

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

**Case No. 3:26-cv-882**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>COMPLAINT TO REVOKE NATURALIZATION</b>
	)	
TAHIR LEKAJ,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

The United States of America (“Plaintiff”) brings this civil action under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) against Tahir Lekaj (“Defendant”) to revoke his U.S. citizenship. Defendant fraudulently and unlawfully procured U.S. citizenship by concealing criminal conduct in which he engaged prior to naturalizing and for which he was charged and convicted after naturalizing. Specifically, before he became a U.S. citizen, Defendant sexually assaulted a child under the age of fifteen. After naturalizing, Defendant was convicted upon a jury verdict of one count of Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003), occurring on or about January 1, 2003 and one count of Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2), occurring on or about January 1, 2003. See

State v. Tahir L., 322 A.3d 455 (Conn. App. Ct. 2024). Throughout his naturalization proceedings, Defendant misrepresented and concealed his criminal conduct, thus unlawfully procuring his naturalization.

This complaint seeks revocation of Defendant's naturalization on four independent grounds. First, Defendant illegally procured his naturalization in that he lacked the statutorily required good moral character to naturalize because he committed unlawful acts adversely reflecting on his moral character during the period when he was required to demonstrate good moral character and no extenuating circumstances exist that would lessen his guilt. Second, Defendant lacked the good moral character required to naturalize because he falsely testified under oath during his naturalization interview about his prior criminal conduct. Third, Defendant lacked the good moral character required to naturalize because he committed two or more offenses during the period he was required to demonstrate good moral character for which an aggregate sentence of five years or more was imposed. Fourth, throughout his naturalization proceedings, Defendant willfully misrepresented and concealed facts that were material to determining his naturalization eligibility.

Based on Defendant's actions described further below and in the attached affidavit showing good cause, the United States brings this civil action under

8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) to revoke and set aside the order admitting Defendant to citizenship and to cancel his Certificate of Naturalization.

## **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. This is an action filed under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) to revoke and set aside the order admitting Defendant to U.S. citizenship and to cancel Defendant's Certificate of Naturalization No. 29011009.

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

3. Venue is proper in this District under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant's residence prior to incarceration is in this District.

## **III. PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff is the United States of America.

5. Defendant is a naturalized U.S. citizen who resided in Connecticut prior to his incarceration. Defendant currently remains incarcerated.

## **IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

6. The affidavit of Dawn West, Supervisory Immigration Services Officer with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS"), Department of Homeland Security, showing good cause for this action as required by 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a), is attached as Exhibit A.

## IMMIGRATION HISTORY

7. Plaintiff was admitted to the United States on August 4, 1999.

8. On or about January 11, 2002, Defendant filed an Application to Adjust Status (“Form I-485”) with the former Immigration and Naturalization Service (“INS”).

9. The INS granted the Form I-485 on February 20, 2003, making Defendant a permanent resident as of August 4, 1999, the date of his admission.

## NATURALIZATION PROCEEDINGS

### Naturalization application

10. On or about June 21, 2004, Defendant filed with USCIS a Form N-400, Application for Naturalization (“naturalization application”).

11. A true and complete copy of Defendant’s naturalization application, except for redactions of personally identifying information that is immaterial to this action, is attached as Exhibit B.

12. On his naturalization application, Defendant answered “No” to Part 10, Section D, Question 15, which asked: “Have you **EVER** committed a crime or offense for which you were NOT arrested?” (emphasis in original).

13. On his naturalization application, Defendant answered “No” to Part 10, Section D, Question 23, which asked: “Have you **EVER** given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for any

immigration benefit or to prevent deportation, exclusion, or removal?" (emphasis in original).

14. On or about May 18, 2004, Defendant signed his naturalization application under penalty of perjury, thereby certifying that his answers to the questions therein were true and correct.

### **Naturalization interview**

15. On April 19, 2005, a USCIS officer orally interviewed Defendant regarding his naturalization application to determine his eligibility for naturalization.

16. At the beginning of the naturalization interview, the USCIS officer placed Defendant under oath.

17. During the naturalization interview, the USCIS officer asked Defendant many of the same questions included in the written naturalization application.

18. During the naturalization interview, Defendant orally testified that he never had committed a crime or offense for which he was not arrested, consistent with his written response to Part 10, Section D, Question 15.

19. During the naturalization interview, Defendant orally testified that he never had given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official

while applying for any immigration benefit, consistent with his written response to Part 10, Section D, Question 23.

20. During the naturalization interview, Defendant made eleven changes to his naturalization application, which were handwritten in red ink by the interviewing USCIS officer.

21. At the end of the naturalization interview, Defendant again signed the naturalization application in the presence of the USCIS officer and again swore that the contents of his naturalization application, including the eleven numbered changes, were true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

22. Based on the information Defendant supplied in his naturalization application and in the sworn answers he gave during his naturalization interview, USCIS approved the naturalization application on April 19, 2005.

### **Oath of allegiance**

23. On May 13, 2005, Defendant answered the questions posed on Form N-445, Notice of Naturalization Oath Ceremony.

24. On May 13, 2005, based on Defendant's approved naturalization application and on the responses he provided on the Form N-445, Defendant was administered the oath of allegiance, admitted to U.S. citizenship, and issued Certificate of Naturalization No. 29011009.

25. A true and complete copy of Defendant’s Certificate of Naturalization, except for redactions of personally identifying information that is immaterial to this action, is attached as Exhibit C.

### **CONNECTICUT STATE CRIMINAL CHARGES AND CONVICTION**

26. In case number LLI-CR20-0190440-T, the State of Connecticut charged Defendant with one count (Count 1) of Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003), occurring on or about January 1, 2003. The State also charged Defendant with one count (Count 2) of Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2), occurring on or about January 1, 2003.

27. A true and complete copy of the disposition, except for redactions of personally identifying information that is immaterial to this action, is attached as Exhibit D.

28. In 2003, under the provision charged in Count 1, a person was guilty of Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree in Connecticut if he “intentionally subjects another person to sexual contact who is . . . under fifteen years of age.” Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003).

29. In 2003, under the provision charged in Count 2, a person was guilty of Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children if he “has contact with the intimate parts, as defined in section 53a–65, of a child under the age of

sixteen years or subjects a child under sixteen years of age to contact with the intimate parts of such person, in a sexual and indecent manner likely to impair the health or morals of such child.” Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2).

30. Defendant pled not guilty to both charges.

31. A jury returned a verdict of guilty against Defendant for both of the charged counts on October 5, 2022.

32. On December 16, 2022, Defendant was sentenced to serve five years on Count 1 (the Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree count), to be served concurrently with his sentence on Count 2. Defendant was sentenced to serve twenty years, execution suspended after ten years, five years mandatory minimum, on Count 2 (the count for violating § 53-21(a)(2)), to be served concurrently with a sentence imposed in a separate criminal docket.

33. Defendant appealed to the Appellate Court of Connecticut, which affirmed the judgment. See State v. Tahir L., 322 A.3d 455 (Conn. App. Ct. 2024).

34. The Supreme Court of Connecticut denied Defendant’s petition for certification to appeal. See State v. Tahir L., 324 A.3d 141 (Conn. 2024) (Mem).

## **FALSE STATEMENTS AND TESTIMONY**

### **Commission of a Crime or Offense for Which Not Arrested**

35. On or about January 1, 2003, Defendant committed crimes for which he had not been arrested at the time he naturalized in 2005, to wit: Sexual Assault

in the Fourth Degree, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003), and Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2).

36. Accordingly, Defendant's representation in his naturalization application in response to Part 10, Section D, Question 15, that he never had committed a crime or offense for which he was not arrested, was false.

37. Likewise, Defendant's sworn testimony at his April 19, 2005 naturalization interview in response to Part 10, Section D, Question 15, that he never had committed a crime or offense for which he was not arrested, was false.

38. Defendant knew his answer to Part 10, Section D, Question 15, as well as his oral testimony in response to this question at his naturalization interview, was false because Defendant knew that, on or about January 1, 2003, prior to his naturalization proceedings, he had committed a crime by sexually assaulting a child.

**False or Misleading Information to any U.S. Government Official  
While Applying for an Immigration Benefit**

39. On or about June 21, 2004, when Defendant submitted his naturalization application, and again on April 19, 2005, when USCIS interviewed Defendant in support of his application, Defendant provided false information to a U.S. government official while applying for an immigration benefit, to wit: representing in his naturalization application and at his interview that he never had

committed a crime for which he had not been arrested, when he had committed on or about January 1, 2003 – but had not yet been arrested for – the crimes of Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003), and Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2).

40. Accordingly, Defendant’s representation in his naturalization application in response Part 10, Section D, Question 23, that he never had provided false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for an immigration benefit, was false.

41. Additionally, Defendant’s sworn testimony at his April 19, 2005 naturalization interview in response to Part 10, Section D, Question 23, that he never had provided false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for an immigration benefit, was false.

42. Defendant knew his answer to Part 10, Section D, Question 23, as well as his oral testimony in response to this question at his naturalization interview, was false because Defendant knew that, in submitting his naturalization application and interviewing in support of it, he had provided false information by representing that he never had committed a crime for which he had not been arrested.

## V. GOVERNING LAW

### Congressionally Imposed Prerequisites to the Acquisition of Citizenship

43. No individual 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) (“An alien who seeks political rights as a member of this Nation can rightfully obtain them only upon the terms and conditions specified by Congress.” (quoting Ginsberg, 243 U.S. at 474)).

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

45. The required “statutory period” for good moral character begins five years before the date the applicant files the application for naturalization, and it continues until the applicant takes the oath of allegiance and becomes a U.S. citizen. Id.; 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(a)(1).

46. Although Congress has not defined specifically what constitutes good moral character for naturalization purposes, the Immigration and Nationality Act

lists certain classes of applicants who cannot be found to have the requisite good moral character. See 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f).

47. Congress explicitly has precluded an individual from establishing the good moral character necessary to naturalize if during the statutory period he commits certain offenses described in 8 U.S.C. § 1182, of which he was convicted or to which he admits. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(3).

48. Among the offenses described in 8 U.S.C. § 1182 that preclude an individual from establishing the required good moral character are the commission of crimes for which he receives multiple criminal convictions with aggregate sentences of confinement of five years or more. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(B); see 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(2)(ii).

49. Congress also explicitly has precluded individuals who give false testimony for the purpose of obtaining immigration benefits from establishing the good moral character necessary to naturalize. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(6).

50. 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 language).

51. Thus, an individual who commits an unlawful act adversely reflecting upon his moral character cannot meet the good moral character requirement unless

he proves that extenuating circumstances existed that would palliate or ameliorate guilt. See 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(3)(iii); see also 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f) (flush language).

52. “[A] conviction during the statutory period is not necessary for a finding that an applicant lacks good moral character. It is enough that the offense was ‘committed’ during that time.” United States v. Suarez, 664 F.3d 655, 661 (7th Cir. 2011) (discussing 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(3) and 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(3)(iii)). Where an individual has been convicted, he is collaterally estopped from contesting all issues necessarily decided in the criminal matter. See id. at 663 (stating that a defendant “may not . . . re-litigate issues decided in his criminal case” in a subsequent civil denaturalization action (citing United States v. Jean-Baptiste, 395 F.3d 1190, 1192 (11th Cir. 2005))).

### **The Denaturalization Statute**

53. Recognizing that there are situations in which an individual has naturalized despite having failed 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 naturalization application, Congress enacted 8 U.S.C. § 1451.

54. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1451(a), a court must revoke an order of naturalization and cancel the individual's Certificate of Naturalization if his naturalization was either:

(i) illegally procured; or

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

55. 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.

56. Naturalization was 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).

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

## VI. CAUSES OF ACTION

### COUNT ONE ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION LACK OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER (Unlawful Acts)

58. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the factual and legal allegations set forth in Sections II through V of this Complaint.

59. As discussed above, among other requirements for naturalization, an applicant must show that he was a person of good moral character for the five-year statutory period before he filed a naturalization application and until the time he becomes a naturalized U.S. citizen. 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(a)(1).

60. Defendant was required to establish that he was a person of good moral character from June 21, 1999, until the date he became a U.S. citizen, on May 13, 2005.

61. An applicant for naturalization is barred from showing that he is a person of good moral character if he committed an unlawful act during the statutory period that reflected adversely upon his moral character and there were no extenuating circumstances that would palliate or ameliorate guilt. See 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(3)(iii); see also 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f) (flush language).

62. Defendant could not establish the requisite good moral character for naturalization because he committed an unlawful act during the statutory period that reflected adversely upon his moral character and there were no extenuating

circumstances that would palliate or ameliorate guilt. See 8 C.F.R.

§ 316.10(b)(3)(iii); see also 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f) (flush language).

63. Specifically, as set forth above in paragraphs 26 to 34, on or about January 1, 2003, Defendant sexually assaulted a child under the age of 15.

64. As a result of his crimes, on October 15, 2022, Defendant was convicted after a jury verdict of one count of Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003), occurring on or about January 1, 2003, and one count of Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2), occurring on or about January 1, 2003.

65. During his statutory good moral character period, Defendant committed the crimes of which he was convicted.

66. Defendant's convictions for sexual assault on a child reflect adversely on his moral character.

67. Defendant's conduct occurred on or about January 1, 2003, which is within his statutory good moral character period.

68. Defendant cannot establish extenuating circumstances with regard to his unlawful activity that render his conduct less reprehensible than it otherwise would be or that tend to palliate or lessen his guilt. He therefore cannot avoid the

regulatory bar on establishing good moral character found at 8 C.F.R.

§ 316.10(b)(3)(iii).

69. Because Defendant committed unlawful acts that adversely reflected on his moral character during the statutory period and he cannot demonstrate extenuating circumstances, he was barred under 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f) and 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(3)(iii) from showing that he had the good moral character necessary to become a naturalized U.S. citizen.

70. Because Defendant was not a person of good moral character, he was ineligible for naturalization under 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a)(3).

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

**COUNT TWO**  
**ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION**  
**LACK OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER**  
**(False Testimony)**

72. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the factual and legal allegations set forth in Sections II through V of this Complaint.

73. As discussed above, among other requirements for naturalization, an applicant must show that he was a person of good moral character for the five-year statutory period before he filed a naturalization application and until the time he becomes a naturalized U.S. citizen. 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(a)(1).

74. Defendant was required to establish that he was a person of good moral character from June 21, 1999, until the date he became a U.S. citizen, on May 13, 2005.

75. An applicant for naturalization is barred from showing that he is a person of good moral character if he gave false testimony, under oath, for the purpose of obtaining an immigration benefit. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(6).

76. Defendant was statutorily barred from showing that he was a person of good moral character during the statutory period because he gave false testimony, under oath, for the purpose of obtaining an immigration benefit, to wit: naturalization. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(6).

77. Defendant provided false testimony for the purpose of obtaining an immigration benefit on April 19, 2005, when he was interviewed under oath in connection with his naturalization application.

78. Specifically, while under oath, Defendant testified that he never had committed a crime for which he had not been arrested.

79. Also on April 19, 2005, Defendant testified under oath that he never had given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for any immigration benefit.

80. During his statutory good moral character period, Defendant committed the crimes of which he was convicted.

81. Defendant's testimony was false because, as described above in paragraphs 26 to 34, during the statutory period, Defendant, on or about January 1, 2003, sexually assaulted a child, but he had not yet been arrested for it.

82. Defendant's testimony was also false because, as described above, he provided false or misleading information to a U.S. government official while applying for any immigration benefit.

83. Defendant knew his testimony to be false.

84. Defendant provided false testimony for the purpose of obtaining an immigration benefit, namely, naturalization.

85. Because Defendant provided false testimony for the purpose of obtaining an immigration benefit, he lacked good moral character during the statutory good moral character period.

86. Because Defendant was not a person of good moral character, he was ineligible for naturalization under 8 U.S.C § 1427(a)(3).

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

**COUNT THREE**  
**ILLEGAL PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION**  
**LACK OF GOOD MORAL CHARACTER**  
**(Multiple Criminal Conviction)**

88. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the factual and legal allegations set forth in Sections II through V of this Complaint.

89. As discussed above, among other requirements for naturalization, an applicant must show that he was a person of good moral character for the five-year statutory period before he filed a naturalization application and until the time he becomes a naturalized U.S. citizen. See 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(a)(1).

90. Defendant was required to establish that he was a person of good moral character from June 21, 1999, until the date he became a U.S. citizen, on May 13, 2005.

91. An applicant for naturalization is statutorily barred from showing that he was a person of good moral character during the statutory period if he committed crimes during his statutory period for which he received multiple criminal convictions and for which the aggregate sentences of confinement were 5 years or more. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(3) (cross-referencing 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(B)); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(2)(ii).

92. Defendant was statutorily barred from showing that he was a person of good moral character during the statutory period because he committed crimes

during his statutory period for which he received multiple criminal convictions and for which the aggregate sentences of confinement were 5 years or more. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(3) (cross-referencing 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(B)); 8 C.F.R. § 316.10(b)(2)(ii).

93. Specifically, as set forth above in paragraph 26 to 34, on or about January 1, 2003, Defendant sexually assaulted a child under the age of 15.

94. As a result of his crimes, on October 15, 2022, Defendant was convicted after a jury verdict of one count of Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003), occurring on or about January 1, 2003, and one count of Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2), occurring on or about January 1, 2003.

95. During his statutory good moral character period, Defendant committed the crimes of which he was convicted.

96. On December 16, 2022, Defendant was sentenced to serve five years on Count 1 (the Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree count), to be served concurrently with his sentence on Count 2. Defendant was sentenced to serve twenty years, execution suspended after ten years, five years mandatory minimum, on Count 2 (the count for violating § 53-21(a)(2)), to be served concurrently with a sentence imposed in a separate criminal docket.

97. Defendant thus was sentenced, in aggregate, to five or more years in prison as a result of his convictions.

98. Because Defendant committed crimes during the statutory period for which he received multiple convictions and was sentenced to an aggregate sentence of five or more years, he was barred under 8 U.S.C. § 1101(f)(3) (cross-referencing 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(B)) from showing that he had the good moral character necessary to become a naturalized U.S. citizen.

99. Because Defendant could not establish the requisite good moral character, he was ineligible to naturalize. See 8 U.S.C. § 1427(a)(3).

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

**COUNT FOUR**  
**PROCUREMENT OF NATURALIZATION**  
**BY CONCEALMENT OF A MATERIAL FACT**  
**OR WILLFUL MISREPRESENTATION**

101. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference the factual and legal allegations set forth in Sections II through V of this Complaint.

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

103. As a result of his crimes, on October 15, 2022, Defendant was convicted after a jury verdict of one count of Sexual Assault in the Fourth Degree, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53a-73a(a)(1)(A) (Rev. to 2003), occurring on or about January 1, 2003, and one count of Injury or Risk of Injury to, or Impairing Morals of, Children, in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 53-21(a)(2), occurring on or about January 1, 2003.

104. Defendant committed the crimes of which he was convicted.

105. As set forth above, throughout his naturalization process, including in his N-400 naturalization application and during his April 19, 2005 naturalization interview, Defendant concealed his criminal actions and willfully misrepresented that (a) he never had committed a crime or offense for which he had not been arrested; and (b) he never had given false or misleading information to any U.S. government official while applying for an immigration benefit.

106. Specifically, Defendant represented on his naturalization application and during his naturalization interview that he never had knowingly committed any crime or offense for which he had not been arrested, despite knowing that such representations were false and misleading.

107. Defendant also represented during his naturalization interview that he never had given false or misleading information to any U.S. Government official

while applying for any immigration benefit, despite knowing that his representation was false and misleading.

108. Defendant knew these two representations were false and misleading, and he therefore provided these two resulting misrepresentations willfully.

109. Defendant's misrepresentations were material to his naturalization because the disclosure of his sexual assault conduct and the disclosure that, in submitting his naturalization application and interviewing in support of it, he lied about his sexual assault conduct, would have had a natural tendency to influence USCIS's decision whether to approve Defendant's naturalization application because such information directly related to statutory and regulatory eligibility criteria that USCIS is required to consider when deciding whether to grant or deny a naturalization application.

110. Indeed, Defendant's criminal conduct precluded him from establishing the requisite good moral character to naturalize. Had Defendant disclosed the truth about his criminal conduct, his ineligibility for naturalization would have been revealed, and USCIS would not have approved his application and would not have administered the oath of allegiance.

111. Finally, Defendant procured his naturalization because of his misrepresentations and concealment. Had Defendant disclosed the truth about his criminal conduct, he would have disclosed his ineligibility for naturalization, and

USCIS would not have approved his application or administered the oath of allegiance.

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

### **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 and willful misrepresentation of material facts;
3. Judgment revoking and setting aside Defendant's naturalization and canceling Certificate of Naturalization No. 29011009, effective as of the original date of the order and certificate, May 13, 2005;
4. Judgment forever restraining and enjoining Defendant from claiming any rights, privileges, benefits, or advantages related to U.S. citizenship that he obtained as a result of his May 13, 2005, naturalization;
5. Judgment requiring Defendant to surrender and deliver, within ten days after the entry of judgment against him, his Certificate of Naturalization and any copies thereof in his possession – and to make good faith efforts to recover and immediately surrender any copies thereof that he knows are in the possession of

others – to the Attorney General or his representative, including undersigned counsel;

6. Judgment requiring Defendant to surrender and deliver, within ten days after the entry of judgment against him, any other indicia of U.S. citizenship (including, but not limited to, U.S. passports, passport cards, and Enhanced Drivers Licenses, whether valid or expired), and any copies thereof in his possession – and to make good faith efforts to recover and then surrender any copies thereof that he knows are in the possession of others – to the Attorney General or his representative, including undersigned counsel; and

7. Judgment granting the United States such other relief as may be

lawful and proper in this case.

DATED: June 4, 2026

DAVID X. SULLIVAN  
United States Attorney

MICHELLE L. MCCONAGHY,  
CT27157

Assistant United States Attorney  
United States Attorney's Office  
157 Church Street  
New Haven, CT 06510  
(203) 821-3700  
michelle.mcconaghy@usdoj.gov

Respectfully submitted,

BRETT A. SHUMATE  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Division  
United States Department of Justice

JENNIFER J. KEENEY  
Associate Director  
Office of Immigration Litigation

JOHN J.W. INKELES  
Chief  
Denaturalization Unit

HOLLY M. SMITH  
Assistant Director  
Office of Immigration Litigation

By:

s/ Aric A. Anderson  
ARIC A. ANDERSON, PHV209412  
Trial Attorney  
United States Department of Justice  
Civil Division  
Office of Immigration Litigation  
P.O. Box 878, Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, DC 20044  
(202) 532-4434  
aric.anderson@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for the United States of America*