

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ABDUVOSIT ABDUJALILOVICH
RAZIKOV,

Defendant.

Civil No. 26-cv-1564

**COMPLAINT TO REVOKE
NATURALIZATION**

I. INTRODUCTION

The United States of America (“Plaintiff”) brings this civil action pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) against Abduvosit Abdujalilovich Razikov (“Defendant”), a native of Uzbekistan, to revoke his unlawfully obtained naturalized U.S. citizenship.

While living in the United State on an expired visa, Defendant paid a U.S. citizen to enter into a sham marriage with him so that he could procure permanent residency in the United States. Then, Defendant paid another U.S. citizen to enter into a sham marriage with Defendant’s Uzbek fiancée—whom Defendant married in a religious ceremony while he was still married to the first U.S. citizen—so she could join him in the United States. Finally, after illegally procuring his citizenship and after divorcing his U.S. citizen “wife,” Defendant engaged in a third sham marriage, this time marrying another Uzbek woman to provide her with immigration benefits. After Defendant’s schemes unraveled, he and the woman he married in the religious ceremony were indicted for conspiring to defraud the United States. She pleaded guilty and was deported, but Defendant absconded from the United States and remains a fugitive from justice.

Defendant’s multiple immigration fraud schemes require his denaturalization. First, he was statutorily ineligible to naturalize because he had not lawfully acquired permanent resident

status, a prerequisite to naturalization; rather, he secured permanent residence status fraudulently through his sham marriage to a U.S. citizen. Second, his immigration fraud rendered him inadmissible, further precluding him from lawfully adjusting status. Third, he illegally procured his naturalization because, in conspiring to defraud the United States prior to his naturalization, Defendant committed unlawful acts that precluded him from establishing the requisite good moral character to naturalize. Fourth, Defendant's false testimony during his naturalization proceedings about his marriages, immigration fraud, and children with his Uzbek wife also precluded him from establishing the requisite good moral character. Finally, Defendant procured his naturalization through willful concealment and misrepresentation of material facts concerning his fraudulent marriage schemes.

Any one of these grounds requires the Court to revoke Defendant's unlawful naturalization and to cancel his certificate of naturalization.

II. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND PARTIES

1. This is an action filed under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) to revoke and set aside the decision admitting Defendant to U.S. citizenship and to cancel Defendant's Certificate of Naturalization No. 34989023, issued on March 23, 2012.

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

3. Plaintiff is the United States of America ("Plaintiff").

4. Defendant is a native of Uzbekistan.

5. Defendant procured U.S. citizenship through naturalization.

6. Upon information and belief, Defendant currently resides in Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

7. Venue is proper in the District of the District of Columbia under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant does not reside in any judicial district of the United States.

III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

8. As required by 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a), the affidavit of Anthony Ojeda, a Special Agent of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Homeland Security Investigations, an agency within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, showing good cause for this action, is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

A. Defendant obtains permanent residency in the United States through a sham marriage to a U.S. citizen.

9. Defendant was born in Uzbekistan in 1979.

10. At the time of Defendant's birth, the now-independent country of Uzbekistan was the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, a republic of the Soviet Union.

11. On October 30, 2003, Defendant entered the United States on a nonimmigrant visitor's visa.

12. Although the terms of Defendant's visa did not authorize employment in the United States, Defendant began working at a restaurant in Memphis, Tennessee, in December 2003.

13. Defendant's visa expired on December 29, 2003.

14. Defendant did not depart the United States upon expiration of his visa.

15. Upon expiration of his visa, Defendant remained in the United States without lawful immigration status.

16. In October 2004, Defendant began working with Jessica McGee ("McGee") at a hotel in Memphis, Tennessee.

17. McGee was at that time and, upon information and belief, remains a U.S. citizen.

18. In late 2004 or early 2005, Defendant asked McGee to marry him so that he could obtain immigration status in the United States.

19. Defendant offered McGee approximately \$5,000 to marry him.

20. McGee accepted Defendant's offer.

21. Defendant and McGee married on April 12, 2005, in Shelby County, Tennessee.

22. When they married, Defendant and McGee understood and agreed that the purpose of their marriage was for Defendant to obtain an immigration benefit from the U.S. government.

23. When they married, Defendant and McGee did not intend to establish a life together.

24. After their wedding, Defendant and McGee did not live together.

25. Defendant and McGee never had any sexual relations before or after their wedding.

26. Pursuant to their agreement, Defendant paid McGee approximately \$5,000 over several installments after their wedding.

27. On May 6, 2005, McGee filed a Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative ("I-130"), with USCIS to establish a qualifying spousal relationship between McGee and Defendant that would allow Defendant to obtain an immigrant visa as a result of that putative relationship.

28. On May 6, 2005, Defendant filed a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status ("Adjustment Application"), with USCIS, seeking to adjust his immigration status to permanent resident based on his marriage to McGee.

29. A true and complete copy of Defendant's Adjustment Application, except for redactions of personally identifying information immaterial to this action, is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

30. In support of his Adjustment Application, Defendant submitted various documents to USCIS to support his claim that his marriage to McGee was bona fide.

31. The documents that Defendant submitted to USCIS for this purpose include a photograph of a cake with the caption "Abduvosit & Jessica Wedding cake."

32. The cake in this photograph was not, however, a true image of a cake at Defendant and McGee's wedding.

33. There was no wedding cake at Defendant and McGee's wedding.

34. On February 1, 2006, a USCIS employee interviewed Defendant and McGee to determine Defendant's eligibility for adjustment of status to permanent resident ("Adjustment Interview").

35. Prior to the Adjustment Interview, Defendant prepared McGee for the Adjustment Interview by coaching her to memorize biographical information about Defendant.

36. During the Adjustment Interview, the USCIS employee sought information about Defendant and McGee's relationship to ascertain whether their marriage was bona fide.

37. During the Adjustment Interview, Defendant falsely portrayed his marriage with McGee as bona fide.

38. During his Adjustment Interview, Defendant did not disclose to the USCIS immigration officer that he and McGee had married so that Defendant could obtain immigration benefits.

39. During his Adjustment Interview, Defendant did not disclose to the USCIS immigration officer that when he and McGee married, they did not intend to establish a life together.

40. On February 1, 2006, based on the information provided in McGee's I-130, Defendant's Adjustment Application, and at their Adjustment Interview, USCIS approved the I-130 and the Adjustment Application and granted Defendant the immigration status of a conditional permanent resident of the United States.

41. On January 3, 2008, Defendant submitted a Form I-751, Petition to Remove Conditions on Residence ("I-751"), to USCIS, seeking to remove the conditional status of his permanent residence on account of his continued marriage to McGee.

42. A true and complete copy of Defendant's I-751, except for redactions of personally identifying information immaterial to this action, is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

43. Defendant signed Part 6 his I-751 under the following certification: "If conditional residence was based on a marriage, I further certify that the marriage was entered in accordance with the laws of the place where the marriage took place and was not for the purpose of procuring an immigration benefit."

44. USCIS approved Defendant's I-751 on December 24, 2008, thereby removing the conditional status of Defendant's permanent residence.

45. Defendant petitioned for divorce from McGee in 2010.

46. A Florida state court finalized Defendant's divorce from McGee on November 23, 2010. See Final Judgment of Dissolution of Marriage, *In re. Marriage of Abduvosit Razikov v. Jessica McGee*, No. 2010-DR-16310 (Fla. Cir. Ct. Nov. 23, 2010) ("Final Judgment of Dissolution of McGee Marriage").

47. A true and complete copy of the Final Judgment of Dissolution of McGee Marriage is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

B. Defendant orchestrates a second sham marriage to secure immigration status for his Uzbek fiancée.

48. While married to McGee, Defendant was in a romantic relationship with an Uzbek woman named Dilrabo Obidova (“Obidova”).

49. When Defendant and McGee married, Obidova was living in Uzbekistan.

50. While married to McGee, Defendant sought to bring Obidova to the United States.

51. In 2006, Defendant worked with an individual named Michael Griffith (“Griffith”).

52. Griffith was at that time and, upon information and belief, remains a U.S. citizen.

53. In 2006, Defendant offered Griffith financial compensation to marry Obidova so that she could come to the United States.

54. Griffith accepted Defendant’s offer.

55. In August 2007, after accepting Defendant’s offer, Griffith traveled to Tashkent, Uzbekistan, where he met Defendant and Obidova.

56. Defendant paid for Griffith’s airfare, hotel, and other travel expenses for that trip.

57. On or about August 12, 2007, Defendant, Obidova, and Griffith agreed that Obidova and Griffith would enter into a sham marriage so Obidova could obtain immigration status and benefits in the United States.

58. Specifically, Defendant, Obidova, and Griffith agreed on or about August 12, 2007, as follows:

- a. Defendant would assist in Obidova's petition for a U.S. visa that would permit Obidova to travel to the United States to marry Griffith;
- b. Once Obidova was in the United States, Obidova and Griffith would enter into a marriage for the sole purpose of obtaining immigration benefits for Obidova;
- c. Defendant would submit documents to the United States government on behalf of Griffith and Obidova so that Obidova could obtain immigration benefits as a result of the marriage;
- d. Obidova and Griffith would not consummate their marriage or treat it as a bona fide marriage;
- e. Griffith would be financially compensated by claiming Obidova on his taxes; and
- f. Defendant and Obidova would marry each other in a religious ceremony before Obidova came to the United States;
- g. If Defendant and Obidova produced children together while Obidova and Griffith were married, Griffith would be listed as the children's father on the children's birth certificates and passport applications and on Obidova's immigration applications; and
- h. Obidova would divorce Griffith once she obtained lasting immigration benefits from the sham marriage.

59. While in Uzbekistan, Defendant staged photos of Griffith and Obidova with Obidova's family and at sightseeing landmarks.

60. Defendant intended that trip and those photographs to create the illusion of a relationship between Griffith and Obidova to make their future marriage and immigration applications appear legitimate.

61. On November 2, 2007, Griffith signed a Form I-129F, Petition for Alien Fiancée (“I-129F”), that sought a visa for Obidova.

62. Defendant assisted in completing the I-129F and paid an immigration attorney to file it.

63. The I-129F included photographs of Griffith and Obidova that Defendant had taken during Griffith’s August 2007 trip to Uzbekistan.

64. On February 8, 2008, USCIS approved the I-129F.

65. Obidova subsequently applied to the State Department for a K-1 fiancée visa.

66. In May 2008, Obidova was interviewed at the U.S. Embassy in Tashkent, Uzbekistan as part of the visa application process.

67. During that interview, Obidova falsely claimed to have a romantic relationship with Griffith.

68. The State Department granted Obidova’s K-1 visa on September 30, 2009.

69. Obidova’s K-1 visa allowed her to travel to and seek admission to the United States to marry Griffith within ninety days of entry.

70. Defendant and Obidova traveled together from Uzbekistan to the United States on November 29, 2009.

71. Prior to traveling to the United States, Defendant and Obidova married each other in a religious ceremony.

72. Obidova and Griffith married each other on January 14, 2010.

73. On January 15, 2010, Defendant caused the submission of a Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Resident Status or Adjust Status, to USCIS that sought the

adjustment of Obidova's immigration status to permanent resident on the basis of her marriage to Griffith ("Obidova I-485").

74. In August 2010, Obidova gave birth to a child with the initials O.A.

75. Defendant is the biological father of O.A.

76. As previously agreed by Griffith, Obidova, and Defendant, Obidova listed Griffith rather than Defendant as O.A.'s father on O.A.'s birth certificate.

77. USCIS approved the Obidova I-485 on September 9, 2010, thereby adjusting Obidova's immigration status to conditional permanent resident.

78. On March 21, 2013, USCIS granted Obidova's Form I-751, Petition to Remove Conditions on Residence, thereby removing the conditional status on Obidova's permanent residence in the United States.

79. On June 2, 2014, Obidova and Griffith divorced.

C. Defendant unlawfully procures his naturalization.

80. On September 6, 2011, Defendant filed a Form N-400, Application for Naturalization ("N-400"), with USCIS.

81. A true and complete copy of Defendant's N-400, except for redactions of personally identifiable information immaterial to this action, is attached hereto as Exhibit E.

82. Part 8(A) of the N-400 asked, "How many times have you been married (including annulled marriages)?"

83. Defendant responded to Part 8(A) of the N-400 by writing "1."

84. Part 8(B)-(E) of the N-400 required Defendant to provide information about his current spouse.

85. Defendant did not provide any information about his current spouse in response to Part 8 (C)-(E) of the N-400.

86. Part 9(A) of the N-400 asked how many sons or daughters Defendant had.

87. Defendant responded to Part 9(A) of the N-400 by writing “0.”

88. Part 9(B) of the N-400 consisted of a blank chart in which Defendant was required to provide information on any sons or daughters he had.

89. Defendant did not provide any information in Part 9(B) of the N-400 about any sons or daughters he had.

90. Part 10(D), Question 15 of the N-400 asked, “Have you ever committed a crime or offense for which you were not arrested?”

91. Defendant responded to Part 10(D), Question 15 of the N-400 by checking the box for “No.”

92. Part 10(D), Question 22(d) of the N-400 asked, “Have you ever: (d) Been married to more than one person at the same time?”

93. Defendant responded to Part 10(D), Question 22(d) of the N-400 by checking the box for “No.”

94. Part 10(D), Question 22(e) of the N-400 asked, “Have you ever: (e) Helped anyone enter or try to enter the United States illegally?”

95. Defendant responded to Part 10(D), Question 22(e) of the N-400 by checking the box for “No.”

96. Part 10(D), Question 23 of the N-400 asked, “Have you ever given false or misleading information to any U.S. Government official while applying for any immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion, or removal?”

97. Defendant responded to Part 10(D), Question 23 of the N-400 by checking the box for “No.”

98. Defendant signed the N-400 and dated it “08/30/11” under a certification that, under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the United States, the information he provided in his N-400 was true and correct.

99. On January 10, 2012, a USCIS employee interviewed Defendant regarding his N-400 to determine Defendant’s eligibility for naturalization (“Naturalization Interview”).

100. At the beginning of the Naturalization Interview, the USCIS employee placed Defendant under oath.

101. During the Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had been married one time, consistent with his written answer to Part 8(A) of the N-400

102. During the Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had no children, consistent with his written answer to Part 9 of the N-400.

103. During the Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never committed a crime or offense for which he had not been arrested, consistent with his written answer to Part 10(D), Question 15 of the N-400.

104. During the Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never been married to more than one person at the same time, consistent with his written answer to Part 10(D), Question 22(d) of the N-400.

105. During the Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never helped anyone enter or try to enter the United States illegally, consistent with his written answer to Part 10(D), Question 22(e) of the N-400.

106. During the Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never given any U.S. Government official any false or misleading information while applying for any immigration benefit, consistent with his written answer to Part 10(D), Question 23 of the N-400.

107. At the conclusion of Naturalization Interview, Defendant signed the N-400 in the presence of the USCIS officer who conducted the Naturalization Interview and swore that the contents of his N-400, including five numbered corrections made to it during his Naturalization Interview, were true and correct to the best of Defendant's knowledge and belief.

108. During his Naturalization Interview, there were no corrections made to Defendant's responses, or lack thereof, to Parts 8(A)-(E); Parts 9(A)-(B); Part 10(D), Question 15; Part 10(D), Question 22(d); Part 10(D), Question 22(e); or Part 10(D), Question 23 of the N-400.

109. Based upon the information supplied by Defendant in his N-400 and based on the sworn testimony he gave during his Naturalization Interview, USCIS approved Defendant's application for naturalization on March 20, 2012.

110. On March 23, 2012, Defendant took the Oath of Allegiance and became a naturalized U.S. citizen.

111. On March 23, 2012, USCIS issued Defendant Certificate of Naturalization No. 34989023 ("Certificate of Naturalization").

112. A true and complete copy of Defendant's Certificate of Naturalization, except for redactions of personally identifying information immaterial to this action, is attached hereto as Exhibit F.

D. Defendant enters into his own second sham marriage to secure immigration benefits for a second woman.

113. On August 12, 2012, Defendant married a woman named Nigora Turabaeva ("Turabaeva").

114. Defendant's marriage to Turabaeva occurred after he had divorced McGee.

115. Defendant's marriage to Turabaeva occurred after he had married Obidova in a religious ceremony.

116. Turabaeva was a native and citizen of Uzbekistan.

117. When Defendant and Turabaeva married, they did not intend to establish a life together.

118. When Defendant and Turabaeva married, they did so intending to evade immigration laws and to obtain immigration benefits for Turabaeva.

119. Turabaeva had two children after she married Defendant.

120. Defendant was not the biological father of the children that Turabaeva had after she married Defendant.

121. On January 11, 2018, Turabaeva filed for divorce from Defendant.

122. Defendant filed a counter-petition for divorce from Turabaeva. *See* Respondent's Counter-Petition for Annulment and Disestablishment of Paternity, *In re. the Marriage of Nigora Turabaeva and Abduvosit Razikov*, No. 2018-DR-000454 (Fla. Cir. Ct. Mar. 2, 2018) ("Counter-Petition").

123. A true and complete copy of the Counter-Petition, except for redactions of personally identifying information immaterial to this action or subject to redaction by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2, is attached hereto as Exhibit G.

124. In his Counter-Petition, Defendant stated that "The purpose of the marriage was not to be 'married' but rather to allow [Turabaeva] to remain in the United States with her children and with her actual Husband, RAVSHAN ABDURAKHMANOV. The marriage was in essence a fraud."

125. In his Counter-Petition, Defendant also stated that “The only reason the ‘marriage’ occurred was because [Defendant] was requested to do so by his ‘best friend’ who is the actual Father of the Wife’s children.”

126. In his Counter-Petition, Defendant also stated that “At no time have the parties held themselves out as Husband and Wife; had sexual relations; consummated the marriage; had children together; lived together; owned anything together; or, in anyway purported to act as Husband and Wife.”

127. In his Counter-Petition, Defendant also stated that “Two (2) minor children, not of the relationship between [Defendant] and [Turabaeva] were born. Unknown to [Defendant] his name was placed on the birth certificates. He is technically the Father of minor children only because he is technically married to the children’s Mother, which is the subject of an annulment as identified in Count I.”

128. In his Counter-Petition, Defendant referenced Obidova and his children with her by claiming that he “At all times material hereto, has lived with his finance’ [sic], with whom he has children.”

129. On June 18, 2018, the Florida Circuit Court entered judgment declaring that Defendant was not the father of Turabaeva’s children and that Ravshan Abdurakhmanov was their biological father. *See* Final Judgment of Disestablishment of Paternity, *In re. the Marriage of Nigora Turabaeva and Abduvosit Razikov*, No. 2018-DR-000454 (Fla. Cir. Ct. June 18, 2018) (“Judgment of Disestablishment of Paternity”).

130. A true and complete copy of the Judgment of Disestablishment of Paternity, except for redactions of personally identifying information immaterial to this action, or subject to redaction by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2, is attached hereto as Exhibit H.

131. On November 30, 2018, the Florida Circuit Court entered a final judgment of divorce for Defendant and Turabaeva. *See* Final Judgment of Dissolution of Marriage, *In re. the Marriage of Nigora Turabaeva and Abduvosit Razikov*, No. 2018-DR-000454 (Fla. Cir. Ct. Mar. 2, 2018) (“Final Judgment of Dissolution of Turabaeva Marriage”).

132. A true and complete copy of the Final Judgment of Dissolution of Turabaeva Marriage is attached hereto as Exhibit I.

133. The Final Judgment of Dissolution of Marriage states that “There are no children of the marriage and none are expected. ... The Final Judgment disestablishing Paternity previously entered herein is ratified and confirmed.”

E. Obidova’s seeks to obtain naturalization unlawfully.

134. Obidova submitted a Form N-400, Application for Naturalization to USCIS on October 21, 2022.

135. On December 15, 2023, a USCIS immigration officer interviewed Obidova regarding her naturalization application to determine Obidova’s eligibility for naturalization.

136. At the beginning of Obidova’s naturalization interview, the immigration officer placed Obidova under oath.

137. During Obidova’s naturalization interview, USCIS recorded in writing the questions asked and Obidova’s answers given at her naturalization interview in a Record of Sworn Statement (“Obidova Record of Sworn Statement”).

138. At the conclusion of her naturalization interview, Obidova was presented with a copy the Obidova Record of Sworn Statement to review, but she refused to sign it.

139. A true and complete copy of the Obidova Record of Sworn Statement, except for redactions of personally identifying information immaterial to this action or subject to redaction by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2, is attached hereto as Exhibit J.

140. During Obidova's naturalization interview, she was asked "You have three children, correct?"

141. In response to that question, Obidova said, under oath at her naturalization interview, "Yes."

142. During Obidova's naturalization interview, she was asked "What are the names and ages of your three children?"

143. In response to that question, Obidova said, under oath at her naturalization interview, the full names, ages, and dates of birth of her children.

144. The children that Obidova identified at her naturalization interview by their full names and dates of birth include the child identified above in paragraph 74 as "O.A."

145. During Obidova's naturalization interview, she was asked "Is the father of your three children, Mr. Razikov?"

146. In response to that question, Obidova said, under oath at her naturalization interview, "Yes."

147. During Obidova's naturalization interview, she was asked for the full name of her children's father.

148. In response to that question, Obidova said, under oath at her naturalization interview, "Abduvosit Razikov."

149. During Obidova's naturalization interview, she was asked, "Did you enter in a religious marriage with Mr. Razikov?"

150. In response to that question, Obidova said, under oath at her naturalization interview, "Yes."

151. On December 19, 2023, USCIS issued Obidova a notice that it was denying her naturalization application (“Obidova N-400 Denial Notice”).

152. A true and complete copy of the Obidova N-400 Denial Notice, except for redactions of personally identifying information immaterial to this action, is attached hereto as Exhibit K.

F. Defendant and Obidova face criminal charges for seeking to capitalize on Defendant’s unlawfully obtained naturalization

153. On December 13, 2023, a grand jury in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida returned a four-count indictment against Defendant. *See* Indictment, *United States v. Razikov*, No. 6:23-cr-229 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 13, 2023), ECF No. 1 (“Indictment”).

154. A true and complete copy of the Indictment is attached hereto as Exhibit L.

155. All four counts of the Indictment charge Defendant with making a false statement in the application and use of a passport, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1542. Three of these counts charge Defendant with using a passport secured by false statement, while the remaining count charges Defendant with making a false statement in a passport application.

156. The Indictment alleges that Defendant obtained his U.S. passport through a certification of naturalization, “which he knew to have been procured and obtained by false statements, including, but not limited to, false statements regarding (1) the defendant’s marital status; (2) his fraudulent marriage to U.S. citizen J.M. for the purpose of procuring an immigration benefit; (3) the birth and existence of his eldest daughter with Uzbek national D.O.; and (4) his ‘Good Moral Character’ and general eligibility for immigration benefits[.]”

157. On December 20, 2023, a criminal complaint was filed against Obidova.

158. On January 8, 2024, Obidova was arrested.

159. On January 24, 2024, a grand jury in the Middle District of Florida returned a ten-count superseding indictment against Defendant and Obidova. *See* Superseding Indictment, *United States v. Razikov*, No. 6:23-cr-229 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 24, 2024), ECF No. 26 (“Superseding Indictment”).

160. A true and complete copy of the Superseding Indictment is attached hereto as Exhibit M.

161. Count I of the Superseding Indictment charges Defendant and Obidova with conspiring to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371.

162. Count I of the Superseding Indictment alleges that Defendant and Obidova had conspired to impair, obstruct, and defeat the lawful functions of the Department of Homeland Security and USCIS with respect to the application, review, investigation, and decision-making process for immigration benefits.

163. Count I of the Superseding Indictment alleges that Defendant and Obidova had conspired with Griffith to defraud the United States in connection with Obidova’s immigration benefit applications.

164. Counts II-V and VIII of the Superseding Indictment charge Defendant with making false statements to obtain a U.S. passport and the subsequent use of a U.S. passport that was secured through false statements, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1542.

165. On May 15, 2024, Obidova pled guilty on three counts of the Superseding Indictment, including Count I.

166. In pleading guilty, Obidova signed and filed with the court a written plea agreement. *See* Plea Agreement, *United States v. Obidova*, No. 6:23-cr-229 (M.D. Fla. May 15, 2024), ECF No. 58 (“Obidova Plea Agreement”).

167. A true and complete copy of the Obidova Plea Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit N.

168. The Obidova Plea Agreement includes a document, entitled “Factual Basis,” that provides the factual basis for her guilty plea (“Factual Basis”).

169. The Obidova Plea Agreement contains the following statement:

The defendant certifies that defendant does hereby admit that the facts set forth in the attached “Factual Basis,” which is incorporated herein by reference, are true, and were this case to go to trial, the United States would be able to prove those specific facts and others beyond a reasonable doubt.

170. Obidova initialed each page of the Factual Basis.

171. In the Factual Basis, Obidova stipulates to the following facts: (a) Defendant, Obidova, and Griffith had entered into a criminal conspiracy through which Obidova fraudulently obtained immigration benefits through a sham marriage between Obidova and Griffith; (b) Defendant committed overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy, including assistance in the preparation and filing of Obidova’s fraudulent immigration applications; (c) Defendant was the father of Obidova’s children; and (d) Obidova and Defendant had entered into a religious marriage before Obidova travelled to the United States to marry Griffith.

172. On August 26, 2024, the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida entered a judicial order of removal for Obidova and subsequently sentenced her to time served.

173. Pursuant to that judicial order of removal, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement removed Obidova to Uzbekistan on August 30, 2024.

174. Upon information and belief, Defendant left the United States in July 2022.

175. Upon information and belief, Defendant currently resides in Uzbekistan.

176. The criminal charges against Defendant remain pending.

IV. GOVERNING LAW

A. Congressionally Imposed Prerequisites to the Acquisition of Citizenship

177. No alien has a right to naturalization “unless all statutory requirements are complied with.” *United States v. Ginsberg*, 243 U.S. 472, 474-75 (1917). Indeed, the Supreme Court has underscored that “[t]here must be strict compliance with all the congressionally imposed prerequisites to the acquisition of citizenship.” *Fedorenko v. United States*, 449 U.S. 490, 506 (1981).

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

179. Congress has also mandated that an alien may not naturalize unless that person “during all periods referred to in the subsection has been and still is a person of good moral character...” 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a)(3).

180. The required statutory period for good moral character begins five years before the date the alien files the application for naturalization, and it continues until the alien takes the oath of allegiance and becomes a United States citizen. *Id.*; 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(a)(1).

181. Although Congress has not specifically defined what constitutes good moral character for naturalization purposes, the Immigration and Nationality Act lists certain classes of aliens precluded from establishing the requisite good moral character. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f).

182. Congress has explicitly precluded aliens who give false testimony for the purpose of obtaining immigration benefits from being able to establish the good moral character necessary to naturalize. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(6).

183. Further, Congress created a ‘catch-all’ provision, which states, “[t]he fact that any person is not within any of the foregoing classes shall not preclude a finding that for other reasons such person is or was not of good moral character.” 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f) (flush text).

184. Thus, aliens who commit unlawful acts adversely reflecting upon their moral character cannot meet the good moral character requirement unless they prove that extenuating circumstances lessen, palliate, or otherwise ameliorate their guilt. *See id.*; 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(3)(iii).

B. The Denaturalization Statute

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

186. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a), the Court must revoke an order of naturalization and cancel the individual's Certificate of Naturalization if his or her naturalization was either illegally procured or procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation.

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

188. Naturalization has been procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, where: (1) the naturalized citizen misrepresented or concealed some fact during the naturalization process; (2) the misrepresentation or concealment was willful; (3) the fact was material; and (4) the naturalized citizen procured citizenship as a result of the misrepresentation or concealment. *Kungys v. United States*, 485 U.S. 759, 767 (1988).

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

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

**COUNT I
ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION
NOT LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE
(SHAM MARRIAGE)**

190. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Sections I-IV of this Complaint.

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

192. The term “lawfully” requires compliance with the substantive legal requirements for admission, and not mere procedural regularity.

193. Defendant entered the United States on October 30, 2003, on a nonimmigrant visitor visa that expired on December 29, 2003.

194. After the expiration of his visa, Defendant remained in the United States and thus held no lawful immigration status.

195. As set forth above in Paragraphs 27 through 40, Defendant adjusted his immigration status to permanent resident on the basis of his sham marriage to McGee, a U.S. citizen.

196. Defendant offered McGee \$5000 to marry him.

197. Over the course of several installments, Defendant gave McGee approximately \$5,000 after they married.

198. When Defendant and McGee married, they did not intend to establish a life together.

199. Defendant and McGee never lived together and never had any sexual relations.

200. Defendant and McGee married for the sole purpose of evading the immigration laws to obtain immigration benefits for Defendant on the basis of their sham marriage.

201. USCIS cannot approve an applicant for immigration benefits based on a marriage entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws. 8 U.S.C. § 1154(c); *see also Bouarfa v. Mayorkas*, 604 U.S. 6, 10 (2024) (“If the noncitizen ‘has previously been accorded’ or ‘sought to be accorded’ an immigration benefit ‘by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws,’ the agency *must* deny the petition. This is known as the sham-marriage bar[.]”) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1154(c)).

202. Because Defendant sought to adjust status to permanent resident on the basis of his sham marriage that he and McGee entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws, Defendant obtained his permanent resident status in violation of law and thus was never lawfully admitted to permanent residence in the United States.

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

204. Because Defendant was ineligible to naturalize, he illegally procured his naturalization, and this Court must revoke his citizenship pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

COUNT II
ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION
NOT LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE
(INADMISSIBILITY DUE TO IMMIGRATION FRAUD)

205. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the factual and legal allegations contained in Sections I-IV of this Complaint.

206. Defendant was precluded from lawfully obtaining his permanent resident status because he was inadmissible when he sought permanent resident status. 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a)(2).

207. Defendant was inadmissible when he sought permanent resident status because he had committed immigration fraud. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i).

208. Defendant had committed immigration fraud by seeking permanent resident status through fraud or willful misrepresentation on his Adjustment Application. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i).

209. Defendant sought his permanent resident status through fraud or willful misrepresentation on his Adjustment Application by claiming his marriage to McGee was bona fide.

210. Defendant's claim on his Adjustment Application that his marriage to McGee was bona fide was fraudulent and a material misrepresentation because when Defendant submitted his Adjustment Application, he knew that his marriage to McGee was not bona fide.

211. When Defendant submitted his Adjustment Application, he knew that his marriage to McGee was not bona fide because when he and McGee married, Defendant and McGee did not intend to establish a life together but married to evade immigration laws to obtain immigration benefits for Defendant.

212. Because Defendant was inadmissible when he sought permanent resident status, Defendant was not lawfully admitted to permanent resident status. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a)(2).

213. Because Defendant was not lawfully admitted to permanent resident status, he was ineligible for naturalization under 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a)(1).

214. Because he was ineligible to naturalize, Defendant illegally procured his citizenship, and this Court must revoke his citizenship, as provided for by 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

COUNT III
ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION
LACK OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER
(UNLAWFUL ACTS ADVERSELY REFLECTING ON MORAL CHARACTER)

215. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Sections I-IV of this Complaint.

216. Because Defendant filed his N-400 on September 6, 2011, his statutory period during which he was required to establish good moral character began on September 6, 2006, and continued until the date he became a U.S. citizen on March 23, 2012.

217. Defendant could not establish the requisite good moral character for naturalization because he committed unlawful acts during his statutory period that reflected adversely on his moral character, and no extenuating circumstances lessen, palliate, or otherwise ameliorate his guilt. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(3)(iii).

218. Specifically, Defendant could not establish the requisite good moral character for naturalization because he committed the unlawful act of conspiring to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371.

219. As described above in Paragraphs 18 to 79, Defendant conspired to defraud the United States through impairing, obstructing, and defeating the lawful functions of the Department of Homeland Security and USCIS with respect to the application, review, investigation, and decision-making process for immigration benefits for himself and for Obidova.

220. Defendant committed the unlawful act of conspiring to defraud the United States by agreeing and joining with McGee to try to unlawfully secure immigration benefits for Defendant from the U.S. government through a sham marriage that McGee and Defendant entered into in furtherance of their conspiracy to defraud the United States.

221. Defendant committed the unlawful act of conspiring to defraud the government during his statutory period in or around 2005 when he agreed with McGee to try to unlawfully secure immigration benefits for himself.

222. Defendant performed multiple overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy to defraud the United States during his statutory period, including engaging in a sham marriage on April 12, 2005, with McGee with the intention of obtaining immigration benefits for himself.

223. Defendant also committed the unlawful act of conspiring to defraud the United States by agreeing and joining with Griffith and Obidova to try to unlawfully secure immigration benefits for Obidova from the U.S. government through a sham marriage that Obidova and Griffith entered into in furtherance of their conspiracy with Defendant.

224. Defendant committed the unlawful act of conspiring to defraud the government during his statutory period when he agreed with Griffith and Obidova in or around August 2007 to try to unlawfully secure immigration benefits for Obidova.

225. Defendant performed multiple overt acts in furtherance of this conspiracy during his statutory period, including: (a) paying for Griffith's August 2007 trip to Uzbekistan; (b) taking photographs of Griffith and Obidova during the August 2007 trip for the purpose of their later submission to U.S. immigration authorities as purported evidence of the bona fides of the relationship; (c) assisting in the preparation and filing of Obidova's I-129F in 2007, Obidova's visa petition in 2008, and Obidova's I-485 in 2010; and (d) concealing his paternity of Obidova's child O.A. on his N-400.

226. Defendant's commission of the unlawful act of conspiracy to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, adversely reflected on his moral character.

227. Defendant cannot establish extenuating circumstances regarding his unlawful acts.

228. Defendant's commission during his statutory period of the unlawful act of conspiracy to defraud the United States reflects so adversely on Defendant's moral character that no evidence of his good moral character would permit Defendant to satisfy his burden of establishing good moral character as required for naturalization.

229. Because Defendant could not establish that he was a person of good moral character within the statutory period, he was ineligible for naturalization under 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a)(3).

230. Because Defendant was ineligible to naturalize, he illegally procured his naturalization, and this Court must revoke his citizenship pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

COUNT IV
ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION
LACK OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER
(FALSE TESTIMONY)

231. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Sections I-IV of this Complaint.

232. To be eligible for naturalization, an alien must show that he is a person of good moral character and has been for the duration of the five-year statutory period before he files a naturalization application until the time he becomes a naturalized U.S. citizen. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1427(a)(3), 1429; 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(a)(1).

233. Because Defendant filed his N-400 on September 6, 2011, his statutory period during which he was required to establish good moral character began on September 6, 2006, and continued until the date he became a U.S. citizen on March 23, 2012.

234. An applicant for naturalization lacks good moral character *per se* if, during the statutory period, he gave false oral testimony, under oath, for the purpose of obtaining an immigration benefit. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(6).

235. During his statutory period on January 10, 2012, Defendant gave false oral testimony, under oath, at his Naturalization Interview to secure an immigration benefit.

236. During his Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had been married only once.

237. That testimony was false.

238. That testimony was false because prior to his Naturalization Interview, he had married Obidova after marrying McGee.

239. During his Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had no children.

240. That testimony was false.

241. That testimony was false because Defendant was the father of a child born in August 2010.

242. During his Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never committed a crime for which he had not been arrested.

243. That testimony was false.

244. That testimony was false because beginning in April 2005, and continuing until January 2024, Defendant illegally conspired to defraud the United States through impairing, obstructing, and defeating the lawful functions of the Department of Homeland Security and USCIS with respect to the application, review, investigation, and decision-making process for immigration benefits for himself and Obidova, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371.

245. During his Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never been married to more than one person at the same time.

246. That testimony was false.

247. That testimony was false because prior to his Naturalization Interview, he had married Obidova while still married to McGee.

248. During his Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never helped anyone enter the United States illegally.

249. That testimony was false.

250. That testimony was false because prior to his Naturalization Interview, he had assisted in the preparation and filing of Obidova's fraudulent fiancée visa application that, upon its approval, facilitated her illegal entry into the United States.

251. During his Naturalization Interview, Defendant said, under oath, that he had never given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for an immigration benefit.

252. That testimony was false.

253. That testimony was false because prior to his Naturalization Interview, Defendant had provided false and misleading information to USCIS in his Adjustment Application and at his Adjustment Interview about the legitimacy of his marriage to McGee and had falsely certified in his I-765 that his marriage with McGee was not for the purpose of procuring an immigration benefit.

254. Defendant gave his false testimony at his Naturalization Interview for the purpose of obtaining naturalization.

255. Because Defendant provided false testimony under oath for the purpose of obtaining naturalization during his statutory period, he was barred under 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(6) from showing that he had the good moral character necessary to become a naturalized U.S. citizen.

256. Because Defendant could not establish that he was a person of good moral character during his statutory period, he was ineligible for naturalization under 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a)(3).

257. Because he was ineligible to naturalize, Defendant illegally procured his naturalization, and this Court must revoke his citizenship pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a).

COUNT V
PROCUREMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP
BY CONCEALMENT OF A MATERIAL FACT
OR WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION

258. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Sections I-IV of this Complaint.

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

260. Defendant willfully misrepresented and concealed information in both his N-400 and during his Naturalization Interview that, if disclosed, would have revealed Defendant's participation in multiple immigration fraud schemes to unlawfully acquire immigration benefits for himself and Obidova.

261. Specifically, Defendant voluntarily and deliberately misrepresented or concealed in his N-400 and during his Naturalization Interviews the following information:

- a. Despite being the father of a child born in August 2010, Defendant represented on his N-400 and at his Naturalization Interview that he had no children.
- b. Despite having married Obidova in Uzbekistan before Obidova travelled to the United States in November 2009, Defendant represented on his N-400 and at his Naturalization Interview that he had only been married once and that McGee was his only current or former spouse.
- c. Despite entering into a marriage with Obidova in Uzbekistan while still married to McGee, Defendant represented on his N-400 and at his Naturalization Interview that he had never been married to more than one person at the same time.
- d. Despite assisting in the preparation and filing of Obidova's fraudulent fiancée visa application that, upon its approval, facilitated her illegal entry into the United States, Defendant represented on his N-400 and in his Naturalization Interview that he had never helped anyone enter the United States illegally.
- e. Despite having provided false and misleading information to USCIS about the legitimacy of his marriage to McGee in his Adjustment Application and at his Adjustment Interview and falsely certifying in his I-765 that his marriage with McGee was not for the purpose of procuring an immigration benefit, Defendant represented on his N-400 and in his Naturalization Interview that he had never given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for an immigration benefit.

262. Defendant's misrepresentations and concealments were material to his N-400 because they had a natural tendency to influence USCIS's decision whether to approve his N-400. Indeed, they bore directly on the requirements for naturalization, specifically,

Defendant's moral character and whether he had lawfully acquired permanent residence in the United States.

263. USCIS would have denied Defendant's N-400 if Defendant had truthfully responded to the questions in his N-400 and thus not concealed: (a) that his marriage to McGee was a sham entered for the purpose of obtaining immigration benefits, and (b) that he had conspired to defraud the United States by securing immigration benefits for Obidova through her sham marriage to Michael Griffith.

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

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- (1) A declaration that Defendant illegally procured his citizenship;
- (2) A declaration that Defendant procured his citizenship by concealment of material facts and by willful misrepresentation;
- (3) Judgment revoking and setting aside the order admitting Defendant to citizenship and canceling Certificate of Naturalization No. 34989023, effective as of the original date of the order and certificate, March 23, 2012;
- (4) Judgment forever restraining and enjoining Defendant from claiming any rights, privileges, benefits, or advantages under any document which evidences United States citizenship obtained through his March 23, 2012, naturalization;
- (5) Judgment requiring the Defendant to surrender and deliver, within ten days of the entry of judgment against him, his Certificate of Naturalization and any copies thereof in his possession to the Acting Attorney General through undersigned counsel for Plaintiff and to make

good faith efforts to recover and immediately surrender to the Acting Attorney General through undersigned counsel for Plaintiff any copies thereof that he knows are in the possession of others, and

(6) Judgment requiring the Defendant to surrender and deliver, within ten days of the entry of judgment against him, any other indicia of U.S. citizenship (including, but not limited to, U.S. passports and enhanced driver's licenses) and any copies thereof in his possession to the Acting Attorney General through undersigned counsel for Plaintiff and to make good faith efforts to recover and immediately surrender to the Attorney General through undersigned counsel for Plaintiff any copies thereof that he knows are in the possession of others, and

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

Dated: May 7, 2026

JEANINE FERRIS PIRRO
United States Attorney
District of Columbia

Respectfully submitted,

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

JENNIFER J. KEENEY
Associate Director
Office of Immigration Litigation

JOHN J.W. INKELES
Chief
Affirmative Litigation Unit

/s/ Hans H. Chen

HANS H. CHEN
Deputy Chief
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division
Office of Immigration Litigation
Affirmative Litigation Unit
P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
Telephone: (202) 305-0190
E-mail: hans.h.chen@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff
United States of America*