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This publication examines the Violence Against Women Act’s (“VAWA”), VAWA confidentiality protections under U.S. immigration laws contained in the statute at 8 U.S.C. § 1367 and 8 U.S.C. 1229(e). This memo first provides the full text of each of these provisions and goes on to address each of the three major protections that VAWA confidentiality provides. Next, for each protection this memo quotes the statute, provides legislative history, and quotes relevant portions of the congressionally mandated implementation policies issued by the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services and DHS’ predecessor agency the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

This document collects and covers two decades of bi-partisan legislative efforts and federal agency policies that continuously improved VAWA confidentiality protections as key efforts to enhance victim safety and improve the ability of police and prosecutors to hold perpetrators accountable for their crimes. A specific goal of VAWA’s confidentiality protections was to undermine by federal statute the ability of perpetrators to avoid or weaken criminal investigations and prosecutions against them by threatening victims with deportation and successfully gaining assistance from immigration enforcement officials who initiate immigration enforcement actions, detain, or deport the victim. A second, equally important goal is to protect victim safety by precluding perpetrators and their representatives and surrogates from gaining access to information about or contained any VAWA confidentiality protected immigration case. These provisions were included in order to stop perpetrators from using information in the victim’s case file or about the existence of the case to locate, stalk, or retaliate against the victim; to interfere with, affect or undermine the outcome of the victim’s immigration case; or to impede the victims ability receive protections from the civil or criminal justice systems.

In creating VAWA’s confidentiality provisions Congress was explicit about its intent.

“In 1996, Congress created special protections for victims of domestic violence against disclosure of information to their abusers and the use of information provided by abusers in removal proceedings. In 2000, and in this Act, Congress extended these protections to cover victims of trafficking, certain crimes and others who qualify for VAWA immigration relief. These provisions are designed to ensure that abusers and criminals cannot use the immigration system against their victims. Examples include abusers using DHS to obtain information about their victims, including the existence of a VAWA immigration petition, interfering

---

with or undermining their victims’ immigration cases, and encouraging immigration enforcement officers to pursue removal actions against their victims.”

“This Committee wants to ensure that immigration enforcement agents and government officials covered by this section do not initiate contact with abusers, call abusers as witnesses or relying on information furnished by or derived from abusers to apprehend, detain and attempt to remove victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and trafficking, as prohibited by section 384 of IIRIRA.”

When DHS issued its All DHS memo implementing VAWA confidentiality discussing the penalties imposed by the statute for violations (up to $5000 penalty and/or disciplinary action) DHS explained the implications of violations as follows:

“Violations of Section 1367 could give rise to serious, even life-threatening, dangers to victims and their family members. Violations compromise the trust victims have in the efficacy of services that exist to help them and, importantly, may unwittingly aid perpetrators retaliate against, harm or manipulate victims and their family members, and elude or undermine criminal prosecutions.”

The DHS VAWA Confidentiality implementation policies apply to all DHS officials who encounter crime victims or VAWA confidentiality protected cases or applicants in their work. With a particularly focus on:

“Those employees who work with applicants for victim-based immigration relief or who have access to protected information, such as United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and Customs and Border Protection (CBP).”

The legislative history of VAWA 2005 states that the VAWA confidentiality section of the --

“Act contains same of the most important protections for immigrant victims. This section is enhances VAWA’s confidentiality protections for immigrant victims and directs immigration enforcement officials not to rely on information provided by an abuser, his family members or agents to arrest or remove an immigrant victim from the United States. Threats of deportation are the most potent tool abusers of immigrant victim use to maintain control over and silence their victims and to avoid criminal prosecution. In 1996, Congress created special protections for victims of domestic violence against disclosure of information to their abusers and the use of information provided by abusers in removal proceedings. In 2000, and in this Act, Congress extended these protections to cover victims of trafficking, certain crimes and others who qualify for VAWA immigration relief. These provisions are designed to ensure that abusers and criminals cannot use the immigration system against their victims. Examples include abusers using DHS to obtain information about their victims, including the existence of a VAWA immigration petition, interfering with or undermining their victims’ immigration cases, and encouraging immigration enforcement offices to pursue removal actions against their victims.”

---

This section requires that the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice provide guidance to their officers and employees who have access to information protected by Section 384 of IIRIRA, including protecting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking and other crimes from the harm that could result from inappropriate disclosure of information. Congress encourages the DHS’s specially trained VAWA unit and CIS VAWA policy personnel: (1) to develop a training program that can be used to train DHS staff, trial attorneys, immigration judges, and other DOJ and DOS staff who regularly encounter alien victims of crimes, and (2) to craft and implement policies and protocols on appropriate handling by DHS, DOJ and DOS officers of cases under VAWA 1994, the Acts subsequently reauthorizing VAWA, and IIRIRA.”

To ensure that DHS officials knew about and complied with VAWA confidentiality requirements, DHS developed and required that all of its officers receive training. The DHS 2013 All DHS Directive required that:

“All DHS employees who, through the course of their work may come into contact with victim applicants or have access to information covered by 8 U.S.C. 1367 complete the VAWA: Confidentiality and Immigration Relief training, which is currently on Component’s Learning Management Systems (LMS). The VAWA Training was developed by FLETC in collaboration with subject-matter experts from several DHS Components, including USCIS, ICE and CBP. No later than 180 days after the enactment of this policy, and on an annual basis thereafter, the Component Heads, or his or her delegates, of CIS OMB, CRCL, USCIS, ICE and CBP report to the Review Committee the rate of compliance for this training.”

ICE has had VAWA confidentiality policies in place since 2007.

“The Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005), which became effective on January 5, 2006, expanded various protections for aliens seeking immigration benefits as crime victims and amended various sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). As a result, operational units of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) will be required to follow new procedures when taking certain actions in cases involving aliens eligible to apply for VAWA benefits or T or U nonimmigrant status. This interim guidance explains how VAWA 2005 affects the current operating procedures of the Office of Investigations (DI) and the Office of Detention and Removal Operations (DRO).”

“For purposes of this interim guidance, if an officer believes there is any credible evidence that the alien may be eligible for VAWA benefits or I or U nonimmigrant status, the requirements of 8 U.S.C. § 1367, described below, must be followed along with standard operating procedure.”

---

8 U.S.C. § 1376 (Also known as IIRIRA Section 384)\textsuperscript{11}

(a) **In general** Except as provided in subsection (b), in no case may the Attorney General, or any other official or employee of the Department of Justice, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or any other official or employee of the Department of Homeland Security or Department of State (including any bureau or agency of either of such Departments)—

(1) make an adverse determination of admissibility or deportability of an alien under the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.] using information furnished solely by—

(A) a spouse or parent who has battered the alien or subjected the alien to extreme cruelty,

(B) a member of the spouse’s or parent’s family residing in the same household as the alien who has battered the alien or subjected the alien to extreme cruelty when the spouse or parent consented to or acquiesced in such battery or cruelty,

(C) a spouse or parent who has battered the alien’s child or subjected the alien’s child to extreme cruelty (without the active participation of the alien in the battery or extreme cruelty),

(D) a member of the spouse’s or parent’s family residing in the same household as the alien who has battered the alien’s child or subjected the alien’s child to extreme cruelty when the spouse or parent consented to or acquiesced in such battery or cruelty and the alien did not actively participate in such battery or cruelty,

(E) in the case of an alien applying for status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)], the perpetrator of the substantial physical or mental abuse and the criminal activity,[1] (F) in the case of an alien applying for status under section 101(a)(15)(T) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)), under section 7105(b)(1)(E)(i)(II)(bb) of title 22, under section 244(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(a)(3)), as in effect prior to March 31, 1999, or as a VAWA self-petitioner (as defined in section 101(a)(51) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(51))[2], the trafficker or perpetrator, unless the alien has been convicted of a crime or crimes listed in section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)]; or

(2) permit use by or disclosure to anyone (other than a sworn officer or employee of the Department, or bureau or agency thereof, for legitimate Department, bureau, or agency purposes) of any information which relates to an alien who is the beneficiary of an application for relief under paragraph (15)(T), (15)(U), or (51) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T), (U), (51)] or section 240A(b)(2) of such Act [8 U.S.C. 1229b(b)(2)].

The limitation under paragraph (2) ends when the application for relief is denied and all opportunities for appeal of the denial have been exhausted.

(b) Exceptions

(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General may provide, in the Secretary’s or the Attorney General’s discretion, for the disclosure of information in the same manner and circumstances as census information may be disclosed by the Secretary of Commerce under section 8 of title 13.

(2) The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General may provide in the discretion of the Secretary or the Attorney General for the disclosure of information to law enforcement officials to be used solely for a legitimate law enforcement purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.

(3) Subsection (a) shall not be construed as preventing disclosure of information in connection with judicial review of a determination in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.

(4) Subsection (a)(2) shall not apply if all the battered individuals in the case are adults and they have all waived the restrictions of such subsection.

(5) The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General are authorized to disclose information, to Federal, State, and local public and private agencies providing benefits, to be used solely in making determinations of eligibility for benefits pursuant to section 1641(c) of this title.

(6) Subsection (a) may not be construed to prevent the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security from disclosing to the chairman and ranking members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate or the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, for the exercise of congressional oversight authority, information on closed cases under this section in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information and that omits personally identifying information (including locational information about individuals).

(7) Government entities adjudicating applications for relief under subsection (a)(2), and government personnel carrying out mandated duties under section 101(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(i)(1)], may, with the prior written consent of the alien involved, communicate with nonprofit, nongovernmental victims’ service providers for the sole purpose of assisting victims in obtaining victim services from programs with expertise working with immigrant victims. Agencies receiving referrals are bound by the provisions of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as affecting the ability of an applicant to designate a safe organization through whom governmental agencies may communicate with the applicant.

(8) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General may provide in the discretion of either such Secretary or the Attorney General for the disclosure of information to national security officials to be used solely for a national security purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.

---

12 8 C.F.R. 214.14(e)(2) requires that “Agencies receiving information under this section, whether governmental or non-governmental, are bound by the confidentiality provisions and other restrictions set out in 8 U.S.C. 1367”


14 151 CONG. REC. E2607 (Dec. 18, 2005) (speech of Hon. John Conyers Jr.), https://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/conyers-extension-of-remarks-immigration-dec-18-2005-crec-2005-12-18-p1-pge2605-4 (“This section also gives the specially trained VAWA unit the discretion to refer victims to non-profit, nongovernmental organizations to obtain a range of needed assistance and victim services. Referrals should be made to programs with expertise in providing assistance to immigrant victims of violence and can only be made after obtaining written consent from the immigrant victim. Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the ability of an applicant to designate a safe organization through which governmental agencies may communicate with the applicant.”)
(c) **Penalties for violations**

Anyone who willfully uses, publishes, or permits information to be disclosed in violation of this section or who knowingly makes a false certification under section 239(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1229(e)] shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action and subject to a civil money penalty of not more than $5,000 for each such violation.

(d) **Guidance**

The Attorney General, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide guidance to officers and employees of the Department of Justice, Department of State, or the Department of Homeland Security who have access to information covered by this section regarding the provisions of this section, including the provisions to protect victims of domestic violence and severe forms of trafficking in persons or criminal activity listed in section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(u)) from harm that could result from the inappropriate disclosure of covered information.

8 U.S.C. § 1229(e)

(e) **Certification of compliance with restrictions on disclosure**

(1) **In general**

In cases where an enforcement action leading to a removal proceeding was taken against an alien at any of the locations specified in paragraph (2), the Notice to Appear shall include a statement that the provisions of section 1367 of this title have been complied with.

(2) **Locations** – The locations specified in this paragraph are as follows:

(A) At a domestic violence shelter, a rape crisis center, supervised visitation center, family justice center, a victim services, or victim services provider, or a community-based organization.

(B) At a courthouse (or in connection with that appearance of the alien at a courthouse) if the alien is appearing in connection with a protection order case, child custody case, or other civil or criminal case relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking, or stalking in which the alien has been battered or subject to extreme cruelty or if the alien is described in subparagraph (T) or (U) of section 1101(a)(15) of this title.

15

**Bar on Relying on Perpetrator-Provided Information**

Statutory Provisions

(a) **In general** Except as provided in subsection (b), in no case may the Attorney General, or any other official or employee of the Department of Justice, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or any other official or employee of the Department of Homeland Security or Department of State (including any bureau or agency of either of such Departments)—

(1) make an adverse determination of admissibility or deportability of an alien under the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.] using information furnished solely by—

(A) a spouse or parent who has battered the alien or subjected the alien to extreme cruelty,

(B) a member of the spouse’s or parent’s family residing in the same household as

the alien who has battered the alien or subjected the alien to extreme cruelty when the spouse or parent consented to or acquiesced in such battery or cruelty,

(C) a spouse or parent who has battered the alien’s child or subjected the alien’s child to extreme cruelty (without the active participation of the alien in the battery or extreme cruelty),

(D) a member of the spouse’s or parent’s family residing in the same household as the alien who has battered the alien’s child or subjected the alien’s child to extreme cruelty when the spouse or parent consented to or acquiesced in such battery or cruelty and the alien did not actively participate in such battery or cruelty,

(E) in the case of an alien applying for status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)], the perpetrator of the substantial physical or mental abuse and the criminal activity,[1]

(F) in the case of an alien applying for status under section 101(a)(15)(T) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)), under section 7105(b)(1)(E)(i)(II)(bb) of title 22, under section 244(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(a)(3)), as in effect prior to March 31, 1999, or as a VAWA self-petitioner (as defined in section 101(a)(51) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(51)] [2], the trafficker or perpetrator, unless the alien has been convicted of a crime or crimes listed in section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)]

Legislative History

The joint statement submitted to the House and the Senate explaining the effects of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, stated about Section 384 --

“Neither shall the Attorney General permit use by, or disclosure to any person (other than an officer of the Department of Justice for official and certain other designated purposes) of any information that relates to an alien who is the beneficiary of an application for relief (which has not been denied) under section 204(a)(1) (A) and (B) (self-petition for immigrant visa by alien who has been battered or subject to extreme cruelty), section 216(c)(4)(C) (hardship waiver allowing removal of conditional permanent resident status based on qualifying marriage because alien spouse or child has been subject to battery or extreme cruelty), or section 244(a 3) (suspension of deportation for alien spouse or child who has been subject to battery or extreme cruelty). Civil penalties are established for willful violations.”16

“This Committee wants to ensure that immigration enforcement agents and government officials covered by this section do not initiate contact with abusers, call abusers as witnesses or relying on information furnished by or derived from abusers to apprehend, detain and attempt to remove victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and trafficking, as prohibited by section 384 of IIRIRA. In determining whether a person furnishing information is a prohibited source, primary evidence should include, but not be limited to, court records, government databases, affidavits from law enforcement officials, and previous decisions by DHS or Department of Justice personnel. Other credible evidence must also be considered. Government officials are encouraged to consult with the specially trained VAWA unit in making determinations under the special “any credible evidence” standard.”17

---


“(T)he Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General and other Federal officials may not use information furnished by, or derived from information provided solely by, an abuser, crime perpetrator or trafficker to make an adverse determination of admissibility or removal of an alien. However, information in the public record and government data bases can be relied upon, even if government officials first became aware of it through an abuser.”18

Department of Homeland Security Implementing Policies

“Section 1367(a) of Title 8 of the United States Code, as amended by VAWA 2005, prevents ICE employees from making an adverse determination of admissibility or deportability of an alien using information furnished solely by certain people associated19 with the battery or extreme cruelty, such as the abuser or a member of the abuser's family living in the same household as the victim. For purposes of this interim guidance, an adverse determination of admissibility or deportability would include placing an alien in removal proceedings or making civil arrests relating to an alien's violation of the immigration laws. Section 1367(a) also generally prohibits ICE employees from disclosing any information about a VAWA, T, or U beneficiary to anyone, especially those who might use the information to the alien's detriment, i.e. an abuser who may wish to have the victim removed from the United States.”20

When the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) first implemented VAWA confidentiality protections in 1997, INS recognized that –

“These provisions, and the Congressional and public scrutiny which accompany them, warrant particular care whenever an INS office or employee suspects that an alien with whom they are dealing might have been subject to domestic violence.” 21

DHS policies are designed to ensure that:

“Adverse determinations of admissibility or deportability against an alien are not made using information furnished solely by prohibited sources associated with the battery or extreme cruelty, sexual assault, human trafficking or substantial physical or mental abuse, regardless of whether the alien has applied for VAWA benefits, or a T or U visa.”22


19 These prohibitions since 1997 have bared reliance on adverse information provided by the perpetrator or the perpetrator’s relatives. Family members living in the home with the victim and/or the perpetrator are included among those from whom adverse information is precluded, but the bar is not limited to this group. See, Paul Virtue, Non-Disclosure and Other Prohibitions Related to Battered Aliens: IIRARA Section 384, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 3 (May 5, 1997), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/conf-vawa-gov-insconfvawamemo-05-05-1997/.


“The following are prohibited sources for purposes of this guidance:

i. A spouse or parent who battered the alien or subjected the alien to extreme cruelty,

ii. A member of the spouse’s or parent’s family residing in the same household as the abusive spouse or parent,

iii. A spouse or parent who battered the alien's child or subjected the alien's child to extreme cruelty (unless the alien actively participated in the battery or extreme cruelty),

iv. A member of the spouse’s or parent’s family residing in the same household as the alien who has battered the alien’s child or subjected the alien’s child to extreme cruelty when the spouse or parent consented to or acquiesced in such battery or cruelty and the alien did not actively participate in such battery or cruelty,

v. In the case of an alien who is applying for a U visa, the perpetrator of the substantial physical or mental abuse and the criminal activity, and

vi. In the case of an alien who is applying for a T visa, Continued Presence, or immigration relief as a VAWA self-petitioner, the trafficker or perpetrator.”

In implementing Congressional directives not to contact abusers and perpetrators, seek or rely on perpetrator provided information, DHS provided illustrations in its policy memos informing its officers that:

“There are a number of ways DHS employees might receive “tips” from an abuser or an abuser’s family, such as: calling ICE to report the victim as illegal, a “landlord” (who may actually be a human trafficker) calling ICE to report that his “tenants” are undocumented, or providing information to USCIS rebutting the basis for the victim’s application. When a DHS employee receives adverse information about a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking or an enumerated crime from a prohibited source, DHS employees treat the information as inherently suspect.”

“An assertion of fraud by the prohibited source, such as an accusation that the marriage is fraudulent, ordinarily will not serve as the sole basis for adverse action. Abusers often claim their marriage is fraudulent in order to exact revenge or exert further control over the victim.”

“Information provided solely by prohibited sources must be independently corroborated. Examples of prohibited sources include: the abuser in the case of a VAWA petitioner, the human trafficker in the case of a T status applicant, or the perpetrator of substantial physical or mental abuse in the case of a U status applicant. In such cases, ICE employees cannot rely solely on these sources when making an adverse determination of admissibility or deportability. This prohibition is important to note because ICE officers sometimes receive information from upset or disgruntled spouses, abusers, traffickers, or family members. An arrest based on such information would not violate § 1367 if, according to existing standard operating procedures, the ICE officer independently verifies the information (e.g., through an immigration database) prior to making the arrest. To avoid a possible violation of § 1367, ICE officers

________________________

23 U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, CONTINUED PRESENCE RESOURCE GUIDE, (July, 2021)
https://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/continued-presence-resource-guide-2021


must verify the information provided from these prohibited sources. For example, if the abuser husband calls ICE and states that his alien wife is in the United States after being ordered removed. ICE must independently verify the prior removal and note such corroboration on Form I-213 (Record of Inadmissible/Deportable Alien).”

In general, section 1367 prohibits DHS personnel “from permitting use by or disclosure of any information relating to a beneficiary of a pending or approved application for alien victim-based immigration benefits to anyone other than a sworn officer or employee of the Department, the Department of State, or the Department of Justice, unless one of several enumerated statutory exceptions apply.”

In 2013 the Secretary of Homeland Security delegated to the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties “the authority to provide DHS-wide guidance and oversight on the implementation of 8 United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 1367 confidentiality and prohibited source provisions (relating to applicants for and beneficiaries of Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), T visa, or U visa protections) in accordance with 8 U.S.C. 1367(d) and Section 810 of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, provided that such authority will be exercised only in accordance with policies and procedures established by implementing departmental Directives or Instructions.”

DHS also confirmed that the prohibited source requirements of VAWA confidentiality extend based on the text of the 8 U.S.C. § 1367(a)(1) to—

- Family violence victims who were battered or subjected to extreme cruelty by their
  - Spouse
  - Parent
  - Family member living in the same household

  **Note:** For these domestic violence cases the prohibited source bars apply whether or not the victim has filed, or is in the process of filing a VAWA confidentiality protected immigration case.


31 The immigration law definitions apply in VAWA confidentiality cases. The definition in the Immigration and Nationality Act Section 101(b)(1) and (2) cover abuse by step-parents of step-children even when state family laws would not recognize a parent child relationship based on the facts of the case.

32 Includes abuse of parents by over 21-year-old citizen sons or daughters. INA Section 240(a)(1)(A)(vi).

33 Paul Virtue, Non-Disclosure and Other Prohibitions Related to Battered Aliens: IIRIRA Section 384, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 3 (May 5, 1997), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/conf-vawa-gov-insconfvawamemo-05-05-1997/ (“While the first category of potential abusers enumerated above -- spouse or parent – parallels the category which can give rise to a claim of immigration status under the VAWA provisions, the other three categories reflect an expansion of protection to battered aliens who are not eligible for status under VAWA. Such expansion to include those who have suffered abuser at the hands of another family member in the same household is similar to IIRIRA section 384 which makes individuals abused by other member of the spouse or parent’s family ‘qualified aliens’ for purposes of public benefits.”).
• Victims in the process of applying for status
  o As a victim of criminal activity under the U visa
  o As a victim of human trafficking under the T visa
  o Covered by the U visa in the process of applying for a U visa.

• “Applying for status” has been interpreted to cover victims who have not yet filed applications for immigration relief. Generally, once a DHS official learns that the immigrant is a victim in the process of preparing an application the victim receives VAWA confidentiality protection. This could include informing local immigration officials that the victim has or is seeking a protection order and will be filing a VAWA, T, U or VAWA work authorization for abused spouses of visa holders application. The All DHS Memo states that--

“The lack of a pending or approved VAWA self-petition does not necessarily mean that the prohibited source provisions do not apply and that the alien is not a victim of battery or extreme cruelty. Similarly, although the prohibited source provisions with respect to T or U nonimmigrant status applies only to applicants for such relief, the victim might be in the process of preparing an application. Accordingly, whenever a DHS officer or employee receives adverse information from a spouse, family member of a spouse, or unknown private individual, the employee will check the Central Index System (CIS) for the COA “384” flag. Employees will be sensitive to the fact that the alien at issue may be a victim and that a victim-abuser dynamic may be at play.”

“Section 384 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), commonly referred to as “384 provisions,” protects the confidentiality of victims of domestic violence, trafficking, and other crimes who have filed for or have been granted immigration relief. Anyone who willfully uses, publishes, or permits any information pertaining to such victims to be disclosed in violation of section 384 of IIRIRA will face disciplinary action and may be subject to a civil money penalty of up to $5,000 for each violation. Therefore, in order to fully comply with and prevent violations of these confidentiality provisions, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has developed a quick and reliable method for DHS components to verify whether an individual has a pending or an approved Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) self-petition or T or U nonimmigrant status petition/application.”

---

34 U Visa criminal activities include: abduction, abusive sexual contact, blackmail, domestic violence, extortion, false imprisonment, felonious assault, female genital mutilation, fraud in foreign labor contracting, hostage taking, incest, involuntary servitude, kidnapping, manslaughter, murder, obstruction of justice, peonage, perjury, prostitution, rape, sexual assault, sexual exploitation, slave trade, stalking, torture, trafficking, witness tampering, unlawful criminal restraint, and attempt conspiracy or solicitation to commit any of these crimes and any similar activity where the elements of the crime are substantially similar.

35 See, USCIS, INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION FOR ABUSED NONIMMIGRANT SPOUSE, 1 (July 23, 2020), https://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/wp-content/uploads/i-765vinstr.pdf. (Abused Nonimmigrant Spouses may also seek employment authorization, as soon as they are eligible under one of the categories listed in form I-765V instructions).


Thus, the DHS Directive requires of all DHS component agencies that:

“Any Component with access to Section 1367 information creates ways to identify those individuals protected by Section 1367 confidentiality, such as through a Central Index System (CIS) database check, and develops safeguards to protect this information in the relevant systems.”

DHS requires of each component agency of DHS

“[E]stablish, to the fullest extent reasonably practicable, means of identifying individuals protected by Section 1367 confidentiality and will take steps to develop safeguards to protect this information in the relevant systems. One such way to help identify most, though not all, of those protected is through a Central Index System (CIS) database check.

a. CIS database check: For any cases where it is suspected that an alien is an applicant for a benefit protected by section 1367, a DHS employee consults the Central Index System (CIS) database to verify whether an alien has a pending or approved application or petition covered by section 1367.

b. CIS contains a class of admission (COA) code “384” (signifying section 384 of IIRIRA) that was created to alert DHS personnel that the individual is protected by section 1367. Information about the location, status, or other identifying information of any individual with the code “384” may not be released outside of DHS, DOJ, or DOS unless one or more of the exceptions applies or the individual has been denied relief and has exhausted all opportunities for appeal.”

Prohibited and Sensitive Locations

Statutory Provisions

(e) Certification of compliance with restrictions on disclosure

(1) In general

In cases where an enforcement action leading to a removal proceeding was taken against an alien at any of the locations specified in paragraph (2), the Notice to Appear shall include a statement that the provisions of section 1367 of this title have been complied with.

(2) Locations – The locations specified in this paragraph are as follows:

(A) At a domestic violence shelter, a rape crisis center, supervised visitation center, family justice center, a victim services, or victim services provider, or a community-based organization.

(B) At a courthouse (or in connection with that appearance of the alien at a courthouse) if the alien is appearing in connection with a protection order case, child custody case, or other civil or criminal case relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking, or stalking in


which the alien has been battered or subject to extreme cruelty or if the alien is described in subparagraph (T) or (U) of section 1101(a)(15) of this title.⁴⁰

Legislative History

“[S]ection 921(f) establishes a system to verify that removal proceedings are not based on information prohibited by section 384 of IIRIRA. DHS must certify that:

(1) no enforcement action was taken leading to such proceedings against an alien at certain places including a domestic violence shelter, a rape crisis center, and a courthouse if the alien is appearing in connection with a protection order or child custody case, or that
(2) such an enforcement action was taken, but that there was no violation of the aforementioned provisions. Persons who knowingly make a false certification shall be subject to penalties.”⁴¹

The legislative history further requires that:

“Removal proceedings filed in violation of section 384 of IIRIRA shall be dismissed. However, further proceedings can be brought if not in violation of section 384.”⁴²

Implementing Policies

In implementing the Violence Against Women Act 2005 amendments to VAWA confidentiality that created a list of locations at which victims of crime seek help and protection from the community based service providers and the justice system, DHS affirmed the statute’s goal of assuring that the VAWA confidentiality enforcement location prohibitions and limitations were equally applicable to all victims. These protections apply to victims who have not filed VAWA confidentiality protected cases.

“Aliens encountered at sensitive locations may be beneficiaries of pending or approved applications for benefits. DHS officers encountering individuals at such locations and considering an enforcement action verify, to the fullest extent reasonably practicable, whether a particular alien is a victim who falls within the protection of the section 1367 provisions.

a. While INA 239(e) does not prohibit arrests of aliens at sensitive locations, it is clear that Congress intended that arrests of aliens at such locations to be handled properly given that they may ultimately benefit from VAWA’s provisions.

b. DHS officers and employees are strongly encouraged to exercise prosecutorial discretion favorably in cases of aliens encountered at the sensitive locations, unless other exigent circumstances exist, including terrorism or other extraordinary reasons for arresting aliens at a敏感 location.”⁴³

“DHS officers and employees comply with the section 239(e) certification requirement even if the alien has not applied for or does not intend to apply for a victim-based application or petition.”  

“Locations requiring certification in accordance with INA section 239(e) are:

i. A domestic violence shelter, a rape crisis center, supervised visitation center, family justice center, a victim services provider, or a community-based organization.  

ii. A courthouse (or in connection with that appearance of the alien at a courthouse) if the alien is appearing in connection with a protection order case, child custody case, or other civil or criminal case relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or stalking in which the alien has been battered or subject to extreme cruelty, or if the alien may be eligible for T or U nonimmigrant status.”

“ICE officers are discouraged from making arrests at these sensitive locations absent clear evidence that the alien is not entitled to victim-based benefits. Aliens encountered at rape crisis centers, domestic violence centers, or any of the sensitive locations noted in INA § 239(e) are likely to be genuine VAWA self-petitioners. While INA § 239(e) does not prohibit arrests of aliens at sensitive locations, it is clear that Congress intended that cases of aliens arrested at such locations be handled properly given that they may ultimately benefit from VAWA's provisions. ICE officers should consider prosecutorial discretion in cases of aliens encountered at sensitive locations unless exigent circumstances exist. Examples of exigent circumstances include criminal activity, fraud, terrorism, or where there are extraordinary reasons for arresting aliens at sensitive locations.”

“Simply stated, ICE officers must independently verify information and check databases at their disposal to determine the existence of any pending victim-based applications for immigration benefits. ICE officers are also reminded to consider the sources of their information and be aware that there is a possibility that the caller may be involved in an abusive or violent relationship with the alien who is the subject of the call. Accordingly, if the source of the independently verifiable information is likely an abuser or someone acting in the abuser's capacity, the ICE officer should consider using prosecutorial discretion.”

“If an officer is unsure whether a particular personal encounter or apprehension requires a certification of compliance under INA § 239(e), the officer should consult the local Office of Chief Counsel (OCC). If time does not permit, the officer should consult his or her immediate supervisor for assistance.”

---


45 As defined by VAWA see, 42 U.S.C. Section 13925(a)(4).
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“Locations specified in INA § 239(e)(2), where if an enforcement action leading to a removal proceeding was taken against an alien at any of the locations specified below, the Notice to Appear (NTA) includes a statement that the provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1367 have been complied with. The locations specified include: domestic violence shelter, rape crisis center, supervised visitation center, family justice center, a victim services, or victim services provider, or a community-based organization. Sensitive locations can also include a courthouse (or in connection with that appearance of the alien at a courthouse) if the alien is appearing in connection with a protection order case, child custody case, or other civil or criminal case relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking, or stalking in which the alien has been battered or subject to extreme cruelty or if the alien is described in subparagraph (T) or (U) of section 101(a)(15) [8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)].”

“DHS employees complete a certification of compliance in cases where enforcement actions leading to a removal proceeding are taken at sensitive locations, as required by INA 239(e) (8 U.S.C. 1229(e)).”

“The file must bear information adequately alerting the officer or agent who is preparing the NTA that the INA 239(e) certification requirement could be implicated. Moreover, in complying with 8 U.S.C § 1367, the file must bear sufficient information to permit the issuing officer or agent to make a reliable assessment that, in fact, the prohibited source and nondisclosure provisions of § 1367 have been complied with.”

“Section 239(e) requires the relevant DHS agency to certify that the agency has independently verified the inadmissibility or deportability of an alien who was encountered at these sensitive locations. Accordingly, before issuing an Notice to Appear (NTA) (with the requisite section 239(e) certification of compliance with 8 U.S.C. section 1367) to an alien against whom an enforcement action leading to a removal proceeding was taken at a sensitive location, DHS employees record on the Form I-213: (1) the sensitive location at which the enforcement action was taken; (2) whether information related to the alien’s admissibility or deportability was supplied by a prohibited source; (3) whether and to what extent such information was independently verified; and (4) an acknowledgement of compliance with the nondisclosure requirements.”

“The certificate of compliance requirements reflects congressional intent that ICE proceed cautiously when making an arrest or otherwise physically encountering an alien at one of the sensitive locations without objective evidence that the alien is in the United States in violation of the immigration laws and that victims of battery, abuse, trafficking, and extreme cruelty be protected. In this regard, ICE
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officers encountering such individuals are to verify information through use of all databases at their disposal, including CLAIMS.\textsuperscript{54}

The statutory protections and ICE policies protecting victims from immigration enforcement at sensitive and protected locations was reaffirmed on January 10, 2018\textsuperscript{55} in the ICE memo governing enforcement of immigration laws at courthouses. That memo recognizes that VAWA confidentiality limitations on immigration enforcement against victims at locations, including courthouses, that are considered sensitive locations when the enforcement action being pursued is against a victim protected under VAWA confidentiality laws.\textsuperscript{56} These protections are in addition to the limitations on immigration enforcement actions at courthouses outlined in 2018 ICE Directive No. 11072.1,\textsuperscript{57} and apply despite the fact that ICE does not consider courthouses to be sensitive locations.\textsuperscript{58}

“See also ICE Directive No. 10036.1, Interim Guidance Relating to Officer Procedure Following Enactment of VAWA 2005 (Jan. 22, 2007), for additional requirements regarding civil immigration enforcement actions against certain victims and witnesses conducted at courthouses.”

**Courthouse Enforcement and Sensitive Locations Policies**

In addition to the protections against immigration enforcement being initiated against immigrant crime victims who benefit from VAWA confidentiality’s statutory protections, immigrant victims also benefit from Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection policies that limit immigration enforcement at courthouses and sensitive locations. These policies place limits on immigration enforcement at locations specified and benefit immigrants generally, and are not limited as the VAWA confidentiality protections are to immigrant crime victims.

The protections offered by the courthouse enforcement policy and the sensitive locations policies are discussed briefly here.

*Ice Courthouse Enforcement Policy*\textsuperscript{59}

**Limits on Courthouse Enforcement to Targeted Immigrants:**

“Policy. ICE civil immigration enforcement actions inside courthouses include actions against specific, targeted aliens with criminal convictions, gang members, national security or public safety threats, aliens who have been ordered removed from the United States but have failed to depart, and aliens who have re-entered the country illegally after being removed, when ICE officers or agents have information that leads them to believe the targeted aliens are present at that specific location.”\textsuperscript{56,560}


\textsuperscript{55} U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, CIVIL IMMIGR. ENF’T ACTIONS INSIDE COURTHOUSES, DIRECTIVE NO 11072.1, 3 (last updated January 31, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/courthouse-directive-2018/

\textsuperscript{56} U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, CIVIL IMMIGR. ENF’T ACTIONS INSIDE COURTHOUSES, DIRECTIVE NO 11072.1, 3 (footnote 2 Jan. 10, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-courthouse-directive-2018/

\textsuperscript{57} U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, CIVIL IMMIGR. ENF’T ACTIONS INSIDE COURTHOUSES, DIRECTIVE NO 11072.1, 3 (footnote 2 Jan. 10, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-courthouse-directive-2018/

\textsuperscript{58} U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, CIVIL IMMIGR. ENF’T ACTIONS INSIDE COURTHOUSES, DIRECTIVE NO 11072.1, 3 (footnote 2 Jan. 10, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-courthouse-directive-2018/

\textsuperscript{59} U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, CIVIL IMMIGR. ENF’T ACTIONS INSIDE COURTHOUSES, DIRECTIVE NO 11072.1, 3 (last updated January 31, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/court-arrests-faq/

\textsuperscript{60} U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, CIVIL IMMIGR. ENF’T ACTIONS INSIDE COURTHOUSES, DIRECTIVE NO 11072.1, 1 (Jan. 10, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-courthouse-directive-2018/; See also U.S. IMMIGR. AND
“Civil immigration enforcement action. Action taken by an ICE officer or agent to apprehend, arrest, interview, or search an alien in connection with enforcement of administrative immigration violations.” 61

Will not target witnesses or others accompanying a targeted immigrant to court.

“Aliens encountered during a civil immigration enforcement action inside a courthouse, such as family members or friends accompanying the target alien to court appearances or serving as a witness in a proceeding, will not be subject to civil immigration enforcement action, absent special circumstances, such as where the individual poses a threat to public safety or interferes with ICE’s enforcement actions.” 62

Enforcement in non-criminal proceedings including family law and civil cases and courts

“ICE officers and agents should generally avoid enforcement actions in courthouses, or areas within courthouses that are dedicated to non-criminal (e.g., family court, small claims court) proceedings. In those instances in which an enforcement action in the above situations is operationally necessary, the approval of the respective Field Office Director (FOD), Special Agent in Charge (SAC), or his or her designee is required.” 63

Policy informs immigration enforcement officers that if civil enforcement takes place in a courthouse officers should

“When practicable, ICE officers and agents will conduct enforcement actions discreetly to minimize their impact on court proceedings.” 64

“Civil immigration enforcement actions inside courthouses should, to the extent practicable, continue to take place in non-public areas of the courthouse, be conducted in collaboration with court security staff, and utilize the court building’s non-public entrances and exits.” 65

“As with any planned enforcement action, ICE officers and agents should exercise sound judgment when enforcing federal law and make substantial efforts to avoid unnecessarily alarming the public.” 66


“ICE officers and agents will make every effort to limit their time at courthouses while conducting civil immigration enforcement actions.”

**Courthouse Enforcement Policies are in addition to the protections offered immigrant victims under VAWA confidentiality laws**

“See also ICE Directive No. 10036.1, Interim Guidance Relating to Officer Procedure Following Enactment of VAWA 2005 (Jan. 22, 2007), for additional requirements regarding civil immigration enforcement actions against certain victims and witnesses conducted at courthouses.”

*Department of Homeland Security Sensitive Locations Policies*

Both Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) have issued policies limiting immigration enforcement at sensitive locations. Immigra
tion and Customs Enforcement policy governing enforcement actions at sensitive locations issued in 2011 that is still in effect as of January 31, 2018 states:

“This memorandum sets forth Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) policy regarding certain enforcement actions by ICE officers and agents at or focused on sensitive locations. This policy is designed to ensure that these enforcement actions do not occur at nor are focused on sensitive locations such as schools and churches unless (a) exigent circumstances exist, (b) other law enforcement actions have led officers to a sensitive location… or (c) prior approval is obtained.”

“The enforcement actions covered by this policy are (I) arrests; (2) interviews; (3) searches; and (4) for purposes of immigration enforcement only, surveillance.”

---


“The sensitive locations covered by this policy include, but are not limited to, the following:73

- schools (including pre-schools, primary schools, secondary schools, post-secondary schools up to and including colleges and universities, and other institutions of learning such as vocational or trade schools); 74

  o 2018 policies further define schools as follows:
  “Schools, such as known and licensed daycares, pre-schools and other early learning programs; primary schools, secondary schools, post-secondary schools up to and including colleges and universities; as well as scholastic or education-related activities or events, and school bus stops that are marked and/or known to the officer during periods when school children are present at the stop”75

- hospitals76 further defined as
  “Medical treatment and health care facilities, such as hospitals, doctors' offices, accredited health clinics, and emergent or urgent care facilities77

- places of worship78 such as churches, synagogues, mosques or other institutions of worship, such as buildings rented for the purpose of religious services;79

- religious or civil ceremonies or observances, such as funerals, weddings80 or other public religious ceremony;81 and

- a site during the occurrence of a public demonstration, such as a march, rally or parade.”82

“This is not an exclusive list, and ICE officers and agents shall consult with their supervisors if the location of a planned enforcement operation could reasonably be viewed as being at or near a sensitive location. Supervisors should take extra care when assessing whether a planned enforcement action could reasonably be viewed as causing significant disruption to the normal operations of the sensitive location. ICE employees should also exercise caution. For example, particular care should be exercised with any

73 U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, FAQ ON SENSITIVE LOCATIONS AND COURTHOUSE ARRESTS, 2 (last updated Jan. 31, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-sensitive-locationcourthouse-faq/ (Sensitive locations policy does not apply to operations that are conducted within the immediate vicinity of the international border, including the functional equivalent of the border. At sensitive locations in these areas at any enforcement actions conducted “agents and officers are expected to exercise sound judgment and common sense while taking appropriate action. consistent with the goals of this policy.”)


82 Id. at 2; U.S. IMMIGR. AND CUSTOMS ENF’T, FAQ ON SENSITIVE LOCATIONS AND COURTHOUSE ARRESTS, 2 (last updated Jan. 31, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-sensitive-locationcourthouse-faq/.
organization assisting children, pregnant women, victims of crime or abuse, or individuals with significant mental or physical disabilities.”\(^{83}\)

“\textit{Exceptions to the General Rule}"

“\textit{This policy is meant to ensure that ICE officers and agents exercise sound judgment when enforcing federal law at or focused on sensitive locations and make substantial efforts to avoid unnecessarily alarming local communities. The policy is not intended to categorically prohibit lawful enforcement operations when there is an immediate need for enforcement action...}”\(^{84}\)

“Pursuant to ICE policy, enforcement actions are not to occur at or be focused on sensitive locations such as school, places of workshop, unless:

- exigent circumstances exist;
- other law enforcement actions have led officers to a sensitive location, or
- prior approval is obtained from a designated supervisory official.”\(^{85}\)

“ICE officers and agents may carry out an enforcement action covered by this policy without prior approval from headquarters when one of the following exigent circumstances exists;\(^{86}\)

- the enforcement action is related to national security, terrorism or public safety,\(^{87}\) or
- there is an imminent risk of destruction of evidence material to an ongoing criminal case.”\(^{88}\)

“When proceeding with an enforcement action under these extraordinary circumstances, officers and agents must conduct themselves as discretely as possible, consistent with officer and public safety, and make every effort to limit the time at or focused on the sensitive location.”\(^{89}\)

“The policy is intended to guide ICE officers and agents' actions when enforcing federal law at or focused on sensitive locations, to enhance the public understanding and trust, and to ensure that people

\(^{83}\) \textit{John Morton, Enf’t Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations, Policy Number 10029.2, 2 (October 24, 2011) http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-2011-sensitive-locations-policy.}

\(^{84}\) \textit{John Morton, Policy Number 10029.2: Enf’t Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations, 2 (October 24, 2011) http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-2011-sensitive-locations-policy.}


\(^{86}\) \textit{John Morton, Enf’t Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations, Policy Number 10029.2, 2 (October 24, 2011) http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-2011-sensitive-locations-policy.}

\(^{87}\) \textit{U.S. Immigr. and Customs Enf’t, FAQ on Sensitive Locations and Courthouse Arrests, 1-2 (last updated January 31, 2018), http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-sensitive-locationcourthouse-faq/; John Morton, Enforcement Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations, Policy Number 10029.2, 2 (October 24, 2011) http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-2011-sensitive-locations-policy (definition of exigent circumstances “involves a national security or terrorism matter; there is an imminent risk of death, violence, or physical harm to any person or property; the enforcement action involves the immediate arrest or pursuit of a dangerous felon, terrorist suspect, or any other individual(s) that present an imminent danger to public safety”).}


\(^{89}\) \textit{John Morton, Enf’t Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations, Policy Number 10029.2, 3 (October 24, 2011) http://niwaplibrary.wcl.american.edu/pubs/ice-2011-sensitive-locations-policy.}
seeking to participate in activities or utilize services provided at any sensitive location are free to do so, without fear or hesitation.  

**VAWA Confidentiality’s Non-Disclosure Protections**

**Statutory Provisions**

**8 U.S.C. § 1376 (Also known as IIRIRA Section 384)**

**(b)** *In general* Except as provided in subsection (b), in no case may the Attorney General, or any other official or employee of the Department of Justice, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or any other official or employee of the Department of Homeland Security or Department of State (including any bureau or agency of either of such Departments)—

1. permit use by or disclosure to anyone (other than a sworn officer or employee of the Department, or bureau or agency thereof, for legitimate Department, bureau, or agency purposes) of any information which relates to an alien who is the beneficiary of an application for relief under paragraph (15)(T), (15)(U), or (51) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act [8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T), (U), (51)] or section 240A(b)(2) of such Act [8 U.S.C. 1229b(b)(2)].

The limitation under paragraph (2) ends when the application for relief is denied and all opportunities for appeal of the denial have been exhausted.

**Legislative History**

“In 1996, Congress created special protections for victims of domestic violence against disclosure of information to their abusers and the use of information provided by abusers in removal proceedings. In 2000, and in this Act, Congress extended these protections to cover victims of trafficking, certain crimes and others who qualify for VAWA immigration relief. These provisions are designed to ensure that abusers and criminals cannot use the immigration system against their victims. Examples include abusers using DHS to obtain information about their victims, including the existence of a VAWA immigration petition, interfering with or undermining their victims’ immigration cases, and encouraging immigration enforcement officers to pursue removal actions against their victims.”

“Section 921(c) provides that this provision shall not apply to pre-vent information from being disclosed, in a manner that protects victim confidentiality and safety, to the chairs and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, including the Immigration Subcommittees, in the exercise of their oversight authority.”

**Implementing Policies**

The Immigration and Naturalization Service in its first memo implementing VAWA Confidentiality protections issued in 1997 recognized that these protections were enacted in part to bar immigration officials from disclosing information about the victim’s whereabouts and information about the victim’s immigration

---


case to the victim’s abusive spouse or parent. It stated that the VAWA confidentiality protections –

“were created by Congress so that the battered alien can seek status independent of the abuser. Thus, disclosure of information to an alleged abuser or any other family member was inappropriate event prior to the new law. With enactment of section 384, however, such inappropriate conduct is not also grounds for disciplinary action or fine, or both.”

“With the passage of § 384 of IIRIRA. Congress imposed strict confidentiality provisions…. This provision, codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1367(a)(2) but commonly referred to as the § 384 confidentiality provision, prohibits disclosure (other than to a "sworn officer or employee of [DHS])- of "any information- relating loan alien who is an applicant for relief under provisions of the INA relating to domestic violence — § 101 (a)(51), trafficking under 101(a)(15)(T), or violent crime under 101(a)(15)(U) — from the time the application for relief is submitted until such time as "the application for relief is denied and all opportunities for appeal of the denial have been exhausted. - 8 U.S.C. § 1367(a)(2). There are limited exceptions to this broad confidentiality provision set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1367(6).”

“Section 1367 covers information relating to beneficiaries of applications for a number of immigration benefits, not just the Form I-360 VAWA self-petition. For the purpose of this guidance if an alien is the beneficiary of a pending or approved application for one or more of the victim-based benefits described below, the requirements of 8 U.S.C. 1367 will be followed:

a. VAWA self-petitioner, which incorporates the following applications or petitions:
   i. I-360 Self-petition - self-petitioners under INA sec. 204
   ii. I-751 Hardship waiver - battered spouse or child hardship waiver
   iii. VAWA CAA - abused Cuban Adjustment Act applicants
   iv. VAWA HRIFA - abused Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act applicants
   v. VAWA NACARA - abused Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act applicants
   vi. VAWA Suspension of Deportation

b. VAWA Cancellation of Removal applicants under INA 240A(b)(2).


d. I-918 U Nonimmigrant Status - victim of qualifying criminal activity under INA 101(a)(15)(U).”

“This guidance serves as a reminder that all DHS officers and employees are generally prohibited from permitting use by or disclosure to anyone other than a sworn officer or employee of DHS, the Department of State (DOS); or the Department of Justice (DOJ) of any information relating to a beneficiary of a pending or approved application for victim-based immigration benefits. This includes a battered spouse or child hardship waiver, VAWA self-petition, VAWA cancellation of removal or suspension of deportation case, or T or U nonimmigrant status, including the fact that they have applied

---


for such benefits. Information that cannot be disclosed includes information about an individual contained in a DHS database as well as information that has not yet been included in a database, such as the location of a beneficiary.*96

“It is important to emphasize that the prohibition extends to any information relating to the battered spouse or child, which could include verification of status or any other routine information.”*97

The information that receives VAWA confidentiality protections is –

“All DHS officers and employees are generally prohibited from permitting use by or disclosure to anyone other than a sworn officer or employee of DHS, Department of State (DOS), or Department of Justice (DOJ) of any information relating to a beneficiary of a pending or approved application for victim-based immigration benefits, including a battered spouse or child hardship waiver, VAWA self-petition, VAWA cancellation of removal or suspension of deportation case, or T or U nonimmigrant status, including the fact that they have applied for such benefits.”*98

“The nondisclosure provision provides protection as soon as a DHS employee has reason to believe that the alien may be the beneficiary of a pending or approved victim-based application or petition, and the limitation ends when the application for relief is denied and all opportunities for appeal of the denial have been exhausted.”*99

“If a DHS employee receives adverse information about a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking or an enumerated crime from a prohibited source, DHS employees should treat the information as inherently suspect and exercise all appropriate prosecutorial discretion with respect to pursuing the adverse information. Further, DHS employees receiving information solely from a prohibited source do not take action on that information unless there is an independent source of


corroboration.”\textsuperscript{101}

“This interim guidance also reminds ICE employees that they are generally prohibited from "permit[ing] use by or disclosure to anyone (other than a sworn officer or employee of “[DHS]”) of any information which relates to an alien who is the beneficiary of an application for relief under victim based benefits (VAWA, T or U nonimmigrant status): If ICE employees know that an alien has sought such victim-based benefits, they are generally prohibited from disclosing any information to a third party.”\textsuperscript{102}

“In enacting this nondisclosure provision, Congress sought to prevent, with limited exceptions, disclosure of any information relating to beneficiaries of applications for VAWA benefits (battered spouses or children) or for T or U nonimmigrant status, including the fact that they have applied for benefits. The disclosure of certain information is permitted in limited circumstances. Those circumstances include disclosure for legitimate law enforcement purposes, statistical purposes, and benefit granting or public benefit purposes. See 8 U.S.C § 1367(b) (listing exceptions to general nondisclosure rule).\textsuperscript{103}

Similarly, release of information in the context of judicial review is limited by statute to contexts where release can be accomplished “in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information.”\textsuperscript{104} This judicial review exception to VAWA confidentiality applies to judicial review of a victim’s VAWA confidentiality protected immigration case.\textsuperscript{105} DHS policy warns DHS officials that:

“Please note, defense counsel in state cases may sometimes attempt to make the entire A-file discoverable; however, the entire file is not discoverable in its entirety under this exception”\textsuperscript{106}

Additionally regulations issued by the U.S. immigration regulations in the context of the U-Visa confirm that:


“Agencies receiving information under this section, whether governmental or non-governmental, are bound by the confidentiality provisions and other restrictions set out in 8 U.S.C. 1367”\textsuperscript{107}

“In short, ICE employees must not reveal any information concerning an alien’s T, U, or VAWA application unless an exception to the general nondisclosure requirement applies. The nondisclosure limitation ends when the application for relief is denied and all opportunities for appeal of the denial have been exhausted.”\textsuperscript{108}

For instance, “Component Heads are authorized to disclose Section 1367 information only in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth below and in accordance with Component-specific processes and procedures for disclosing Section 1367 information jointly developed by the Component, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.”\textsuperscript{109}

Furthermore, “Component Heads (or their designees, provided that any such designee is adequately trained on applicable protections and policies), in coordination with the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) or his designee, are permitted to disclose Section 1367 Information to Law Enforcement Officials, provided that disclosure is made in furtherance of the Department’s or the recipient’s Legitimate Law Enforcement Purpose in a manner that protects the confidentiality of such information and the recipient agrees not to further disseminate the information or use it for a purpose other than the purpose for which it was provided absent express authorization”\textsuperscript{110} However, law enforcement agencies who receive Section 1367 information must comply with VAWA confidentiality guidance. Only disclosure under “exigent circumstances” may be disclose without advance coordination with the “Director of USCIS so long as USCIS is notified of the disclosure and the circumstances surrounding the disclosure within 24 hours of the disclosure.”\textsuperscript{111}

“When cases arise involving aliens known to be applicants for VAWA, T, or U relief, ACCs should take particular care to ensure that the confidentiality provisions are not violated. Once ACCs are made aware that an alien is the beneficiary of a pending or approved VAWA, T, or U petition, they should ensure that the court is aware of any pending VAWA, T, or U issues prior to the hearing, either orally or in writing on the record. If such notification is not possible, the court should be notified as soon as is reasonable after the alien’s VAWA, T, or U status is verified. If a case arises in which the applicant's

\textsuperscript{107} 8 C.F.R. 214.14(e)(2)


safety would be at risk by disclosing the application to the court or to opposing counsel, please consult your Deputy Chief Counsel for guidance.”

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security requires that each of its component agencies, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Customs and Border Protection, and their subdivisions, each—

“establish, to the fullest extent reasonably practicable, means of identifying individuals protected by Section 1367 confidentiality and will take steps to develop safeguards to protect this information in the relevant systems. One such way to help identify most, though not all, of those protected is through a Central Index System (CIS) database check.

a. CIS database check: For any cases where it is suspected that an alien is an applicant for a benefit protected by section 1367, a DHS employee consults the Central Index System (CIS) database to verify whether an alien has a pending or approved application or petition covered by section 1367.

b. CIS contains a class of admission (COA) code “384” (signifying section 384 of IIRIRA) that was created to alert DHS personnel that the individual is protected by section 1367. Information about the location, status, or other identifying information of any individual with the code “384” may not be released outside of DHS, DOJ, or DOS unless one or more of the exceptions applies or the individual has been denied relief and has exhausted all opportunities for appeal.”

“Once the pending VAWA, T, or U petition/application is adjudicated, the COA will be updated to reflect the correct classification, which is unique to each type of immigration relief. However, DHS personnel can continue to identify the individual as covered by the confidentiality provisions of section 384 of IIRIRA via the history screen in CIS because the 384 code will be maintained in CIS. In addition, when the individual applies for subsequent benefits, such as adjustment of status, the COA will be populated accordingly; however, the CIS history screen will continue to include the 384 code, identifying the individual as being covered by the confidentiality provisions. If the petition/application is denied, the confidentiality provisions will continue to apply to the individual until all final appeal rights are exhausted.”

Additionally, the Council on Combating Violence Against Women is in charge of monitoring the compliance and knowledge of the VAWA, the VTVPA, the subsequent authorizations of those acts, and related immigration laws.

Filing Complaints Regarding VAWA Confidentiality Violations

When an employee of the Department of Homeland Security violates VAWA confidentiality protections or is involved in an enforcement action that takes place in violation of DHS, Immigration or Customs Enforcement (ICE), Customs and Border Protection (CBP) or United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)


policies, any individual may file a complaint with the DHS Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (DHS CRCL). Regarding VAWA confidentiality complaints DHS CRCL instructs:

“The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and its components are committed to ensuring full compliance with the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). VAWA and the provisions associated with it bear direct impact on the work of DHS and its components:

- VAWA’s confidentiality provisions generally prohibit third-party disclosure of any information relating to an alien who is an applicant for relief under VAWA;
- VAWA’s confidentiality provisions prohibit DHS from using information from particular individuals as the sole basis for arresting and charging an alien with removability; and
- VAWA’s confidentiality provisions require certification that the confidentiality provisions have been complied with when enforcement actions are taken at specified locations, such as domestic violence shelters, rape crisis centers, or courthouses.

A clear, consistent means of reporting alleged violations by DHS employees of VAWA’s confidentiality provisions serves the interests of both DHS and the public. DHS has therefore established procedures for reporting alleged violations. Following these procedures will allow DHS to investigate and address complaints.”

Complaints alleging a violation of the VAWA confidentiality provisions by a DHS employee should be submitted in writing via letter, fax or e-mail DHS CRCL.

“CRCL recommends that complaints include at least the following information. If you are filing a complaint on behalf of someone else, you must provide CRCL with the express written consent of that individual to receive information about the complaint.

Appropriate contact information: name, date of birth, A-number (if available), and contact information for the alien; and name and contact information for the organization filing the complaint (if any). A written description of the circumstances of the alleged violation, including: date, time and location; name(s) and contact information of any witness(es); and name and contact information (if available) of the DHS employee(s) alleged to have committed the violation. Relevant documentation, including: copies of any paperwork served at or during the occurrence of the alleged violation, such as NTAs and warrants; and copies of any pending VAWA, T-visa or U-visa applications filed with DHS. A summary of other steps, if any, that have been taken to resolve this complaint.

CRCL will initially refer complaints to the DHS Office of the Inspector General. The complaint may later be referred to the relevant DHS component.”

---


In addition to filing a complaint with DHS, CRCL, regarding complaints about compliance with courthouse enforcement or sensitive locations policies Immigration and Customs Enforcement states that:

“There are a number of locations where an individual may lodge a complaint about a particular ICE enforcement action that may have taken place in violation of the sensitive locations policy. You may find information about these locations, and information about how to file a complaint, on the OHS or ICE websites. You may contact ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) through the Detention Reporting and Information Line at (888) 351-4024 or through the ERO information email address at ERO.INFO@ice.dhs.gov, also available at https://www.ice.gov/webform/ero-contact-form. The Civil Liberties Division of the ICE Office of Diversity and Civil Rights may be contacted at (202) 732-0092 or ICE.Civil.Liberties@ice.dhs.gov”119

The CBP sensitive locations policy states that:120

“There are a number of locations where an individual may lodge a complaint about a particular DHS enforcement action that may have taken place in violation of the sensitive locations policy. You may find information about these locations, and information about how to file a complaint, on the DHS, CBP, or ICE websites.

You may contact ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) through the Detention Reporting and Information Line at (888)351-4024 or through the ERO information email address at ERO.INFO@ice.dhs.gov, also available at https://www.ice.gov/webform/ero-contact-form. The Civil Liberties Division of the ICE Office of Diversity and Civil Rights may be contacted at (202) 732-0092 or ICE.Civil.Liberties@ice.dhs.gov.

You may contact the CBP Information Center to file a complaint or compliment via phone at 1-877-227-5511, or submit an email through the website at https://help.cbp.gov.”

---