

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

Comment # Topic	Comment	USCIS Response
1	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>I am against the reinstatement of public bonds for travelers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It creates unnecessary financial barriers for families <p>It duplicates existing financial scrutiny (affidavit of support, income checks). It unfairly delays issuance for applicants.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien’s circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>The statutory requirements and procedures for processing immigrant visa applications are different from those for adjustment of status. The Department of State (DOS) and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) will continue to follow the applicable laws, regulations, and policies when determining whether to invite an alien to submit a public charge bond. The comment regarding the use of public charge bonds for travelers is outside the scope of this form revision.</p>
2	Commenter: Anonymous	

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

<p>I am writing to express my opposition to the reinstatement of Form I-945 and the associated Public Charge Bond requirement, specifically as it pertains to the families of disabled United States Veterans.</p> <p>As a Permanently and Totally (P&T) Disabled Veteran, I am deeply concerned that these changes create an unnecessary and discriminatory barrier for families who have already demonstrated self-sufficiency through earned federal benefits.</p> <p>1. Redundancy with CHAMPVA Coverage My spouse is already enrolled in and approved for CHAMPVA. This is a comprehensive, federally-funded health benefits program provided to the dependents of disabled veterans. Under the proposed "totality of circumstances" test, health and potential medical costs are primary factors. Because the Department of Veterans Affairs already guarantees my spouse's healthcare, there is zero risk of my spouse becoming a public charge due to medical expenses. Requiring a bond (I-945) from a family that already has government-backed private healthcare is redundant and serves no logical purpose other than to create a financial hurdle.</p> <p>2. Financial Hardship for Fixed-Income Veterans A 100% P&T disability rating provides a stable, guaranteed income, but it is a fixed income. Forcing a Veteran family to produce upwards of \$8,000 to \$15,000 for a "public charge bond" is a significant financial shock that could lead to the indefinite separation of our family. This rule effectively penalizes Veterans for their service-connected disabilities by assuming their household is "at risk" despite their income being guaranteed by the very government seeking the bond.</p> <p>3. The Unfair Impact of the "Visa Pause" The current suspension of visa processing for 75 countries, including Thailand, has already placed my wife and I in a state of limbo.</p> <p>To end this pause by implementing a high-cost bond requirement—without a specific exemption for Veteran families who provide CHAMPVA—is a betrayal of the promise to care for those who have served.</p> <p>Recommendation: I urge the Department of Homeland Security to include a categorical exemption from the Public Charge Bond requirement for any immigrant spouse who is currently enrolled in or eligible for CHAMPVA.</p> <p>Furthermore, a signed Affidavit of Support (I-864) from a P&T Veteran should be given "heavy favorable weight" that automatically overcomes the need for a bond, given the permanence of the sponsor's income.</p> <p>Veterans with foreign spouses often serve as the primary 'financial bridge' for their families. When a bond requirement is added, it does not merely vet the immigrant; it specifically targets the Veteran's savings. For a disabled Veteran on a fixed income, this creates an unnecessary financial penalty for military service.</p> <p>My wife is highly self-sufficient: she is well educated, fluent in English, and has maintained 20 years of continuous</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of INA in the plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded alien becomes a public charge, as required by INA 213.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

	<p>employment with the same employer.</p> <p>We are not seeking handouts. While I recognize the necessary purpose of these rules in safeguarding our immigration and naturalization process, they lack the flexibility required for families in my situation.</p> <p>As a P&T Veteran with service-connected health considerations, my ability to remain in Thailand is limited. We need to return to the U.S. to launch our small business and get on with our lives. I urge the Department to consider the guaranteed healthcare (CHAMPVA) and income already provided by Veteran sponsors as more than sufficient to meet the goals of this rule without the need for a burdensome bond.</p> <p>Thank You For Your Attention To This Matter.</p> <p>Respectfully, Army Combat Veteran OEF Hooah!</p>	<p>This form is related only to the submission of public charge bonds, and this form may only be submitted after an officer has determined an alien is inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4). This form does not change how a public charge inadmissibility determination is made, and suggestions for changes to the inadmissibility determination are outside the scope of this project. Delays or pauses to visa issuance are also outside the scope of this project.</p>
3	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>I am submitting this comment as a U.S. citizen sponsor currently petitioning for my spouse and our soon-to-be-born child. I believe in the principle of financial self-sufficiency for immigrants, but I am concerned that the proposed reinstatement of Form I-945, without clear income thresholds, creates an unnecessary financial burden on families who have already proven they are not a public charge risk.</p> <p>As a sponsor, I have already signed a Form I-864, Affidavit of Support. This is a legally binding contract that holds me financially responsible for my family. For any sponsor with an annual income of \$100,000 or more, this existing contract is already an ironclad guarantee.</p> <p>Requiring a secondary cash bond (Form I-945) from someone in the top 20% of American earners—nearly 400% of the federal poverty line—serves no "practical utility" for the government. It is a redundant requirement that does not add any security beyond what is already provided by a high-income I-864.</p> <p>I would like the agency to consider the impact on a household expecting a child. Even for a family that can afford the "hit," locking away thousands of dollars in a bond is a poor use of capital that should be going toward prenatal care, hospital bills, and a child's future.</p> <p>While the agency notes that tourist visa bonds now range from \$5,000 to \$15,000, applying these high amounts to permanent immigrants with stable, high-earning U.S. citizen sponsors feels punitive rather than protective.</p> <p>Recommendation for a "Safe Harbor" and a Predictable Cap</p> <p>To make this rule more efficient and fair, I recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A \$100,000 Safe Harbor Waiver: USCIS should implement an automatic waiver of Form I-945 for any U.S. citizen sponsor who earns \$100,000 or more. At this income level, the sponsor has clearly demonstrated the ability to support their family without government aid. • An \$8,000 Maximum Bond Cap: To provide families with the ability to plan their finances, the agency should 	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

	<p>establish a clear "ceiling" for the bond. I propose a maximum of \$8,000. Having a predictable cap ensures the bond remains a safety net and does not become an insurmountable barrier to family reunification.</p> <p>Conclusion The immigration system should reward financial stability. By exempting high-earning sponsors and capping bond amounts, USCIS can focus its resources on truly borderline cases while supporting the stability of hard-working American families.</p>	<p>DHS has not set a maximum public charge bond amount in the bond regulations. In setting the bond amount, USCIS officers consider all pertinent facts and circumstances specific to the alien and set the bond in an amount of at least \$1,000. This is consistent with the discretionary authority Congress provided in INA 213.</p>
4	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>Adopted children and biological children under the age of 18 acquire U.S. citizenship upon entering the United States on IR-3 or IR-2 visas and taking up residence with their petitioners. Public charge concerns do not apply to American citizens; therefore, IR-3 adopted children and IR-2 adopted and biological children should be exempted from this visa pause.</p>	<p>USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>The suggestion made by this commenter is outside the scope of this form reinstatement with changes.</p>
5	Commenter: Shamira Khanam	
	<p>I am writing as an individual to strongly support the reinstatement of the Public Charge Bond (Form I-945). My family has been waiting for our F4 immigrant visa since 2005, and we believe this bond type is a very important tool for families. We encourage this bond because it provides a second chance for applicants who might otherwise be denied under the public charge rule.</p> <p>Instead of a final refusal, the bond allows a family to provide a financial guarantee to the U.S. government, ensuring that the applicant will be self-sufficient. We believe continuing this bond option is a fair way to allow more people to join their families in the United States while protecting public resources.</p> <p>We highly encourage the government to finalize and continue using this form.</p> <p>Sincerely, Shamira Khanam</p>	<p>This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>
6.	Commenter: Gazi Ishtiaq	
	<p>I respectfully oppose reinstating the Public Charge Bond requirement. Immigrant visa applicants already undergo rigorous financial scrutiny through the Affidavit of Support and related documentation. Adding a bond imposes an unnecessary financial burden, delays family reunification, and creates inequities between applicants processed by USCIS and those processed at consulates abroad. The bond does not enhance public charge determinations but instead punishes families who have already waited years. I urge USCIS and OMB not to impose this bond requirement and instead rely on existing statutory safeguards.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		<p>inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support under Section 213 of INA in the plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded alien becomes a public charge as required by INA 213.</p>
7.	Commenter: MIR RIZWAN SHAH	
	<p>I am from Pakistan and residing in UAE, and an EB2-NIW candidate. I support this initiative of bond to not allow immigrants who intend to become an unnecessary burden on public funds. On the other hand, I request the government to expedite the process especially for EB1 and EB2 categories for the benefit of the country(USA) and for the candidates professional ventures. I kindly request the good offices to lift the pause at the earliest.</p>	<p>Response: This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>
8.	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>I oppose reinstating the public charge bond. It creates unnecessary financial burden on families. Instead of bonds, why can't we fix the method of eligibility for public assistance programs?</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		The suggestion made by this commenter is outside the scope of this form reinstatement.
9.	Commenter: Anonymous	
	I am for the bond, anything to get my husband’s petition approved and allow him to come be with our child. Hope this is instated soon.	Response: This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.
10.	Commenter: Kervens Dor	
	<p>I am writing to express my concern regarding the recent pause in visa processing affecting nationals from approximately 75 countries, based on the administration’s interpretation of public charge risk. This policy is highly debatable and raises serious legal and ethical concerns.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed Form I-945, Public Charge Bond, appears to contradict the long-standing purpose of Form I-864, Affidavit of Support. Form I-864 already places a legally binding obligation on U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents to financially support sponsored immigrants and ensure they do not rely on public benefits. This framework has been sufficient for decades.</p> <p>Moreover, many of these immigrants are on a direct path to U.S. citizenship. They work legally, contribute to the economy, and pay thousands of dollars annually in federal, state, and local taxes—just like other Americans. Based on these contributions, they should not be categorically excluded from public benefits, particularly when the majority do not rely on them at all.</p> <p>This policy unfairly targets immigrants who follow the legal process, are sponsored by family members or major U.S. businesses, and work hard to support themselves and their communities. The introduction of Form I-945 is unnecessary and discriminatory, given that immigrant admissions have historically been supported through family sponsorship and employment-based programs without the need for such a bond.</p> <p>The current approach has already generated significant scrutiny and will likely face extensive legal challenges in the courts. I urge USCIS to reconsider policies that undermine fairness, contradict existing regulations, and disproportionately burden lawful immigrants who are contributing members of society.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien’s circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support under Section 213 of INA in the</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		<p>plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded alien becomes a public charge, as required by INA 213.</p> <p>This form is related only to the submission of public charge bonds. Delays or pauses to visa issuance are outside the scope of this form revision.</p>
11.	Commenter: Amy Alicea	
	<p>My husband is a Syrian resident and I am a resident of the us, Pennsylvania for 61 years. We have been navigating the immigration system since November of 2023. We have supplied everything legally and through a lawyer and I'll documents have been filed for my husband to immigrate to the US. Finally after 2 years in April of 2025 we received a notice that we had an interview date at the embassy of Jordan in April of 2025. My husband and myself flew to Jordan and had his interview and supplied all the necessary documents needed. They requested a translation of my husband's military book and a joint sponsor. We supplied this through our lawyer to them in June of 2025. From June of 2025 till December 16th of 2025 we were put in administrative processing with me emailing the embassy of Jordan and through my lawyer requesting if they needed any additional information and we were told no. On December 16th 2025 I received an email stating for my husband to supply them with his passport a new photo and have a new medical exam done since his expired because we were put in administrative processing for longer than 6 months. By the time my husband obtained a Visa and we obtained another \$1,000 for him to travel back to Jordan it was January 4th 2026. On that date my husband had a new exam supplied his passport and new photo to the Embassy of Jordan. On January 5th 2026 I received an email from the embassy of Jordan for my husband to come pick up his passport they were unable to stamp it for a Visa due to the president's policy. I need to be a voice for all the immigrants who are doing this legally and through lawyers. We have did everything legally and navigated the system and supplied all proper documents for my husband to come only to be told of this. We have over \$20,000 in travel filing fees and legal fees only to be told this could not happen and do not have a definite date for my husband to come in sight. This is cause great financial mental anguish to me and my family. The President should have supplied waivers to the people who have done this legally. I need to be a voice and I need to have this addressed as to why the people who have done this legally are now put together with illegal immigrants. I need you to address this situation and I need to know why you have put us in the same situation as the illegal immigrants. Please tell me why you are not taking into consideration the people who have spent so much money so much time and followed everything down to the law that you have not taken this into</p>	<p>Response: This comment is case-specific and outside the scope of this form reinstatement with revisions.</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

	<p>consideration. I need some answers. Why are we being punished when we are following the law and the system as was set. May I ask did his policy take effect January 1st or now as I'm reading it the policy ban does not take effect until January 21st 2026. Can you please help us my husband was refused his Visa stamp at the embassy of Jordan on January 4th 2026. I'm questioning it now the date. Anything you could do would be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Amy Alicea</p>	
<p>12.</p>	<p>Commenter: Anonymous (3)</p>	
	<p>This is UNJUST because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It creates unnecessary financial barriers for families. • It duplicates existing financial scrutiny (affidavit of support, income checks). • It unfairly delays issuance for applicants already waiting years. • It risks unequal treatment between USCIS and consular applicants. 	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support under Section 213 of INA in the plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		<p>requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded alien becomes a public charge, as required by INA 213.</p> <p>The statutory requirements and procedures for consular processing are different from those for adjustment of status. DOS and DHS will continue to follow the applicable laws, regulations, and policies for an alien’s specific benefit request to make a public charge bond determination.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Commenter: Anonymous</p>	
	<p>This only harms people trying to do it right.</p>	<p>Response: This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p>Commenter: Jasmin Clarke</p>	
	<p>I am a U.S. citizen submitting this comment as a family-based immigration sponsor who is petitioning for my husband.</p> <p>My husband has been steadily employed in Jamaica for over nine years. He fully supports himself, manages his own finances responsibly, and contributes to the care of his family. He has a long, proven history of working, paying his obligations, and living independently without reliance on public assistance.</p> <p>By immigrating to the United States, my husband would bring these same strong work ethics and financial responsibility with him. Rather than becoming a public charge, he would be a contributing member of American society, working, paying taxes, and helping to strengthen a household that is currently supported by one income. His presence would allow our family to grow economically from one working adult to two, increasing overall household stability and tax contributions.</p> <p>I respectfully urge USCIS to recognize that in family-based immigration cases like mine, the Affidavit of Support (Form I-864) already provides substantial and enforceable protection against public charge concerns. Sponsors are required to meet strict income thresholds, submit extensive financial documentation, and accept long-term legal responsibility to reimburse the government for any means-tested public benefits used by the immigrant. Reinstating or broadly applying a public charge bond would create an unnecessary and duplicative financial burden on U.S. citizen families who are already fully compliant with the law. Such a requirement would disproportionately impact working families and delay lawful family reunification without offering meaningful additional safeguards.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien’s circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

	<p>If USCIS determines that a public charge bond must exist, it should be applied only in rare, clearly defined circumstances, based on individualized assessments, and not imposed automatically or broadly in family-based cases where the sponsor has demonstrated financial stability.</p> <p>Family reunification is a cornerstone of U.S. immigration law. Policies that unnecessarily delay or financially burden U.S. citizens seeking to reunite with their spouses undermine this principle and place undue strain on American families.</p> <p>I respectfully request that USCIS rely on the existing Affidavit of Support framework rather than reinstating or expanding the use of public charge bonds in family-based immigration cases.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit this comment</p>	<p>circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support under Section 213 of INA in the plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded alien b becomes a public charge, as required by INA 213.</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>Commenter: Anonymous</p>	
	<p>I support any measure that helps reunite families who have been waiting years to do things the legal way. If this bond helps resolve long-standing case pauses, it is a welcome tool. However, I urge the Department to ensure the bond amount is reasonable so it does not become an impossible financial burden for families just trying to be together.</p>	<p>Response: This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>Commenter: Anonymous</p>	
	<p>It can't be that a legally married couple have to pay a bond to let be together and raise a family with kids together. It defeats the whole arrangement of marriage. Let's find ways of exposing fake marriages and let people pay the penalty for default instead of a bond. Thanks</p>	<p>Response: This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>
<p>17.</p>	<p>Commenter: Patricia Duff</p>	
	<p>Yes, I support reinstating the public charge. Please review all comments carefully, and please audit. Immigrant communities are attempting to overwhelm US citizen comments to oppose reinstatement of public charge.</p> <p>Please see here: https://www.reddit.com/r/immigration/comments/1qlz8/potential_new_public_charge_bonds_for_immigrant/</p>	<p>Response: This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

	<p>If this were not an issue with foreign visitors, they would not need to game the public comment section.</p> <p>Reinstate public charge.</p>	
18.	<p>Commenter: Mike Mike</p> <p>Public charge bonds should be required only in cases where an individualized, fact-specific determination shows a meaningful risk of becoming a public charge, rather than applied broadly or presumptively. USCIS policy has historically treated public charge bonds as a discretionary safeguard, used only after a finding of likely public charge and not as a blanket requirement. Preserving this targeted approach is critical to avoiding unnecessary financial barriers for otherwise admissible applicants.</p> <p>In parallel, USCIS should reevaluate the income threshold for Form I-864, Affidavit of Support. The current requirement of 125% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines simultaneously allows a sponsor to qualify as financially sufficient while remaining eligible for certain means-tested public benefits. This structural inconsistency undermines the purpose of both the affidavit of support and the public charge framework and warrants regulatory review to ensure coherence and fairness.</p> <p>Finally, if public charge bonds are reinstated, the process should be fully digitized. Petitioners already maintain a myUSCIS online account for filing Form I-130 and related benefits. Requiring applicants to prepare, mail, and manually process Form I-945 introduces unnecessary friction, delays, and administrative cost. The bond form should be submitted electronically through myUSCIS, with bond payments made online, consistent with modern USCIS filing practices and basic principles of efficient government service delivery.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>The sufficiency determination of the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA is a separate determination from the public charge inadmissibility determination made under INA 212(a)(4)(B). When required, an alien must submit a sufficient Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA in order to avoid being found inadmissible as likely at any time to become a public charge. However, the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA is only part of the totality of the circumstances determination and an alien may still be inadmissible under INA 212(a)(4),</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		<p>even if he or she has submitted a sufficient Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. The income threshold is a statutory requirement in INA 213A that cannot be changed through form instructions or regulations and must be done by Congress.</p> <p>USCIS continues to expand its online services and digital form availability as part of ongoing modernization efforts. While not all forms are currently available in digital format, USCIS regularly reviews and updates its processes to improve accessibility and efficiency</p>
19.	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>I strongly urge against reinstating the Public Charge Bond requirement. Immigrant visa applicants already face rigorous financial scrutiny through the Affidavit of Support and related documentation. Adding a bond would impose an undue financial burden, delay family reunification, and create unfair disparities between applicants processed by USCIS and those processed at consulates abroad. The bond doesn't improve public charge assessments, but instead penalizes families who've already waited years. I encourage USCIS and OMB to rely on existing statutory safeguards rather than imposing this unnecessary bond requirement.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		<p>inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support under Section 213 of INA in the plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded becomes a public charge, as required by INA 213.</p> <p>The statutory requirements and procedures for consular processing are different from those for adjustment of status. DOS and DHS will continue to follow the applicable laws, regulations, and policies for an alien's specific benefit request to make a public charge bond determination.</p>
20.	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>I am a US citizen and am separated from my wife due to the 39 country travel ban. I make well over the federal poverty limits and do not receive or absorb any welfare benefits and neither will my wife. if this form means that my wife will be eligible for an exemption from the travel ban given we prove that she will not be a public charge then I welcome it, considering it does not put unreasonable financial burden on petitioners who already make enough. The travel ban is really hurting a lot of US citizens and it makes us go through great emotional, psychological and financial distress. the implementation of this form is welcomed considering it will unite us with our spouses and children</p>	<p>Response: This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p>
21.	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>I am commenting on the reinstatement, with change, of the Public Charge Bond information collection (Form I-945).</p> <p>My husband is from Ghana, and my family is experiencing the impact of this policy firsthand. We recently attended our immigrant visa interview, which seemed to go well, but the very next day our case was placed into 221(g) administrative processing without explanation due to a visa pause affecting countries like Ghana. This has already created significant uncertainty, emotional strain, and separation for our family.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

	<p>I work full time as a healthcare worker in the United States, caring for patients, paying taxes, and supporting our household without any public benefits. We are financially self-sufficient and committed to building our life here.</p> <p>I considered the K-1 fiancé visa but ultimately chose the spousal immigrant visa (CR-1) process because I wanted to do things properly from the start. Now, the existing visa pause combined with the potential reinstatement of public charge bonds adds additional layers of paperwork, cost, and stress on families who are already trying to follow the law.</p> <p>Reinstating a public charge bond would create further financial and procedural barriers for U.S. citizens and their spouses, even when petitioners are clearly capable of supporting their families without government assistance. This risks prolonging family separation and undermines the principle of family unity in U.S. immigration policy.</p> <p>Please consider how these information collections and bond requirements affect real U.S. citizens and their families who are working, contributing, and simply trying to live together lawfully in this country.</p>	<p>being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p>
22.	Commenter: John Tumbaco	
	<p>I oppose reinstating the Public Charge Bond. It creates unnecessary financial barriers for families. It duplicates existing financial scrutiny (affidavit of support, income checks). It unfairly delays issuance for applicants already waiting years. It risks unequal treatment between USCIS and consular applicants.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>The statutory requirements and procedures for consular processing are different from those for</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		adjustment of status. DOS and DHS will continue to follow the applicable laws, regulations, and policies for an alien's specific benefit request to make a public charge bond determination.
23.	Commenter: lillian sandlin	
	<p>I oppose the reinstatement of this bond. I am a US-born citizen who is currently in the process of getting my Pakistani-born husband an immigration visa so our family can live together in the US. Pakistan is one of the countries affected by the immigration visa pause against 75 countries to evaluate if we need more rules or fees to avoid public charge issues for immigrants from these countries. I believe that the existing rules are enough, and having to pay extra money that could go towards things like housing, moving costs, etc to a bond is an unnecessary hurdle given that we already have to file an affidavit of support to prove our financial stability. Requiring the I-945 bond will create an unfair financial burden on families going through the immigration process. I strongly OPPOSE</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien's circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p>
24.	Commenter: Anonymous	
	<p>While I strongly support any measure taken by the govt to prevent fraudulent public charge by incoming immigrants and even US citizens, I also oppose an approach of collective punishment. For hardworking and law-abiding US Citizen sponsors who have earned consistently more than 250K+ annually for many years and paid due tax should not have to pay bond again redundantly for their loved ones who intend to immigrate despite proving solid financial strength and sponsorship commitment thru the regular instruments such as affidavit of support, tax transcript, W2, employment verification, etc. Bond requirement assessment should be subjective not a blanket approach.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

		<p>submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien’s circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p>
<p>25.</p>	<p>Commenter: Anonymous</p>	
	<p>The public charge bond proposed rule lacks particularity and specificity in its application and review. The immigrant visa application process is already burdensome and takes many years for many to complete. The government should provide clarity to ease the burden of applicants and adjudicating officers alike. The proposed rule must outline clearer standards as to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Who the public charge bond will apply to, 2) The amount of the public charge, and 3) The ability to terminate the bond. <p>1) There is no clear indication of how someone will be identified as to requiring a bond. We currently have the I-864 affidavit of support, which is determined by 125% of the HHS poverty guidelines, and creates liability for the sponsor(s) to pay if the intended immigration uses public benefits. This rule proposes no such source or clear line of distinction for applicability. This leaves an agency officer with wide discretion, and could be applied unevenly against nationals of certain countries, which is in direct conflict with Congress's explicit national treatment provision outlined in the INA. Therefore, there must be an identified scale, for example using the HHS poverty guidelines, to determine public charge applicability. Clearly defining who would be subject to the charge enables petitioners and beneficiaries to prepare their visa applications with predictable information and make family reunification plans according to their incomes.</p> <p>2) The proposed rule does not indicate the amount of the charge or how the amount correlates to the beneficiary's risk of being a public charge. There must be some standard to apply in determining the bond amount that is set by the agency and reviewed at specified intervals. For example, setting the maximum bond at 20% of the HHS poverty guidelines with yearly review of the percentages. Further, the agency should tier the bond levels and clearly outline how the tiers correlate to an individual's risk of becoming a public charge. For example, providing consular officers with a list of potential public charge criteria, and for every criteria checked off, a point is added. Points are clustered into ranges within the tiers, e.g. 10% HHS poverty guideline public charge bond for 1-3 points, 15% HHS poverty guideline for 4-5 points, and so forth. This would provide clarity to petitioners,</p>	<p>Response: USCIS will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Public charge bonds are not required to be submitted by all aliens applying for adjustment of status. A public charge bond allows an alien who has been found to be inadmissible only based on being likely at any time to become a public charge to nonetheless be admitted. Before inviting an alien inadmissible under the public charge ground to submit a public charge bond, the officer will have first considered the totality of the alien’s circumstances, including the mandatory statutory factors in INA 212(a)(4)(B), the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA (if required), and any receipt of public benefits by the alien and determined, based on those facts and circumstances that the alien is likely at any time to become a public charge.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of INA in</p>

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

	<p>beneficiaries, and officers alike in making determinations.</p> <p>3) The proposed rule outlines how a bond may be terminated, but does not elaborate further on the ability to terminate the bond when the individual is no longer at risk of being a public charge. This specific part of the rule must be rewritten or supplemented with clarity and specificity, for example, outlining that provided the household income is 400% of the HHS poverty guidelines the bond may be terminated at request of the petitioner or beneficiary.</p> <p>At its core, the public charge bond rule is an interest free loan the government is taking in exchange for legal status. There is no guarantee where this money will be stored or what it will be used for while within government hands. This is an affront to due process and the spirit of this nation's immigration laws, which is uniquely designed for family reunification and does not discriminate based on national origin.</p> <p>This rule is only going to make it harder for people to have families in the United States and live out the American dream. I myself am unable to start a family, at childrearing age, because my spouse's immediate relative visa is on indefinite hold during the current 75-country immigrant visa pause. The biological tock is clicking for myself, and many others, and the declining birthrate and immigration rate will cause ripples throughout the US economy now and for decades to come. Thus, the short earned gain of this bond is at the cost of future prosperity for this country. While we all understand and respect the need to protect national security, the government must, at minimum, provide further clarity to anyone going through this already complicated, long, and stressful process and can do so through the proposed steps above.</p>	<p>the plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded alien becomes a public charge, as required by INA 213.</p> <p>DHS has not set a maximum public charge bond amount in the bond regulations. In setting the bond amount, USCIS officers consider all pertinent facts and circumstances specific to the alien and set the bond in an amount of at least \$1,000. This is consistent with the discretionary authority Congress provided in INA 213. DHS disagrees that public charge bonds function like interest free loans. As indicated in the USCIS Policy Manual, where USCIS collects a cash bond from the obligor, once that bond is cancelled, USCIS must return the interest that accrued on the amount. See, https://www.uscis.gov/policy-manual/volume-8-part-g-chapter-12</p>
<p>26.</p>	<p>Commenter: Amy Smith</p>	
	<p>I am writing as a United States citizen. My husband and I are co-sponsoring our son's wife. Their case is at the NVC stage and the 75 country pause has caused a lot of confusion. We believe that our assets and income will meet the standards laid out to overcome the public charge question. Having said that, if the rules are changed as to income levels required and our assets are deemed to not be enough, we support the bond as a way to avoid having the visa denied and a longer wait period. I believe it is fair to look at each case to determine public charge risk, as the parameters are already quite stringent, but maybe the bond would simplify the process somewhat. After almost two years of this process, with our US citizen son and his hopeful immigrant wife, we want the chance to prove that she will not become a public charge.</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>This comment does not propose any changes and USCIS will not make any changes based on this comment.</p>
<p>27.</p>	<p>Commenter: Anonymous</p>	

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments (regulations.gov): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations (federalregister.gov):

<p>As a U.S. citizen, who petitioned for my Jamaican husband and stepson through lawful family-based immigrant visas, I strongly oppose reinstating the public charge bond. This policy creates unnecessary financial hardship for families who have followed every legal step, punishing us for doing exactly what the law requires.</p> <p>Petitioners are already required to submit a legally binding Affidavit of Support (Form I-864). If financial documents show insufficiency, they must secure a joint sponsor. Those signing the affidavit are held financially responsible and fully aware they must support the immigrant, prevent reliance on public benefits, and face severe consequences if the immigrant becomes a public charge.</p> <p>Many families are already strained, single-handedly supporting two households across countries while covering duplicate rent, travel, and daily living costs. The emotional devastation of prolonged separation is overwhelming. A public charge bond would force us and other families to lock up our savings in government-held security. Forcing families to pay a bond would deplete their savings and tie up funds needed for essentials to avoid becoming a public charge such as housing, food, and medical care once they migrate to the U.S.</p> <p>The bond's design is fundamentally flawed and subjective. Leaving its necessity and amount entirely to individual consular officers invites bias, inconsistency, and unequal treatment. Two families with identical finances, assets, and circumstances could face wildly different demands—one ordered to post \$1,000, another hit with \$8,000—solely based on the officer assigned to their case. This erodes public trust, undermines due process, and treats compliant U.S. citizens like cash cows rather than partners in a fair immigration system.</p> <p>My husband exemplifies the self-sufficiency this bond falsely questions. College-educated with trade certifications in construction and culinary skills, he's highly employable despite rebuilding his life twice after fire and Hurricane Melissa losses. He's never sought public aid and lives by a simple principle: "If given a broom, I'd sweep the streets for honest work." Suggesting families like ours need extra financial shackles insults his character, work ethic, and our preparedness.</p> <p>Even worse, this policy disadvantages those following consular processing abroad compared to individuals adjusting status inside the U.S., effectively rewarding unlawful presence while penalizing law-abiding families who chose compliance from the start. Reinstating the bond contradicts America's core immigration principle of family unity and inflicts needless suffering on citizens exercising their legal rights.</p> <p>I urge the Department of State to reject this harmful, redundant measure and prioritize reuniting compliant families without additional barriers.</p>	<p>Response: USCIS disagrees and will not make any changes to the form based on this comment.</p> <p>Congress gave DHS the authority under INA 213 to consider whether to exercise its discretion on a case-by-case basis to admit aliens who are inadmissible only under INA 212(a)(4) upon the submission of a suitable and proper public charge bond. Congress acknowledged the existence of the Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of INA in the plain language of the public charge bond statute in INA 213, making clear that the availability of public charge bonds continues notwithstanding the requirement to submit an Affidavit of Support Under Section 213A of the INA. Allowing aliens who are inadmissible under INA 212(a)(4) to submit a bond will ensure the government is held harmless if a bonded alien becomes a public charge, as required by INA 213.</p> <p>DHS has not set a maximum public charge bond amount in the bond regulations. In setting the bond amount, USCIS officers consider all pertinent facts and circumstances specific to the alien and set the bond in an amount of at least \$1,000. This is consistent with the discretionary authority Congress provided in INA 213.</p> <p>The statutory requirements and procedures for consular processing are different from those for adjustment of status. DOS and DHS will continue to follow the applicable laws, regulations, and policies for an alien's specific benefit request to make a public charge bond determination. The suggestion that DOS reject the use of public charge bonds is out of scope of this project.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Form I-945-008 Reinstatement with Change - Responses to 60 and 30-day FRN Public Comments

Public Comments ([regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov)): Docket 2025-0173

60-day and 30-day FRN Citations ([federalregister.gov](https://www.federalregister.gov)):