to discuss the extension letter.

Unsuccessful Call Back on 21 Sep 2023

217. The call back by the local USCIS representative was made on 21 Sep 2023 in the morning.

Mrs. Carr was not home (as she was working) but it was rescheduled for later that evening at 7:30PM when Mrs. Carr was likely to be home. Mr. Carr called Mrs. Carr and she came home a little early and was home by 7PM but the USCIS representative did not return the call as agreed upon. No further return calls were made for this request.

Request that Mr. Carr be Mrs. Carr's Authorized Representative

218. Due to the confusion of not being able to get any response from USCIS, on 25 Sep 2023,

Mr. and Mrs. Carr called USCIS at the prescribed number and spoke with Martha, ID G029811.

They asked about how to submit a G-28 appointment of Mr. Carr as the representative in this matter. They were told to mail the application to:

ATTN: N-400, G28 submission
850 NW Chipman Rd, Suite 5000
Lees Summit, MO 64063

An online G-28 request had been submitted on 24 Sep 2023 and the hard copy request was mailed on 26 Sep 2023. Martha also explained how to submit a document directly to USCIS on their web site and an electronic copy of the G-28 was submitted on 28 Sep 2023. See ECF 30-5.

Martha also explained that USCIS responds to G-28 requests within 30 days. No response has been received to date on this G-28 request.

Denial of Reschedule Request, Not Sent to Authorized Email

219. While speaking with Martha on 25 Sep 2023, Mr. and Mrs. Carr also learned that on 19 Sep 2023, USCIS had denied their request to reschedule the interview and sent an email to airpk1961@gmail.com, an email address that is rarely monitored. See ECF 10-8.

220. This was not proper. Before they were married Mrs. Carr had used that email and Mr. Carr had used carrbp@gmail.com. However, since their marriage they have shared their emails with both parties having full access to both email addresses. As they have a legal union, they are not required to maintain separate personal email addresses and now reference all emails to carrbp@gmail.com which is regularly monitored. In rare cases when businesses insist on separate email addresses for separate persons, they provide Mrs. Carr's old email address, but that address is not regularly monitored. At no time have they agreed that USCIS should direct email notices to Mrs. Carr's old email address and none of the submissions to USCIS have authorized the use of that email address. The actual email from USCIS is ECF 10-8 which stated in part:

Type of service requested: -- Appointment Reschedule ... USCIS has reviewed your request for a rescheduled appointment, and we regret to inform you that your request has

been denied based on the information provided. Failure to comply with your appointment notice or to appear for your scheduled interview may result in adjudication of your application based on the available information."

New request to Reschedule Interview

221. Due to the delay in their receipt of the denial of their request to reschedule the interview (sent on 19 Sep 2023, found on 25 Sep 2023), Mr. Carr uploaded a timely explanation of the reasons for rescheduling the interview on 27 Sep 2023 (see ECF 30-7) along with copies of the flight tickets, date restricted European visas, hotel reservations, required medical insurance coverage and European bus tour tickets, all of which are non-refundable. The document explains that the purpose of the trip is religious obligations, family obligations, business promotion, business training and education, and leisure. Planning for the trip was started in Feb 2023 and the leisure portion of the trip was to celebrate the approval of Mrs. Carr's N-400 application for naturalization as USCIS stated in the USCIS approval of I-751 and N-400 in ECF 10-5 on 31 Jan 2023.

222. On 2 Oct 2023, Mr. and Mrs. Carr called USCIS at the prescribed number and spoke with Crystal, ID G027432.

Mr. and Mrs. Carr asked that Crystal submit a new request to reschedule the interview based on the documents submitted on 27 Sep 2023. Crystal explained that they could not make a new request to reschedule the interview until 15 days after the previous denial on 19 Sep 2023, i.e. 04 Oct 2023 (after the start of Mrs. Carr work week).

They explained that they had provided additional justification for rescheduling the interview which has been uploaded for USCIS to consider.

They asked that USCIS review the uploaded G-28, separately filed online and sent via mail and submitted electronically 28 Sep 2023 (ECF 30-5). Crystal explained that USCIS has 30 days to act on G-28 requests.

223. On 10 Oct 2023, Mr. and Mrs. Carr called USCIS at the prescribed number and spoke with Antoinette, ID G0023588.

Mr. and Mrs. Carr asked that Antoinette submit a new request to reschedule the interview

explaining that it was more than 15 days after the previous denial of the request to reschedule and explained that they had submitted additional documentation.

Antoinette contradicted the previous representative, Crystal, and stated that new requests to reschedule can only be made more than 30 days after a previous denial. As interviews are scheduled with the nominal 30 days notice (33 days if notice is by mailing), this would ensure that USCIS never reconsiders any denial of rescheduling no matter what the extenuating circumstances. As this claim also contradicts the previous representative it is likely that Antoinette's and possibly Crystal's claims are false and, hence, federal crimes.

USCIS Denies N-400 Citizenship Application for Failure to Appear

224. The Decision from USCIS dated 13 October 2023 previously provided to relevant

Defendants as ECF 10-8 states:

On July 11, 2022, you filed a Form N-400, Application for Naturalization, with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) under section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). After a thorough review of the information provided in your application for naturalization, the documents supporting your application, and your testimony during your naturalization interview, USCIS has determined that you are not eligible for naturalization. Accordingly, USCIS must deny your application for naturalization. ...

On November 13, 2018, you obtained conditional permanent resident status through your spouse and your conditions were removed on January 30, 2023. USCIS received your Form N-400 on July 11, 2022, and on January 30, 2023, you appeared for an interview to determine your eligibility for naturalization.

At the beginning of your naturalization interview, an Immigration Services Officer placed you under oath and then administered the naturalization test. At that time you were unable to write a sentence in ordinary usage of the English language, and answer 6 of 10 U.S. Government and history (civics) questions correctly. Since you did not achieve a passing score on the English or civics portions of the naturalization test, on October 11, 2023, you were scheduled for a second interview to retake these portions of the naturalization test. On October 11, 2023, you did not appear as requested. Further, you have not provided USCIS with a good reason for your absence. Your failure to appear at the second interview means you have not passed the English or civics testing requirements for naturalization. As a result, you are ineligible for naturalization since you

have not demonstrated your ability to pass the English or civics requirements for naturalization. Therefore, USCIS must deny your application for naturalization. See INA 312 and Title 8, Code of Federal Regulations (8 CFR) [312.5\(a\)](#) and (b).⁹

If you believe that you can overcome the grounds for this denial, you may submit a request for a hearing on Form N-336, Request for a Hearing on a Decision in Naturalization Proceedings, within 30 calendar days of service of this decision (33 days if this decision was mailed). See attached [8 CFR 336.2](#) (a) and [103.8\(b\)](#). Without a properly filed Form N-336, this decision will become final. See INA 336.¹⁰

USCIS Refuses to Provide New Green Card

225. On 19 Oct 2023, Mr. and Mrs. Carr called USCIS at the proscribed number and requested that Mrs. Carr be sent a new Green Card as her I-751 was approved on 31 Jan 2023 but the Green Card was withheld as her N-400 was also approved and her Certificate of Naturalization was imminent. However, the purported Decision of 14 Oct 2023, ECF 10-8, clearly indicates that USCIS does not intend to provide Mrs. Carr with the promised Certificate of Naturalization in the foreseeable future.

226. This request resulted in a referral of T1B2922301353MSC which concerned 'Non Delivery of Permanent Resident Card'. It was answered on 27 Oct 2023 with the document previously provided to relevant Defendants as ECF 10-11 which listed 'Type of service requested: -- Non-Delivery of Permanent Resident Card' but answered with: "You ... contacted U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) because you have not received your denial, termination or revocation notice. **We have enclosed a copy of the notice for your reference.** Please note that we are not able to extend the period for you to file an appeal from this decision. Therefore, follow the instructions on your notice carefully and submit accordingly."

227. **There was no notice attached** and the text does not make sense with respect to the request for a green card from an approved application. It appears to be the standard form letter message supporting a denial of a request. However, the actual notice (ECF 10-5) was in the form of an approval which was actually an 'effective denial based on false premises'. As such, it did not include the normal (and required) verbiage of notice of appeal requirements.

⁹ INA 312 is [8 USC § 1423](#), refers to [8 CFR § 312](#)

¹⁰ INA 336 is [8 USC § 1447](#)

228. The form letter does mention the requirement to contest an unfavorable decision within 30 days and, of course, pay the \$700 fee first. However, as this decision referred to was an approval which was illegally contorted by false pretenses to be an effective denial, the text of the response is not responsive to actual request.

229. It appears that when USCIS attempts to effectively deny an I-751 application by claiming approval based on false pretenses, there is no way to appeal or correct the error other than the federal district courts.

230. In late May 2024, Mrs. Carr received her requested 10 year 'green card' (see ECF 49-3) from USCIS without any explanation. This was several months after the denied request of 19 Oct 2023 to USCIS as described above as well as the filing of this suit, the first USATXN Motion to Dismiss (ECF 15, 08 Mar 2024) and the second USATXN Motion to Dismiss (ECF 33, 09 May 2024). It is possible that USCIS had concluded that some of the relief sought in Plaintiffs; Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (ECF 18, 28 Mar 2024) was well justified and USCIS provided the requested relief rather than waiting for this court to order it.

231. As Mrs. Carr had her 10 year green card her fears of being deported without cause or notice if she failed her citizenship test (para 171 on page 34) were reduced and it appeared that further relief was not forthcoming, the Carr's submitted a new N-400 application on 10 Sep 2024 (receipt is ECF 49-4) with an application fee of \$710 and an estimated first interview date in May of 2025. The actual interview was rescheduled for 10 Feb 2025 (ECF 70-10) and Mrs. Carr passed the citizen tests with an Oath Ceremony scheduled for 28 Feb 2025 (ECF 71-2). At the Oath Ceremony Mrs. Carr received her Certificate of Naturalization (ECF 71-3).

232. On 2 May 2025 Mrs. Carr completed her USCIS I-130 immigration petition for her son Rujipas Lawichai (Tin) which was accepted (ECF 71-4) with estimated visa availability of 2034 (ECF 71-11). On 15 May 2025 Tin requested to join the complaint seeking, among other things, a prompt immigration visa (ECF 71-6).

233. Mrs. Carr's son, Tanapon Lawichai, nickname Earth, requested to join complaint on 7 May 2025 while on active duty military service and deployed to an area with restricted access (ECF 71-1). On 13 May 2025 Mrs. Carr completed her USCIS I-130 immigration petition

for Earth which was accepted (ECF 71-5) with estimated visa availability in 2034 (ECF 71-11).

234. On 30 May 2025, USCIS accepted the I-130 immigration petition for Buakhao Von Kramer (ECF 71-7) with estimated visa availability in 2042 (ECF 71-11).

USCIS FOIA Failures

Access to Case Records Unlawfully Denied

235. On 01 Sep 2023, Mr. Carr submitted a request for the entire record in the I-751 and N-400 cases via an online submission of a G-639 FOIA request (ECF 70-21). Mr. Carr asked for every email, message, or other records which reference the two receipts in this matter (MSC2091582908 and IOE9752855294) including both audio and video recordings. The request was assigned request ID NRC2023277190 and the response was made on 05 Oct 2023 (ECF 16-3).

236. However, the response was only 32 pages and was only the original I-751 and N-400 applications. It did not include the requested audio or video recordings or electronic messages (results of phone calls to USCIS) as requested nor did it include notices which had been sent to the Carr's (machine readable format).

237. Note that this is a violation of the applicant's due process right to have access to the evidence against the applicant. Mr. Carr had requested access to every record which the tribunal relied on to deny the N-400 application, but was denied access to all such records. It is also possible that the claim that there were only two responsive documents was a federal crime of falsifying government records as it is clear that more records were requested and there was no justification for withholding the other documents.

238. On 31 Oct 2023 a new FOIA request was submitted via email a copy of which is (ECF 10-9) which was acknowledged on 20 Nov 2023 (ECF 70-23) as NRC2023371972. However, the response (ECF 70-24) on 2 Jan 2024 had extensive records but no video records, audio records or electronic records of documents provided to Plaintiffs (as specifically requested).

USCIS FOIA Cumulative N-400 and I-751 Data Request Denied

239. On 23 Dec 2023 Mr. Carr requested cumulative data for N-400 (citizenship) applications (ECF 16-6) which was accepted on 26 Dec 2025 (ECF 16-5). On 3 Mar 2025 USCIS FOIA

denied the request based on the need to create records (citing [5 USC § 552 FOIA](#))

240. On 23 Dec 2023 Mr. Carr requested cumulative data for I-751 (10 year Green Card) applications (ECF 16-5) as OPQ2023000041 which was accepted on 26 Dec 2025 (ECF 70-25). On 24 Apr 2025 USCIS FOIA denied the request based on the need to create records (ECF 70-26).

Cumulative Data Does not Meet FOIA ‘New Data’ Criteria

241. The two USCIS FOIA cumulative data requests specifically cited [Ctr. for Investigative Reporting v. DOJ, No. 18-17356, 982 F.3d 668 \(9th Cir. 2020\)](#) as listed on the DoJ web site¹¹ which states

the use of a query to search for and extract a particular arrangement or subset of existing data from the ... [agency] database does not require the creation of a "new" agency record under FOIA.

Legal Arguments

Lack of Jurisdiction

242. Of primary importance is the lack of jurisdiction for USCIS to revise or ignore a prior final decision.

243. It is well understood that in the interest of justice to all parties in an action, there must be some final closure of arguments and litigation. Final decisions are intended to provide that relief to all parties with the caveat that each party has 30 days to notify all other parties of any pending disagreements. This is normally done through a notice of appeal requirement, generally within 30 days after proof of service of the decision by the prevailing party.

244. If USCIS had any complaints or concerns with the findings of facts in the I-751 decision of 31 Jan 2023, they should have raised the concerns within 30 days of publication of the decision.

245. As there is no avenue for USCIS to submit a motion for reconsideration of a matter which was decided by USCIS, the only forum where USCIS can seek redress is a new action in the federal district courts.

¹¹ The DoJ web site was accessed at <https://www.justice.gov/oip/ctr-investigative-reporting-v-doj-no-18-17356-2021-wl-4314789-9th-cir-sept-23-2021-wardlaw-j> on 26 Apr 2025.

246. To provide otherwise is to deny all applicants to USCIS from the justice of having any final decision.

Lack of Notice to Support Failure to Appear

247. Another fundamental principle of due process is that all participants must be given adequate and sufficient notice of any action. It is clearly a travesty of justice to deny an application because of failure to appear when there is no evidence of notice.

248. In particular, in this case there is compelling evidence showing that Mr. Carr did not receive notice of the upcoming interview until less than 30 days before the interview, i.e. 15 Sep 2023 for a hearing on 11 Oct 2023. As such, the improper denial must be overturned.

Lack of an Independent and Impartial Tribunal

249. One of the fundamental premises of due process is to have matters decided by an independent and impartial tribunal. It is important to recognize that Mr. Carr had filed numerous complaints with the DHS OIG concerning malfeasance and other unlawful activities by USCIS. His final complaints were for the federal crimes of falsifying government records by several employees who reported directly or indirectly to the director who made the final decision.

250. It is absurd to even consider that the Field Office Director, Ms. Montgomery, could be unbiased in resolving a matter in which several of her employees were accused of federal crimes which would surely reflect poorly on her own performance and future career opportunities.

Additional Federal Crimes by Ms Montgomery

251. One of the foundations of any government of law is to have accurate written records of all proceedings. That is almost certainly why Congress has decided to make it a serious federal crime to falsify any government record.

252. When Director Montgomery cited the approval of the I-751 application without mentioning the finding of an approval of the N-400 application, she falsified the record by omitting required facts and concealing material facts.

253. When Director Montgomery stated 'Further, you have not provided USCIS with a good reason for your absence.' without mentioning the original request to reschedule she committed the crime of falsifying the record by failing to include required facts and concealing material facts. Further, Director Montgomery does not mention the extensive

documentation of substantial financial and personal impact required to change long standing plans in order to attend the interview. This evidence was provided to USCIS, and she falsified the record by omitting critical facts and concealing material facts.

254. The entirety of her decision is based on timely notice and lack of response but she fails to discuss any of the factors which are critical elements of her decision.

Right of Appeal Prohibitive / Denied

255. The contested decision continues with the following text in ECF 10-10:

If you believe that you can overcome the grounds for this denial, you may submit a request for a hearing on Form N-336, Request for a Hearing on a Decision in Naturalization Proceedings, within 30 calendar days of service of this decision (33 days if this decision was mailed). See attached [8 CFR 336.2](#) (a) and [103.8\(b\)](#). Without a properly filed Form N-336, this decision will become final. See INA 336.¹²

256. An initial reading of this paragraph suggests that there are administrative procedures for appealing such bad decisions. However, while USCIS borrows heavily from judicial terminology in describing their processes and procedures creating the semblance of 'due process', the reality is USCIS does not provide any of the elements of due process.

257. In particular, the required fee to file N-336, request for a hearing, was a hefty \$700 (now \$780) while the fee for filing a new N-400 is only \$625. Similarly, the filing fee for a motion to reconsider was also \$700 as was the fee for filing a 'Notice of Appeal'. For a budget minded applicant, the filing fees with federal district courts are a much more affordable \$350 (admittedly heavily subsidized) so that applicants with limited assets may only be able to afford to file with the district courts rather than pursue the absurdly expensive administrative alternatives.

258. The likely reason that federal district courts are heavily subsidized is that justice should be provided to all persons and should not be restricted to the wealthy who can afford substantial fees.

Decision Misconstrues [8 CFR 336.2\(a\)](#)

259. The decision listed above claims that a properly filed N-336 is required to appeal an illegal decision. This is incorrect as the relevant rule [8 CFR 336.2\(a\)](#) states:

(a) The applicant, or his or her authorized representative, may request a hearing on the

¹² INA 336 is [8 USC § 1447](#)

denial of the applicant's application for naturalization by filing a request with USCIS within thirty days after the applicant receives the notice of denial.

There is no mention of N-336 and its exorbitant fee. Mr. Carr chose an alternative of emailing a request for assistance to the Director of USCIS (ECF 30-8) as well as the DHS IG, his Representative in Congress, and DoJ. This email was sent on 7 Nov 2023, well within the 30 day requirement. Not only did it meet the requirements of [8 CFR 336.2\(a\)](#) and a timely request, it also completed exhaustion of remedies guideline by requesting assistance from numerous other sources.

Automated Phone System Prevents Applicants from Being Heard

260. It is a violation of due process for USCIS to restrict applicants to an automated phone system for all questions, concerns, requests, and evidence.

261. First of all, USCIS can not require all applicants to have phone access. They must provide a physical address where applicants and their representative or interpreter can ask questions and present concerns, requests, issues, and evidence. Appointments can not be required though substantial waits may be required without an appointment.

262. This in person access is required as each applicant must be permitted to be heard whether they have access to a phone or are technically savvy.

263. Further, it is a violation of due process when the automated phone system hangs up on applicants who are not able to correctly state their needs. The system must instead pass the request on to a human representative to hear the issues of the applicant though this option may be deferred during non-business hours and holidays.

264. While providing this human access can be a significant expense, it is required for the due process opportunity to be heard.

265. If USCIS chooses it can also provide online secure messaging to applicants and their representatives as a cost effective way of providing a reliable and less expensive method raising concerns and getting responses.

Difficult Appointment of Spouse as Representative

266. It is a violation of the due process for USCIS to restrict the ability of an I-751 applicant's spouse to represent the applicant.

267. Due process requires the right to representation though not necessarily by an attorney. As

the spouse is an American citizen, they almost certainly have better English and U.S. government skills. As such they are ideal representatives for their immigrant spouses.

268. In fact it is completely legal and proper for a spouse to represent the other party as needed in a real legal union (a.k.a. marriage). In truth, one of the signs of a fake marriage would be the absence of the citizen spouse to represent the immigrant spouse.

Inclusive Assumptions for Freedom of Information Act Requests

269. As due process requires that the applicant have full access to all of the evidence presented against him or her, the FOIA default must be to provide all records including audio and video recordings which the tribunal has access to.

Plaintiffs Were Damaged by USCIS's Unlawful Decisions and Actions

270. The refusal of USCIS to provide Mrs. Carr with her Certificate of Naturalization harmed Mrs. Carr by limiting her ability to vote and enjoy other privileges of citizenship. Also, Mrs. Carr has close family members (which includes two sons, a brother, and two sisters including Mrs. Von Kramer) who have been denied their right to apply for immigration and be placed in the queue for Permanent Residence (Green Card) as well as, potentially, citizenship.

Count 8

DHS OIG Takes No Action To Address Criminal Behavior

271. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 270, as if fully set forth herein.

272. On 4 Dec 2022, Mr. Carr complained via DHS OIG Hotline that Mrs. Carr had been stranded in Thailand through the unlawful, knowing failure of USCIS to abide by the statutory mandates of [8 CFR § 216.4](#) ...

Upon receipt of a properly filed Form I-751, the alien's conditional permanent resident status shall be extended automatically, if necessary, until such time as the director has adjudicated the petition.

273. Mr. Carr was assigned case number HLCN1670132157186 but has not received any further response from DHS OIG.

274. On 5 Dec 2022 expanded on his complaint against USCIS and received case number HLCN1670226793068 but has not received any further response.

275. It is possible that the announcement on 23 Jan 2023 of a new 48 month extension letter (ECF

48-2) was based on Mr. Carr's complaint on 4 Dec 2022 that Mrs. Carr was stranded in Thailand due to the expiration of her 24 month extension letter.

276. However, Mrs. Carr's freedom to work and travel freely was never restored as she never received the 48 month extension letter.

277. On 10 Sep 2023, Mr. Carr notified the DHS OIG directly through the IG of the federal crimes committed by USCIS (ECF 49-5). He also opened a complaint via DHS OIG Hotline and was assigned case number HLCN1694292030038.

278. On 13 Nov 2023, Mr. Carr notified the DHS OIG through an online hotline complaint of the additional federal crimes committed by USCIS as previously reported to the DHS IG in ECF 30-8 as well as the 'whistle blower' retaliation taken by USCIS against Mrs. Carr for Mr. Carr's widespread reports of federal crimes. The complaint via DHS OIG Hotline was assigned case number HLCN1699850033209.

279. It is the DHS OIG's responsibility to not only insure that such serious malfeasance and deprivation of a person's constitutionally guaranteed rights do not happen but also that the harm from failures is redressed to the degree possible by the monitored agency (USCIS in this case).

Count 9

DoJ Takes No Action To Address Criminal Behavior

280. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 279, as if fully set forth herein.

281. The Plaintiffs refer to the Verified Brief (ECF 76-3) defending Count 6 and Count 9 which are against CIGIE and DoJ as well the Verified Brief (ECF 67-3) discussing Sovereign Immunity and Executive Discretion. ECF 76-3 also refers to another Verified Brief (ECF 76-4) which discusses the dangers of illegal orders and the importance of supporting the constitution and our government of law. The Plaintiffs also refer to the Verified Brief (ECF 75-7) which discusses the duties and responsibilities of IG's in general and the DoJ with respect to reporting crimes (IG) and enforcing the law (DoJ). In addition the right to representation in this matter is discussed in the Verified Brief (ECF 75-5) on the right to representation.

282. In addition, the Plaintiffs refer to Verified Briefs ECF 30-3, ECF 30-4, and ECF 30-6 concerning creative sanctions for government attorneys and pro se parties, USATXN's

criminal efforts to delay this matter, and violations of 5th Circuit Court's rules by including references to 'not precedent' decisions without properly identifying that the decisions are not precedent.

DoJ Does Not Defend the Constitution or Enforce the Law

283. On 3 Mar 2023 Mr. Carr notified the DoJ Attorney General via mail of the allegations raised against the USPS, USPS OIG, and USPS BoG (ECF 14-4). The DoJ had previously been copied on the allegations as they were raised to the relevant agencies.

284. On 5 Jun 2023, the DoJ opened reference NM301959635 for the matter with email contact of criminal.division@usdoj.gov, referring the matter to the Postal Inspection Service (ECF 17-1).

285. On 20 June 2023 Mr Carr notified the DoJ and other defendants via mail of federal crimes and malfeasance in the DoS and related agencies and asking assistance in correcting the unlawful actions (see ECF 14-2). Mr. Carr did not request the prosecution of any party. The DoJ had previously been copied on the various complaints with the DoS agencies.

286. On 10 Sep 2023 Mr. Carr asked for the assistance of the DoJ with respect to the USCIS and related agencies, ECF 49-3. The DoJ had previously been copied on the various complaints with the USCIS agencies. On 7 Nov 2023 an expanded notice of intent to contest the unwarranted denial of the N-400 application was sent to DoJ and the USCIS Director which is ECF 30-8. The request for assistance to the USCIS Director could be construed as a [8 USC § 1447\(a\)](#) request for a hearing before an immigration officer due to the exorbitant cost of N-336 applications (para 223-253 and relief 38).

287. On 9 Oct 2023, Mr. Carr again asked the DoJ and other defendants for assistance with the USPS problems clarifying that he was not seeking prosecution of any party but instead seeking to end the federal crimes and other unlawful practices, ECF 14-5.

288. On 25 Oct 2023, Mr. Carr again asked the DoJ for assistance in correcting the unlawful practices by CIGIE with respect to failing to maintain proper standards for IG's and OIG employees. He did not request the prosecution of any party, only assistance in preventing unlawful conduct. ECF 30-8.

DoJ Commits Crimes to Violate Constitutional Rights

289. On 1 Mar 2024 AUSA Padis sent an email to Mr. Carr which violated 18 USC § 1001 (illegal falsification of governments records, i.e. lying in a government email) in order to

trick the Plaintiffs into granting an unwarranted delay even though he was sent a copy of ECF 10-5 (which the court and USATXN have steadfastly refused to address) and left Mrs. Carr in dire circumstances of being an apparent illegal during times when apparent illegals are arrested and deported to high security prisons in El Salvador without notice or opportunity to be heard (or the chance demonstrate they they are, in fact, legal, as in Mrs. Carr's case, a naturalized citizen as stated in ECF 10-5). The resulting email thread is ECF 28-1. Clearly DoJ's duty to enforce the law does not justify violating criminal statutes in order to deprive citizens or even permanent residents of their constitutional rights.

Count 10

IRS Violates Due Process and Statutes in Collections Process

2023 Form 1040 Filed, Minimum of 90% Estimated Taxes Paid

290. The Plaintiffs repeat and reaffirm paragraphs 1 through 288, as if fully set forth herein.

291. The Plaintiffs refer to the Verified Brief (ECF 76-5) defending Count 10 and Count 11 which are against the IRS and TIGTA as well the Verified Brief (ECF 67-3) discussing Sovereign Immunity and Executive Discretion. ECF 76-5 also refers to another Verified Brief (ECF 75-7) which discusses the duties and responsibilities of IG's in general and the DoJ with respect to reporting crimes (IG) and enforcing the law (DoJ). ECF 76-5 also refers to another Verified Brief (ECF 71-9) which argues that the IRS must provide estimated tax payment penalty relief when there is 'Annualized Income' as well as better tools. ECF 71-9 refers to the Verified Brief ECF 71-8 which explains that constitutional due process and pro se representation prevent any aspect of the government (congress, courts or executive) from requiring individuals to do that which is impossible or, penalizing individuals for failing to do that which is not possible (this is the foundation of what it means to have a fair hearing).

292. On 9 Apr 2024, the Carrs' joint Form 1040 was accepted electronically by the IRS as submission 4401182024100a1026fd with:

- * \$318,662 as IRA distributions,
- * \$334,813 as Adjusted Gross Income,
- * \$68,790 as Total Tax, and
- * \$63,500 as 2023 payments (all were estimated payments).

The payments were 92% of tax due with balance due of \$5,290 posted on 11 Apr 2024 (ECF

67-6 redacted). The estimated tax payments were above the normal minimum of 90% requirement to avoid penalties.

IRS Sends Tax Penalty Notice Which is Unfounded and Incorrect

293. On 6 May 2024 the IRS sent the Carrs a CP30 notice which they received on 9 May 2024 with an amount due of \$1,055.19 as a penalty for failing to pay sufficient estimated taxes (ECF 67-7). It should be noted that the Carrs had paid more than the minimum 90% in estimated taxes but that the estimated payments were made predominately in the second half of 2023 which was when the income was received.

294. Mr. Carr immediately contacted the IRS to find out how to correct the problem and on 9 May 2024 at 10:55AM spoke with Ms Pelosia (ID 1004987031) at the number provided of 800-829-8374 and was advised that he should file Form 843 Request for Abatement. She was unable to answer his other questions about how estimated taxes should be paid when substantial income is received late in the year. She advised instead that he should contact 'Tax Law'. She then transferred the call to a number which was no longer functioning but referred callers to IRS.gov for tax law help. Mr Carr could not find any references to how estimated tax payments should be made under these circumstances.

295. It should be noted that Ms. Pelosia was incorrect as IRS Form 2210 is the form which should have been submitted with an appeal letter as stated by the IRS in ECF 67-11. IRS Form 2210 determines the amount of penalties based on when estimated payments are made and could, theoretically, be used to compute the amount of estimated payments required to avoid penalties when significant income is received as a one time payment. However, the computation of penalties on IRS Form 2210 is quite complex and it is doubtful that even 1% of IRS employees really understand the underlying mechanics of IRS Form 2210 and its requisite IRS Form 1040 Schedule D tax worksheet. The IRS appears to be trying to trick taxpayers into overpaying their estimated taxes through absent and incorrect guidance. However, separate reliefs will be suggested for the IRS:

- * to provide a simple explanation of heuristics to permit taxpayers to avoid penalties, and
- * to provide OpenDocument Spreadsheets (ODS) for the requisite schedule D tax worksheet

and IRS Form 2210 and its schedules and worksheets.

296. On 10 May 2024 Mr. Carr mailed the requested Form 843 Abatement Request (ECF 67-8 redacted)¹³ along with an explanation (ECF 67-9 redacted) and documentation of the significant income sources (stock broker statements). These documents were received by the IRS on 16 May 2024 (ECF 67-10).

IRS Form 2210 Submitted With Payment of Computed Penalty, \$340.81

297. There were delays in processing the appeal and another notice was mailed to Mr. Carr on 01 July 2024 for \$1,068.18. On 19 Aug 2024 the IRS notified Mr. Carr of a delay in processing their Form 843. However, on 27 Aug 2024 the IRS notified Mr. Carr that his Abatement Request was denied but that he could file a IRS Form 2210 with the breakdown of income received through the year (see ECF 67-11).

298. It should be noted that Ms Pelosia (ID 1004987031) was incorrect in advising Mr. Carr to submit Form 843 as this form can not be used for the relief sought, but instead an appeal with IRS Form 2210 is required as explained in ECF 67-11.

299. Ms Pelosia did not receive appropriate training to know how to correctly answer Mr. Carr's questions and should have referred the matter to another employee / supervisor who was aware of how to correct penalties in the case of income which was not evenly distributed throughout the year. She certainly should have known that the 'Tax Law' group that she attempted to transfer his call to had been disbanded so that she could have referred the matter to her supervisor for assistance.

300. Mr. Carr sent the IRS Form 2210 (ECF 67-12, redacted)¹⁴ along with a direct appeal (ECF

13 All documents identified as redacted have been modified to remove sensitive personal information using normal redaction procedures as required by [FRCP Rule 5.2](#). The documents originally provided to the Defendants were unredacted and included the sensitive personal information.

14 IRS Form 2210 is quite complex and Mr. Carr found it ambiguous and confusing, especially the worksheet required to compute the actual penalties. He made several iterations in a spreadsheet which he developed to insure that all income and estimated payments were correctly distributed to appropriate quarters. There was an additional column to verify that the totals matched the amounts listed on the Form 1040 filed previously, which had been computed in a similar fashion on different pages of the same spreadsheet. He had transcribed the results into the

69-1, redacted) on 6 Sep 2024 and it arrived with the IRS on 8 Sep 2024 (ECF 67-14). The IRS Form 2210 computed the appropriate penalty as \$340.81 which Mr. Carr paid electronically with the IRS on 3 Sep 2024.

301. On 23 Sep 2024 the IRS sent a notice which claimed that the Carrs owed 745.67 (recognizing the payment of \$340.81, but not the IRS Form 2210).

302. On 10 Oct 2024 the IRS Form 2210 and direct appeal were forwarded by the IRS to the 'office that can best process your request' (ECF 67-15), i.e. IRS 'Independent Office of Appeals' in Fresno, CA.

Final Notice and Seizure While Appeal Pending

303. On 11 Nov 2024 the IRS sent the Carrs each via USPS 'Signature Required' certified mail two otherwise identical CP504 Notices (ECF 67-16) stating that they owed \$753.70 which was due immediately and that the IRS would commence to seize (or Levy) their property. The Carrs' appeal was still pending at that time and this notice violated IRS policy of permitting taxpayers to contest penalty payments and prevent seizure until the appeal was resolved.

304. The CP504 from IRS dated 11 Nov 2024, ECF 67-16, stated:

⚠ Final Balance Due Reminder – Notice Intent to Seize (Levy) Your Property or Rights to Property

As of November 11, 2024, we have not received your overdue tax after sending several notices to you. You must pay your balance immediately or we may levy (seize) your property. If you don't make your payment now, we'll consider your noncompliance an active choice and you could face a

IRS Form 2210 manually, but, sadly, he did that on early iterations but did not correctly transcribe all the final values before sending the pdf file to the printer. He made pen and ink corrections to the IRS Form 2210 before signing and mailing, but in the rush to send in the appeal, he did not make a copy (picture) of the signed Form 2210 with the corrections. The redacted pdf file provided to the court reflects the corrected values from the spreadsheet along with removing personal identification information (specifically, the full SSAN). A separate FOIA request is outstanding to retrieve a copy of the IRS Form 2210 which Mr. Carr mailed.

levy.

Amount Due Immediately: \$753.70.

Payment must be received immediately.

What you must do immediately

305. On the 13 Nov 2024 the Carrs signed for the notices and that evening paid the disputed amount of 753.70 to the IRS. When Mr. Carr considered the disruption and damages which could result from the seizure of their car, house, and joint business accounts (a source of income), the comparatively paltry sum demanded by the IRS seemed a reasonable payment even though the demands by the IRS were unfounded and illegal.

306. On 25 Nov 2024 Mr. Carr sold sufficient (81.28 shares) Vanguard Total Stock ETF shares (VTI) for \$298.07 each so that on 28 Nov 2024 he could make the planned tax payment of \$24,000 to the IRS for their 2024 taxes (though formally a IRA withdrawal of 24,242.42 with 99% withholding). The improperly mandated payment of \$753.70 required the early sale of 2.53 shares of VTI ETF / stock, their preferred investment at that time.

Appeal Decision of 18 Nov 2024

307. On 18 Nov 2024, the Carrs received the final findings of facts, decision, and order from IRS Appeals (ECF 67-17) which states in part:

Appeals received your case on 10/09/2024. We are releasing jurisdiction and returning your case to the originating office because my initial review of your case file showed that the case submitted by the IRS to Appeals is incomplete.

I am writing to let you know that your case file has been returned to the originating IRS office so that they may complete the information which Appeals requires. When they complete the information that is required, a notice will be sent to you to let you know that your case has been submitted again to Appeals.

308. This decision was woefully inadequate in that it did not clearly state that the IRS computed charges of \$1,055.19 on 6 May 2024 were not supported by the evidence before Appeals and

that all IRS computed penalties are overturned (without prejudice) or remanded so that the IRS can compute new penalties as appropriate.

Request to Reconsider Appeals Decision

309. On 2 Dec 2024, Mr. Carr asked that IRS Appeals reconsider the decision of 18 Nov 2024 (ECF 67-18) and provide the requested relief considering the circumstances. It was received by IRS Appeals on 6 Dec 2024 (ECF 67-19) but no reply has been received to date.

Request for Assistance Sent to Defendants

310. On 17 Dec 2024 Mr. Carr sent an email to the IRS, TIGTA, CIGIE, DoJ, and USATXN (who is representing the U.S. government in this matter) asking for their assistance in resolving this matter. ECF 67-1 is the content of that request.

311. Mr. Carr also submitted an online request to TIGTA which was assigned ID TRN-2412-0282 to this complaint on 19 Dec 2024. No other response or relief has been received to date.

Apparently IRS Starts Numerous Minor Collections and Ignores Appeals

Most Taxpayers Pay After Threat to Seize Property then IRS Buries Appeal

312. The IRS does not track appeals to minor collections as necessary to provide a fair hearing and instead delays the appeal until the taxpayer is sent a threat of property seizure. The Taxpayer routinely pays the minor amount and then the IRS simply buries the appeal taking no action as the resolution of the appeal would almost certainly result in a refund (and they are trying to collect revenue, not refund it).

313. The initial appeal was received by the IRS Appeals on 16 May 2024 (ECF 67-10) but Mr. Carr did not receive any response. He found the IRS web site concerning appeals which states (ECF 67-20):

Contact Appeals

If your case was forwarded to Appeals, contact us to check the status at 855-865-3401.
Be ready to leave a message with:

Your name

Your tax ID number

A number where we can reach you

We'll research your case and return your call within 48 hours.

If we haven't received your case, you won't receive a call back from us. For assistance with your issue, get help online or by phone.

314.Mr. Carr called IRS Appeals at 855-865-3401 on 14 Jun 2024 (almost a month after it was received by IRS Appeals) and was told there was a backlog in processing appeals and that it normally took 30 days for the IRS to forward the file to Appeals and that they would not respond if the file had not been forwarded. Mr. Carr left a message (just under 30 days) but received no response.

315.Mr. Carr called IRS Appeals at 855-865-3401 on the following dates:

16 Jul 2024

24 Sep 2024

13 Nov 2024

13 Feb 2025

and left a message as requested but received no response until 13 Feb 2025 when he got a message which stated:

Hi Brian, my name is Tamara. I'm calling you back from IRS Appeals customer service office. It looks like the case was closed from appeals on 11/21 and sent back to the IRS basically because they didn't build the case correctly asking them to correct it and resubmit it. I suggest calling back in about a month for a status update. Again our number to call. This is 855-865-3401. Thank you, and have a good day. (transcription by Google Voice)

316.It is possible that some of the written responses by the IRS in this matter were a response to these calls, but there is no evidence to support this.

317.It is also apparent that while the appeals were sent to 'IRS Appeals', this correspondence was actually opened by an IRS group which prepares the IRS response to the appeal before routing the appeal to the actual IRS Appeals group. This routing group does not have the required independence for an appeal. This group can and does route appeals to IRS Appeals in such a fashion that appeals which are not advantageous to the IRS are delayed and in

some case, ignored indefinitely. This clearly precludes due process by denying any hearing when the IRS chooses (e.g. IRS knows that it will lose the appeal and have to make a refund).

318. It is apparent that the IRS has learned that with low value, low quality penalties such as this, it is more economical (better return on expenses) to simply ignore appeals until the customer is threatened with property seizure and pays the contested amount. Then, even if the taxpayer has a strong appeal, they can keep the amount paid by just burying the appeal (not submitting the appeal to IRS Appeals).

IRS Admits Correct Amount of Penalty Was \$340.81, Initiates Refund

319. On 18 Feb 2025 the IRS sent a letter confirming that the IRS Form 2210 of 3 Sep 2024 had a correct computed penalty of \$340.81 and that a refund could be issued in four to six weeks.

320. The refund check was actually recorded as 24 Feb 2025 and was for \$758.72. There were no computations provided for that amount, but it is likely based on interest only as the alternative of losses the Carrs faced would be computed as \$765.45 (maximum price of VTI ETF was on 14 Feb 2025 302.55 which is \$765.45 for 2.53 shares) for a net credit due of \$6.73.

Explanation of Uneven Income and Estimated Taxes Needlessly Obtuse

321. Questions about how to estimate taxes due referred to [IRS Publication 505](#) which is titled 'Tax Withholding and Estimated Tax' and is 44 pages long. It has a section 'Annualized Income Installment Method' with what to do 'If you don't receive your income evenly throughout the year'.

322. There are several pages discussing estimated taxes but no simple clear guidelines as to the size of required estimated payments. There is a Worksheet on page 24 which is included in ECF 70-4. A careful review of the Worksheet reveals that it conceals the important fact that the four tax periods are unequal in length but required payments are for income which has not been received yet with:

Period	Payment Date	Income Date Range	Period Length (Months)	First Payment	Second Payment	Third Payment	Fourth Payment
1	15 Apr	Jan-Mar	3 (1 / 4)	1 / 4	1 / 4	1 / 4	1 / 4
2	15 Jun	Apr-May	2 (1 / 6)		1 / 2	1 / 4	1 / 4
3	15 Sep	Jun-Aug	3 (1 / 4)			3 / 4	1 / 4
4	15 Jan	Sep-Dec	4 (1 / 3)				All

The history of estimated tax payments and the injustice of the Internal Revenue code along the proposed relief is discussed more thoroughly in Mr. Carr's Verified Brief concerning estimated tax payments (ECF 71-9 based on due process in ECF 71-8).

323. In the relief section there are suggestions for more succinct and understandable guidelines and tools which the IRS could include in more general descriptions of making estimated tax payments in the case of uneven income through the year. This will help train employees such as Ms Pelosia (ID 1004987031), IRS Appeals Tribunal Diana M. Bushman (from ECF 67-19), and other unnamed IRS employees so that they can understand and correctly process estimated tax payments and the associated penalties. There will also be a suggestion for an open document format spreadsheet tool for estimated tax payments, IRS Form 2210 and IRS Form 1040 and common schedules to help IRS employees and taxpayers easily comply with estimated tax payment requirements. This is discussed in depth in Mr. Carr's Verified Brief concerning estimated tax payments (ECF 71-9).

IRS FOIA Requests

324. ECF 67-21 is a redacted copy of the IRS FOIA request 2025-06521 which requested the personal information for the Carrs received by the IRS on 13 Jan 2025 for documents related to this matter. They requested copies of all notices or penalties sent by the IRS to them as well as any documents provided to or from IRS Appeals to include Ms. Diana M. Bushman of Appeals in Ogden, UT concerning this matter.

325. On 6 Feb 2025 the IRS FOIA office sent the status of request 2025-06521 as 'in process' and initially due on 5 Jun 2025 as well as a promise of notice if there are any changes in the status of this request. ECF 70-1.

326. However, the status of 2025-06521 on 21 Apr 2025 was closed without any notice of changes in the status. ECF 70-2.

327. While it is inferred that the IRS did not single out the Carrs for such illegal treatment, the magnitude of the actual problem has not been determined. ECF 69-2 is a copy of the cumulative FOIA request 2025-06698 received on 13 Jan 2025 for information to determine the magnitude of the IRS violations beyond those of the Plaintiffs.

328. The status of IRS FOIA request 2025-06698 on 5 Feb 2025 was provided by the IRS (ECF 69-3) as in process with an estimated completion date of 12 May 2025 as well as a promise of notice if there are any changes in the status of this request. The delay exceeds statutory requirements and after 26 Feb 2025 the Plaintiffs can appeal this delay in this court.

329. However, the status of 2025-06698 on 21 Apr 2025 was closed without any notice of changes in the status. ECF 70-3.

Arguments

30 Day Notice Before Seizure Required by Statute

Federal statute requires 30 day notice before property seizure

330. Internal Revenue Code Section 6331(d) is [26 USC § 6331](#) which states: ...

(d) Requirement of notice before levy

(1) In general

Levy may be made under subsection (a) upon the salary or wages or other property of any person with respect to any unpaid tax only after the Secretary has notified such person in writing of his intention to make such levy.

(2) 30-day requirement

The notice required under paragraph (1) shall be ... or

(C) sent by certified or registered mail to such persons' last known address, no less than 30 days before the day of the levy.

331. To summarize, before the IRS can seize property it must provide notice in writing and certified mail is acceptable but the notice must be at least 30 days before the levy / seizure.

332.No such notice was provided. The CP504, ECF 67-16, did not contain notice of '30 days', only 'immediately'.

333.The IRS provides a [sample](#) CP504 (ECF 70-5) which states:

If you don't call us to make payment arrangements or we don't receive the amount due within 30 days from the date of this notice, we may levy your property or rights to property and apply it to the ...[amount] you owe.

334.This is in distinct contrast to the CP504 the Carrs received, ECF 67-16, described above, which focuses on the finality of the notice and the need to make payment immediately.

335.The omission of this mandatory 30 day notice from the CP504 and substitution of 'immediately' is, in fact, a federal crime of falsifying a government record.

18 USC § 1001 Crime To Omit 30 Day Notice

336.18 USC § 1001 states:

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully -

- (1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact;
 - (2) makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or
 - (3) makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry;
- shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years or, ...

337.In this statute, the definition of falsification of government records is very broad including (2) any materially false representation or (1) covers up a material fact (such as omitting the fact that the taxpayer has thirty days to appeal or make a payment before the IRS can seize property). Further, with (3) and any use of a false document, anyone authorizing or sending a defective CP504 is guilty of this crime.

Seizures must be blocked by Active Appeals

338.It is a violation of the fundamental constitutional right to due process to seize property while an appeal is active. Further, every agent of the federal government must preserve individual constitutional rights, it is part of the oath of office for officers, employees, and contractors.

339. This is clearly stated in the IRS web page with the '[Taxpayer Bill of Rights](#)', ECF 70-6, which states that Taxpayers have: ...

The Right to Challenge the IRS's Position and Be Heard

The Right to Appeal an IRS Decision in an Independent Forum

340. It is clear that the IRS is seeking to maximize revenue collection through increased enforcement, an admirable goal. However, this seems to include assessing penalties which, while plausible, are likely overestimates of the amount due (they are a stretch). Indeed once the facts are known, there might not be any penalty at all. However, if the IRS is aggressive in its computation of penalties, it should expect that there will be substantial appeals and many of these appeals will be valid.

341. Under these circumstances, rather than letting appeals lag, it is incumbent on the IRS to provide sufficient resources to keep appeals and taxpayers records thereof up to date. It is unacceptable to illegally seize taxpayer property because of delays in processing appeals.

Relief Sought

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, The Plaintiffs ask this Court to enter Orders:

USPS, OIG and DoJ Corrections

1. Directing USPS to provide a credit for future services for \$26.35 to Mr. and Mrs. Carr; In the alternative, USPS can provide a credit to Mr. Carr's credit card (the same card which was charged initially) or a check in that amount to Mr. Carr in the event that USPS finds it too cumbersome to add support for credits for future services to its online web services.
2. Directing USPS to update its dispute / credit process so that postal customers can get guaranteed refunds for late deliveries with a single visit / web form with the presumption that the delivery was late as attested by the customer (and notice that falsifying a government record is a federal crime).
3. Directing USPS OIG to do a preliminary investigation whenever USPS delivery records conflict with the customer's attestation. USPS OIG must refer the matter to DoJ in all cases

where there is clear evidence that either the customer or the delivery driver falsified a government record. Due to the automated nature of many USPS records, this determination could be automated to a substantial degree so that USPS OIG staff only need to get involved with cases where there are clear indications of falsification of government records.

4. Directing USPS to promptly correct all incorrect delivery records, certainly before they are accumulated and reported to Congress and the U.S. public or used for computing management bonuses.
5. Directing USPS OIG, DoS OIG, and DHS OIG to expeditiously investigate all plausible allegations of federal crimes. In the event that an OIG does not have sufficient resources to expeditiously investigate all plausible allegations of a federal crime sufficiently to determine if a federal crime is likely, it can refer the matter to local management or other parties for resolution, but it must report all such plausible allegations of federal crimes to DoJ which it does not investigate itself. If an OIG finds that any allegation of a federal crime is likely it must expeditiously report the matter to DoJ whether or not the crime is deemed to be worthy of prosecution. The determination of prosecution is reserved solely to DoJ.
6. Directing DoJ to investigate USPS BoG, USPS management, USPS IG, and USPS OIG management to determine if there were illegal orders preventing USPS OIG staff from reporting federal crimes to the DoJ. If there is evidence of such illegal orders, all such orders must be properly rescinded. Any penalties or prosecution is solely at the discretion of DoJ.
7. Directing DoJ to investigate USPS BoG and USPS management to determine if there were illegal orders encouraging falsifying delivery records (a.k.a. improper 'Stop the Clock' scans). If there is evidence of such illegal orders, all such orders must be properly rescinded. Any penalties or prosecution is solely at the discretion of DoJ.

Department of State Corrections

8. Directing DoS to provide a credit for future services of \$80.00 to Mr. and Mrs. Carr and \$624 to Mrs. Von Kramer. These credits can be used by the parties themselves, their family, or their friends. In the alternative, the DoS can provide checks in those amounts to the Plaintiffs in the event that DoS finds it too cumbersome to support these credits in their otherwise automated payment system.
9. Directing DoS to ensure that all visa denials include clear and specific references to the evidence considered and rationale for denial. All visa denials must be reviewed by

supervisors and corrected if there is not clear and specific references to the evidence considered and the rationale for denial. The applicant must be promptly informed of the rationale for the rejection in writing in any case. Any visa denials which are not corrected in this fashion should be referred to the DoS OIG and reported to the DoJ for any such omissions for decisions on prosecution for falsification of government records through omission of required facts.

10. Directing DoJ to work with DoS to ensure that all the elements of due process are properly implemented in the visa application review process with particular attention to the right to representation and the right to access all the evidence presented against the applicant.
11. The European Schengen visas could be considered as a starting point as they are able to provide fair and consistent visitor visas at an affordable rate, often relying on global firms who handle much of the burden of collecting and reviewing the required paperwork.
12. Directing DoS OIG to investigate whether there were unpublished unlawful policies or guidance provided to interviewers such as denying non immigrant visas to older widows of deceased American citizens or applicants with concurrent immigration applications. All such policies must be rescinded and any decisions on prosecution is reserved to the DoJ.
13. Directing DoS to evaluate all non-immigrant visa applications since 1 Jan 2018 to the present on a per country basis to determine the denial rate for applications where according the applicant was over 57 years old and marital status listed in the application would be indicative of eligibility for SSA survivors' benefits, specifically deceased spouse who was an American citizen or permanent resident with more than ten years residence and not remarried.
14. DoS is further directed that if the denial rate for the identified applicants is more than one standard deviation higher than all applicants for the specific country, then all identified applicants must be contacted and offered a credit for the prior denied visa application(s), adjusted for any increases in the application fees. Further, the prior applicant must also be provided with the SSA's preliminary determination of current eligibility for survivors' benefits based on the deceased spouse's work history and other dates provided by DoS from the visa application.

SSA Order

15. Directing SSA to reconsider the finding that Mrs. Von Kramer's does not have five years of

lawful presence in the United States. As Mrs. Von Kramer was unlawfully prevented from visiting the United States in 2019, 2020 and 2021 with the stated goal of, among other things, establishing a lawful presence, the SSA is directed to credit her with having met the requirements of lawful presence for those three years. If her actions in 2022 and 2023 or later years meet the requirements for lawful presence, then Mrs. Von Kramer must be held to have established a lawful presence in the United States and granted the benefits thereof.

16. Any DoS identified applicants whose previous non-immigrant visas may have been improperly denied as determined above and who later are granted non-immigrant visas should also be given letters from the DoS stating that the applicant may have been denied prior visa applications unlawfully and asking that SSA credit the applicant with 'lawful presence' for the years when they may have been unlawfully denied the ability to visit the U.S. with the letter identifying the date of the first improper denial and the date of the first approved visa.

CIGIE Corrections

17. CIGIE must review its standards and policies to ensure that all IG's and OIG employees are aware of the requirements to expeditiously investigate and report federal crimes. In the event that a particular OIG does not have sufficient resources to expeditiously investigate all plausible allegations of a federal crime sufficiently to determine if a federal crime is likely, it can refer the matter to local management or other parties for resolution, but it must report all such plausible allegations of federal crimes to DoJ which it does not investigate itself. If a particular OIG finds that any allegation of a federal crime is likely it must expeditiously report the matter to DoJ whether or not the crime is deemed to be worthy of prosecution. The determination of prosecution is reserved solely to DoJ.
18. Directing the DoJ to investigate the failure of CIGIE to itself promptly investigate and report federal crimes. All such practices and policies which led to past failures must be rescinded. The decision on penalties and prosecution are reserved solely to the DoJ.

USCIS Relief

Credit for Visa Fees when Stranded Overseas

19. Directing USCIS to provide a credit for future services with USCIS to Mr. and Mrs. Carr for \$80 for use on their behalf as well as their family members and friends. This credit is half of the business / tourist visa application fee which was required in order for Mrs. Carr to

return to the U.S. when she was stranded in Thailand in 2022. The fee was \$160, but DoS has been requested to provide the other half for their unlawful denial of such a visa to Mrs. Carr in 2017. In the alternative USCIS may choose to provide checks to all injured parties as an alternative to credits for future services in this and other reparations, but this is solely at the option of USCIS. It is possible that the total reparations requested may justify handling them as credits for future services.

Credit for Extraneous I-751 and N-400 Fees

Directing that Mrs. Carr be given a credit for future services with USCIS for the extraneous I-751 application fees of \$680 which were duplicated with N-400 services (interview and biometrics). Mrs. Carr never received any I-751 specific services and should not have been charged for the services.

In addition, Mrs. Carr should be given an additional credit for \$710 for the additional N-400 application (ECF 49-4) as described in para 231.

These credits can be used for future services with USCIS for herself, her family, Mr. Carr's family, or Mr. or Mrs. Carr's friends.

Credit for Delay in Granting Citizenship

20. Directing USCIS to credit Mrs. Carr with additional credits for the deprivation of the rights of citizenship to include the rights for close family members to seek immigration authorizations as well as the right to vote and such. As it is not possible retroactively grant Mrs. Carr the right to vote and others rights of being a U.S. citizen (such as the right to visit Europe without a European visa) the family members should be credited with twice the delay in her citizenship, i.e. their position in the queue for immigration visas should be adjusted as if their application was received earlier. The doubling of their credit in queue position corrects not only the delay in their application but also they get their citizenship rights (e.g. voting) earlier in compensation for the deprivation of Mrs. Carr's citizenship rights (e.g. voting). For Mrs. Carr the computation of the credit for family members immigration should be based on the delay in citizenship which should be from 13 Nov 2021 (first eligibility date) to the date when her Certificate of Citizenship was received on 28 Feb 2025 or 39 months.. The 2021 date is used because that is the earliest date that Mrs. Carr

was eligible to become a citizen and is in recognition of the unwarranted challenges and barriers USCIS placed on her citizenship. Indeed Mrs. Carr would have become a citizen on that date had USCIS permitted it.

21. Doubling 39 months is 78 months (6.5 years) so that Mrs. Carr's sons visa availability would be an estimated visa availability of 2027 from 2034 (see para 232). However, for Mrs. Carr's sister, Mrs. Von Kramer, her estimated visa availability would be reduced from 2042 to 2035 (siblings are in a significantly lower priority queue).
22. Given Mrs. Von Kramer's current age of 64, it is not clear if she will be able to travel in 10 years. The court is asked to direct that Mrs. Von Kramer visa availability be adjusted to the currently available date out of consideration of her age and the other stress that the violations of her constitutional rights created.
23. Similarly, the court is asked to further adjust the visa availability date of Mrs. Carr's sons, Tin and Earth, the few additional months required for immediate availability out of consideration of the stress which Mrs. Carr and her family were subjected to when she was stranded in Thailand and later had both 10 year green card and citizenship approved (ECF 10-5) only to later learn it was all a ruse (and possible retaliation for her complaints about being illegally stranded in Thailand) so that both her 10 year green card citizenship were denied and that she was left as an apparent illegal alien at a time when mass deportations were being implemented.

Review of Other I-751 and N-400 Records

24. Directing that USCIS databases should be queried for all I-751 records processed since 1 Jan 2018 to determine how many other records were similarly falsified. In particular, how many I-751 applications by quarter were approved but with no permanent resident card or Certificate of Naturalization issued within 90 days.
25. If the identified applicants are found to have a statement in the I-751 approval that the corresponding N-400 had been approved then these applicants should be issued a Certificate of Naturalization as soon as possible if they have not already been issued said certificate.
26. All such applicants should be similarly credited for future services with USCIS for their use, their families use, or their friends use for the cost of the I-751 application fee. In addition, any relatives who apply for immigration visas based on their citizenship status should be

credited with double the time of the original applicant's delay. The delay is computed to be from the date of the I-751 claim of N-400 approval to the actual date of issuance of a Certificate of Naturalization.

27. If the number of applicants and immigration credits are so large as to substantially impact current immigration queue members, USCIS is directed to apply to Congress to get sufficient additional slots for each country so as to preserve the integrity of the queue for that country.

Falsified Records Must Be Corrected

28. Further, all falsified records should be deleted (actually hidden to avoid potential database corruption) with new records of a falsified record being inserted at the same date and time of the deleted / hidden record. There should be an additional corresponding record at the current date and time which includes the content of the falsified record for later review.
29. All reports to Congress and other entities which relied on these falsified completion records must be revised to note the number of records which were previously recorded as processed, but were actually pending correction of the false resolution. The corrected resolutions should be added to current reports as approvals from previously denied falsified records (a new category).

Adjustments for Language / Cultural Differences

30. Just as USCIS has added exemptions for people with medical impairments, as well as exemptions based on age, USCIS is directed to extend these exemptions to consider the education opportunities presented to a particular individual before they were 21. They should also be extended to consider the difficulty in mastering English based on the nation of birth.
31. For example, there could be an annual review by country of the rate of application for citizenship as well as the rate of granting citizenship. Exemptions should be granted to individuals from countries like Thailand where mastering English is extremely difficult for those who are older and poorly educated. The exemptions should be granted based on age less years of formal training in English before they were 21 and sufficient to correct the rate of citizenship approvals to match those of countries such as Canada or the United Kingdom where the rate of granting citizenship is, presumably, highest.
32. The approval rate would be the number of approvals from a particular country divided by

the number of permanent residents from that country who are eligible to apply for citizenship, not the number who actually apply. It is expected that there will be a large backlog of residents from Buddhist / Muslim countries who would like to be citizens but did not apply because the English and Civics test were too difficult for them to pass based on their lack of exposure to English in their youth.

33. For countries such as Thailand and other Buddhist / Muslim countries, this would likely mean eliminating the English and civics test for all N-400 applicants for a few years until the rate of granting citizenship matches that of Canada or the United Kingdom. This would be a valuable correction to eliminate the past unlawful discrimination against certain groups based on religion, race, culture, and age.

USCIS Must Correct Time For Legal Notice

34. USCIS be directed to allow more time for timely notices of actions. If USCIS wishes to update its notice process to record and publish accurate records of the actual date of mailing of notices, 7 days could be added to the actual date of mailing for notices. Three days for first class mail is insufficient to be confident of prompt receipt.
35. As it generally takes USCIS 6 days to print a notice and prepare it for mailing, this would normally be 45 days after the date of the decision itself to allow for unforeseen delays in processing before and after mailing.
36. Of course, any denials based on assumed notice without an accurate record of delivery (signature required mailing or process server), would be conditional and must be easily contestable in the event that there was not actual timely delivery. The applicant must be able to contest the denial without any additional fees by explaining any extenuating circumstances which prevented timely notice or appearance (e.g. applicant was in the hospital and did not receive the notice or was not able to appear or answer while hospitalized).
37. For all cases where USCIS denied an application for failure to appear and there was not 45 days notice nor any record of the actual date of mailing, all such actions since 1 Jan 2018 must be remanded to USCIS for proper processing overturning all denials where there was not proof of timely notice.
38. The applicant must be given a credit for the filing fees for the original application as well as having the application opened again for proper consideration. All denial records must be

updated to note the denial was overturned due to lack of notice. All reports to Congress and others which were based on the improper denial (showing an application was processed) must be corrected to show that the application was incorrectly denied and has been returned to an active status.

Adjustment of USCIS Fees for Appeal, Reconsideration

39. USCIS fees for N-336 requests to review, motions to reconsider, notice of appeal, and actual appeal filing must be reduced so that they are not prohibitive. It is suggested that no motion to re-argue or motion to reconsider should cost more than 5% of the federal district court filing fee (now \$350, hence no more than \$17.50). Actual appeal filing fees should not exceed half the district court filing fees, e.g. \$175. There must be no fee for N-336 and other motions to reconsider when the applicant is contesting presumptive / conditional denials for failure to appear as the applicant must be provided the opportunity to explain failures in actual notice or extenuating circumstances which prevented appearance or answering (e.g. hospitalization).
40. The justification for this is to encourage applicants to seek redress with the USCIS rather than going directly to the district courts. It also furthers due process by making the proceedings fair and providing opportunities for applicants to be heard / argue their cases as necessary.

USCIS Must Restore Interview Waivers and

Cease Criminal Background Reviews for I-751 Applications

41. The administrative policies implemented by the prior USCIS director in the 2018 time frame must be rescinded. They do not provide any improvement in enforcement and greatly harm applicants' rights in these matters. They are also in direct violation of the waiver or interview within 90 days requirement explicitly stated in [8 CFR § 216.4\(b\)\(1\)](#) and cited above.
42. Mrs. Carr is requesting that interview waivers be resumed at an accelerated rate so that at least 2 months of backlog are eliminated each month. Realistically that means that three months of applications must be granted their permanent resident card each month without the optional interview and without further delay.
43. This should eliminate the current illegal four year backlog within two years.
44. Once the backlog is reduced to three months the accelerated approvals can be eliminated

and mandatory approvals without interview will only be for those applications which have languished in the queue for up to three months and the total number of pending applications exceeds the number of new applications.

45. If there are concerns about applicants not understanding the criminal background questions in English, USCIS can provide written copies of the criminal background questions translated into all the appropriate languages. However, these questions should only be applied to new applicants for immigration visas, not approved permanent residents.
46. USCIS should immediately begin with interview waivers for the oldest applications, but if USCIS wishes, it can send out new forms to potential waiver recipients asking for authorization to access all of their social media, mobile and credit rating records for both spouses. Failure to provide authorization or the appropriate accounts and addresses would result in a delay of any interview waivers. All applicants who authorized full electronic access to their records could be granted waivers before applicants who did not provide such access though the delay in the scheduling of an interview is restricted to 90 days in [8 CFR § 216.4\(b\)\(1\)](#) in all cases.
47. Over time, USCIS could develop AI programs which very accurately identify fake marriages based on the contents or lack of social media and other records. Given the vast amount of information available through phone records (e.g. Google's timeline which could show the location of each spouse for every day and night of their purported marriage), social media and credit histories, the interview itself appears to be a highly ineffective and very expensive method of identifying fake marriages. A well trained AI program could identify fake marriages with substantially greater accuracy at a fraction of the cost of interviews. Of course an actual interview would be required before deportation, but the interviewer would be able to confirm the problems identified by the AI program such time lines which indicate that the couple had lived apart for an excessive period.
48. While extensions for conditional 'green cards' may continue to be necessary under limited circumstances (specified by statute), the extensions can not be in the form of a simple printed letter. They must have the same form factor and durability as the 'green card' itself. USCIS could simply manufacture another conditional 'green card' with each extension or, if that poses security concerns (too many copies of the same 'green card' in circulation), manufacture an extension card with suitable measures to restrict counterfeiting but with the

alien number (matching the 'green card') and revised expiration date in clear bold text (the largest and boldest text on the extension card). The current extension letter had so much text and such fine print that even government agents were unable to accurately compute the actual revised expiration date.

Required Access Provided to Applicants

49. USCIS must immediately disable hang ups by the automated phone system and instead fail over to a human representative. Further, USCIS must send notices to all active applicants of the address where they can go without any appointment to ask questions and raise concerns. USCIS must respond to in person questions, concerns and requests.
50. Secure messaging systems are now relatively routine technology and should be offered as an addition to the MyUSCIS web page to provide a more reliable and cost effective alternative for those applicants who choose to use this option. It is absurd to require technically savvy applicants or their representatives to navigate the lengthy automated phone system to get to speak to a person who will reduce their input to 80 characters at great expense to USCIS and great information loss from incomplete or inaccurate transcription.

USCIS Must Guarantee Applicants' Right to Representation

51. USCIS must grant immediate approval to any spouse who files to become an applicant's representative. Further, the application form itself must be adjusted to allow that option on the application itself.
52. Pending I-751 applicants must be notified immediately of their ability to add their spouse as a representative via a simple phone call.

More Expansive FOIA Responses

53. USCIS must change its defaults for FOIA requests to provide access to every record including audio and video recordings which reference the requested receipt number.

DHS OIG Corrections

54. Directing DHS OIG to ensure that it promptly investigates and reports all federal crimes as described above. Further, while the decision to prosecute resides solely with the DoJ, the DHS OIG needs to ensure that serious malfeasance such as depriving foreign nationals of their constitutional rights is promptly investigated and corrected. Further, the DHS OIG must ensure that appropriate and timely redress is provided to injured parties.

55. For example, if a foreign national is unlawfully stranded overseas, the DHS OIG must ensure that the offending agency corrects the defect promptly, perhaps sending a PDF file with the required extension letter via email to the stranded party in time to not hinder their travel plans. The 23 Jan 2023 approval of a 48 month extension letters was too late and was not provided to the injured party in this case.

DoJ Corrections

56. Directing the DoJ to monitor and track all plausible allegations of federal crimes as necessary to insure that the criminal behavior is not repeated and that injured parties receive appropriate redress. It is acceptable for local OIG's or even local management to complete the bulk of the investigations as long as the DoJ monitors the results and does not forego the option of criminal prosecution until adequate remediation is put in place to prevent future crimes and redress is provided to all injured parties.

57. Directing the DoJ to investigate all failures of OIG's to expeditiously report plausible federal crimes to the DoJ as described above. Any failures to report federal crimes must be investigated as potential 'obstruction of justice' crimes though prosecution remains the purview of the DoJ and the threat of prosecution should be used as a cudgel to insure future adherence as well as redress when appropriate.

IRS Corrections

58. The IRS must promptly record and process all appeals so that all IRS employees and individual taxpayers can know the status of each appeal. No collection notices (and certainly no CP504 property seizures) should be sent to taxpayers who have an active appeal other than the notice that they will have 30 days after their appeal is resolved before they need to make any payments.

59. The IRS must answer all outstanding FOIA requests from Mr. Carr to, among other things, allow the court to determine the magnitude of the problems with taxpayers getting notices of property seizures (CP504 notices) while their appeals were pending. This may support the addition of classes of taxpayers to this matter.

60. The IRS must make credits for future taxes to all taxpayers who paid contested penalties while their appeal was in process.

61. The IRS must provide the Carr's a credit for future taxes (or in the alternative a refund with interest) of \$6.73 based on damages for the early sale of VTI ETF as discussed previously.

62. The IRS must also provide a tax credit for the penalty of \$340.81 as the IRS provided incorrect and insufficient information about the amount of estimated taxes due when income received was not distributed equally throughout the year as discussed in ECF 71-9.
63. The IRS must also provide a credit for future taxes to all similar taxpayers who paid the required estimated taxes by 15 Jan (generally 90%) but were required pay penalties for the distribution of payments through the year as discussed in ECF 71-9 without proper explanations and guidance by the IRS.
64. The IRS must provide better explanations and guidance about estimated tax payments so that even low income 1099 workers can avoid penalties. The IRS must also automatically forgive penalties for the short second tax period (paid on 15 June) as specified by the Internal Revenue Code (and Congress) to the degree that those penalties violate due process (penalizing 1099 workers for not being prescient and omnipotent). This unusual infringement on apparent executive discretion is described in detail in ECF 71-9 and is based on an in depth analysis of due process in ECF 71-8.
65. The IRS must also develop better tools to allow taxpayers (and tax professionals as well as IRS employees) to determine the amount estimated taxes due at the end of each tax period as described in ECF 71-9.

TIGTA and DoJ Corrections

66. TIGTA and DoJ were notified of the federal crimes (falsifying government records) and violations of individual constitutional rights (due process) in Dec 2024, but took no apparent action until Feb 2025 when all the facets of this matter tidied up in anticipation of the dismissal by this court. Both TIGTA and DoJ have an obligation to promptly prevent future federal crimes and provide redress as possible for damaged parties. Such relief should not be delayed or accelerated for improved results in litigation.

Conclusion

67. Granting the Plaintiffs such additional relief as the interests of justice may require, together with their costs and disbursements in maintaining this action.

Respectfully submitted,

Verification of Complaint

We the undersigned Plaintiffs hereby affirm under penalty of perjury in both the United States and Thailand that as individuals:

1. I have reviewed the statements and believe all of the statements to be true to the best of my knowledge.
2. I have reviewed the associated documents and exhibits and believe them to be true and accurate copies with the exception of the documents identified as being redacted. The redacted documents have only been altered to remove sensitive personal information according to normal redaction procedures.

I hereby reaffirm that the above is true to the best of my knowledge under penalty of perjury in both the United States and Thailand.

/s Brian P. Carr

Brian P. Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061
Date: 8. October 2025
Location: Irving, TX

/s Air Carr

Rueangrong Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061
Date: 19 Aug 2025
Location: Irving, TX

/s Buakhao Von Kramer

Buakhao Von Kramer
105 - 3 M 5 T YANGNERNG
SARAPEE, CHIANG MAI 50140
THAILAND
Date: 20 Aug 2025
Location: Bangkok, Thailand

/s Rujipas Lawichai

Rujipas Lawichai
Ban Tha Sala 1 Moo 7
Si Mueang Chum, Maesai,
Chiang Rai 57130 Thailand
Date: 19 Aug 2025
Location: Phuket, Thailand

/s Tanapon Lawichai

Tanapon Lawichai
Ban Tha Sala 1 Moo 7
Si Mueang Chum, Maesai,
Chiang Rai 57130 Thailand
Date: 19 Aug 2025
Location: As ordered by Thai Army while deployed on combat assignment

Case, Statute, and Other Alphabetical Index

18 USC § 10.....	7, 13, 29, 40, 42
18 USC § 1001.....	7, 13, 29, 40, 42, 56, 67
18 USC § 1038.....	7
18 USC § 1505.....	7, 32
18 USC § 1510.....	7, 32
18 USC § 201.....	7, 32
18 USC Ch 96 (RICO).....	7, 32
2020 Blog report by USPS OIG.....	17
26 USC § 6331.....	7, 66
26 USC § 7803.....	7
26 USC Internal Revenue Code.....	7
28 USC § 1331.....	7
28 USC § 1367.....	7
28 USC § 1391.....	7
28 USC Chap 171.....	7
28 USC Part II - Department Of Justice.....	7
39 USC (Postal Service).....	7
39 USC § 410.....	15
42 USC Ch. 21B.....	7
5 USC § 2302.....	7
5 USC § 404.....	7, 17 f., 30 f.
5 USC § 424.....	7
5 USC § 551–559.....	7
5 USC § 552 FOIA.....	7, 50
5 USC § 702.....	7
8 CFR § 103.....	7, 47, 52
8 CFR § 216.....	7, 21, 33 f., 37, 54, 76 f.
8 CFR § 216.4.....	7
8 CFR § 312.....	47
8 CFR § 336.....	47, 52
8 CFR 336.2.....	52 f.
8 CFR Part 1292.1.....	7
8 USC § 1146.....	7
8 USC § 1184.....	7, 20, 23
8 USC § 1202.....	27 f.
8 USC § 1304.....	33
8 USC § 1421.....	7
8 USC § 1423.....	47
8 USC § 1447.....	7, 47, 56
Administrative Procedure Act.....	7
Classified Information Procedures Act (CIPA).....	28
CP504.....	67

Ctr. for Investigative Reporting v. DOJ, No. 18-17356, 982 F.3d 668 (9th Cir. 2020).....	50
DR-AR-18-001.....	17
ECF 10-1.....	17
ECF 10-10.....	41, 52
ECF 10-11.....	47
ECF 10-2.....	18
ECF 10-3.....	18
ECF 10-4.....	20, 29
ECF 10-5.....	36, 45, 47, 57, 73
ECF 10-6.....	39
ECF 10-7.....	40
ECF 10-8.....	44, 46 f.
ECF 10-9.....	49
ECF 11-2.....	14
ECF 11-3.....	16 f.
ECF 11-4.....	17
ECF 11-5.....	17
ECF 12-3.....	19
ECF 12-4.....	22
ECF 12-5.....	27
ECF 13-1.....	23
ECF 13-2.....	28
ECF 13-3.....	28
ECF 14-2.....	28, 30 f., 56
ECF 14-3.....	31
ECF 14-4.....	15, 18, 56
ECF 14-5.....	31, 56
ECF 14-6.....	31
ECF 15.....	48
ECF 16-1.....	41
ECF 16-3.....	49
ECF 16-4.....	35 f.
ECF 16-5.....	49 f.
ECF 16-6.....	49
ECF 16-7.....	22, 26
ECF 17-1.....	56
ECF 17-3.....	30 f.
ECF 17-4.....	41
ECF 18.....	14 f., 17, 48
ECF 18-3.....	13
ECF 18-4.....	13
ECF 18-6.....	33 f., 38
ECF 18-7.....	15, 17
ECF 18-8.....	14
ECF 18-9.....	14
ECF 20-2.....	35

ECF 24-1.....	33 f.
ECF 28-1.....	57
ECF 30-3.....	55
ECF 30-4.....	55
ECF 30-5.....	44 f.
ECF 30-6.....	55
ECF 30-7.....	45
ECF 30-8.....	32, 53, 55 f.
ECF 33.....	48
ECF 34-2.....	39
ECF 34-6.....	29
ECF 34-7.....	29 f.
ECF 39-3.....	29
ECF 45-1.....	34
ECF 48-2.....	54
ECF 49-3.....	41, 48, 56
ECF 49-4.....	48, 72
ECF 49-5.....	55
ECF 67-1.....	62
ECF 67-10.....	59, 62
ECF 67-11.....	58 f.
ECF 67-12.....	59
ECF 67-14.....	60
ECF 67-15.....	60
ECF 67-16.....	60, 67
ECF 67-17.....	61
ECF 67-18.....	62
ECF 67-19.....	62, 65
ECF 67-20.....	62
ECF 67-21.....	65
ECF 67-3.....	13, 30, 32, 55, 57
ECF 67-6.....	57
ECF 67-7.....	58
ECF 67-8.....	59
ECF 67-9.....	59
ECF 69-1.....	59
ECF 69-2.....	66
ECF 69-3.....	66
ECF 70-1.....	65
ECF 70-10.....	48
ECF 70-11.....	15
ECF 70-12.....	15
ECF 70-13.....	15
ECF 70-14.....	27
ECF 70-15.....	27
ECF 70-16.....	27

ECF 70-17.....	28
ECF 70-18.....	28
ECF 70-19.....	28
ECF 70-2.....	66
ECF 70-20.....	28
ECF 70-21.....	49
ECF 70-23.....	49
ECF 70-24.....	49
ECF 70-25.....	50
ECF 70-26.....	50
ECF 70-3.....	66
ECF 70-4.....	64
ECF 70-5.....	67
ECF 70-6.....	68
ECF 70-7.....	15
ECF 70-8.....	15
ECF 70-9.....	15
ECF 71-1.....	48
ECF 71-10.....	9
ECF 71-11.....	48 f.
ECF 71-2.....	48
ECF 71-3.....	48
ECF 71-4.....	9, 48
ECF 71-5.....	49
ECF 71-6.....	48
ECF 71-7.....	49
ECF 71-8.....	18, 57, 65, 80
ECF 71-9.....	57, 65, 80
ECF 75-2.....	12
ECF 75-3.....	15
ECF 75-4.....	15
ECF 75-5.....	18, 32, 55
ECF 75-6.....	18
ECF 75-7.....	16, 19, 32, 55, 57
ECF 75-8.....	18 f.
ECF 76-2.....	32
ECF 76-3.....	30, 55
ECF 76-4.....	30, 55
ECF 76-5.....	57
ECF 82.....	30
Fifth Amendment.....	4, 7, 21, 28
FRCP Rule 5.2.....	59
FTCA.....	7
IG Act of 1978.....	7
INA 214.....	23, 26
INA 312.....	47

INA 336.....	47, 52
INA 8 USC Ch 12.....	7
INA Section 222(f).....	27 f.
INA Section 264.....	33
Internal Revenue Code.....	80
Internal Revenue Code Section 6331(d).....	66
IRS Form 1040.....	65
IRS Form 1040 Schedule D tax worksheet.....	58
IRS Form 2210.....	58 ff., 64 f.
IRS Publication 505.....	64
Kiareldeen v. Reno 71 F.Supp.2d 402.....	28
LR 1.1.....	86 f.
LR 11.1.....	86 f.
Some Kind of Hearing.....	5
SSA POM RS 02610.025.....	26 f.
Taxpayer Bill of Rights.....	68
TXND.....	86
TXND Local Civil Rules.....	86
.....	15

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On the recorded date of submission, I electronically submitted the foregoing document with the clerk of court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas, using the electronic case filing system of the court. I also hereby certify that on this same date no copies were served via U.S. mail as all parties in this matter were enrolled in the court's electronic case filing (and service) system.

/s Brian P. Carr

Brian P. Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES

In accordance with [TXND LR 11.1\(d\)](#), on the recorded date I received permission from Rueangrong Carr, Buakhao Von Kramer, Rujipas Lawichai, and Tanapon Lawichai to sign this document electronically on their behalf after sending them a copy of the Proposed Second Amended Complaint via Line (a secure and reliable messaging app popular in Japan, Thailand and other countries) and received their consent electronically via Line.

[TXND Local Civil Rules LR 1.1](#) states:

Definitions. Unless the context indicates a contrary intention, the following definitions apply in these rules: ...

(c) Attorney. The word "attorney" means either:

- (1) a person licensed to practice law ... or
- (2) a party proceeding pro se in any civil action.

LR 11.1 states:

(c) Certification of Signature of Another Person. By submitting a document by electronic means and representing the consent of another person on the document, an attorney who submits the document certifies that the document has been properly signed.

(d) Requirements for Another Person's Electronic Signature. An attorney who submits a document by electronic means that is signed by another person ... must:

- (1) ... or **represent the consent of the other person** in a manner **permitted** or required by the presiding judge; ...

Based on [LR 1.1](#), LR 11.1 can be restated as:

By submitting a document by electronic means and representing the consent of another person on the document, a... [pro se party] who submits the document certifies that the document has been properly signed.

... A ... [pro se party] who submits a document by electronic means that is signed by another person ... must:

... or **represent the consent of the other person** in a manner **permitted** or required by the presiding judge; ...

/s Brian P. Carr

Brian P. Carr
1201 Brady Dr
Irving, TX 75061

Date: 8. Oct. 2025
Location: Irving, Texas