



## OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT CASE EXAMPLES

October 22, 2025

### **Example 1: Referral** [REDACTED]

This complex case study included fraudulent misrepresentation of age and sponsor fraud, which may have led, in part, to the labor exploitation of two youth and release of multiple children to an unfit sponsor who intentionally misrepresented his age, identity and relationship with multiple UAC. ORR was unable to verify the identity of the sponsor due to permissive policy requirements which did not require DNA testing or universal fingerprinting of sponsors.

Two [REDACTED] brothers were admitted to ORR care in July 2023, and their alleged adult brother was identified as the potential sponsor for both boys. At the time, potential sponsors who were the adult siblings (Category 2A) of children in ORR care were not required to undergo universal fingerprinting or complete DNA testing. The sponsor submitted his application and supporting documents, and in September 2023 the two boys were approved for release to the sponsor. There are no records in the case file that show that the sponsor's identity documents were submitted to the [REDACTED] Consulate for verification. There is also no documentation that indicates ORR was aware the potential sponsor had previously been in ORR custody, a fact which was discovered in a later sponsorship attempt. Once released, the brothers were not enrolled in school and, instead, the sponsor forced them to work as roofers. Post-Release Services (PRS) successfully contacted the children and sponsor for the 7-day post-release contact. Despite multiple PRS attempts to contact the sponsor for the 14-day check and initiation of services and to conduct a 30-day follow-up call, all were unsuccessful in reaching the sponsor or the children.

Approximately one year later, the sponsor was identified as a potential sponsor for two additional minors, his alleged brother and alleged nephew, who had entered ORR care together in November 2024. Changes to background check processing and DNA testing requirements since his first sponsorship (September 2023) resulted in the potential sponsor undergoing fingerprinting for background checks, and DNA testing to prove his filial relationship with the alleged brother. The sponsor's fingerprint results revealed that the sponsor was previously in ORR custody and had used a fraudulent birth certificate with a falsified date of birth of June 10, 2000, to enter ORR care as an alleged minor, during which time he had also been fingerprinted by the encountering law enforcement agency. While the fingerprints taken during the sponsorship background check showed the



potential sponsor's name and fraudulent date of birth of June 10, 2000, the birth certificate submitted by the potential sponsor during the sponsorship process had a date of birth of [REDACTED]. The ID submitted by the potential sponsor corroborated the [REDACTED] date of birth, confirming he entered ORR care as an adult (the potential sponsor's birth certificate and ID were verified through the consulate). DNA results revealed that the sponsor was not biologically related to the alleged brother he was attempting to sponsor. The birth certificate for the alleged brother in care was sent to the consulate and verified. Because the alleged brother in care had the same parents as the previously sponsored brothers, it was determined that fraud was also committed by the sponsor in the prior sponsorships. Consequently, the sponsor was denied sponsorship of the second set of minors.

Current document verification guidance would have likely identified the sponsor's birth certificate as fraudulent and prevented his original entry to ORR custody as an adult. Additionally, mandatory fingerprinting and DNA testing requirements would likely have prevented the release of children in the first sponsorship.

#### **Example 2: Referral** [REDACTED]

In 2022, two [REDACTED] brothers in ORR care were released to their alleged father (Category 1). Both unaccompanied alien children (UACs) were released to the sponsor in accordance with Field Guidance #10, enacted in 2021 for the purpose of expediting the sponsorship process for parents of UACs. In this case, the first child was released after 5 days, and the second was released after 17 days. Prior to their respective releases, the sponsor was not required to complete fingerprinting, and no verification of the sponsor and children's relationship was required beyond the submission of birth certificates. The sponsor is alleged to have had violent criminal history, which a fingerprint background check would have likely revealed. Had ORR had this information during the sponsor application phase this would likely have triggered the need for a home study and possibly led to an outright denial of sponsorship.

After release, the sponsor allegedly regularly assaulted them and withheld their wages until their smuggling fees were paid. The UACs were not allowed to attend school. The sponsor and the UACs lived in a trailer with no heating or cooling where they shared a bed, woke daily at 3:00 AM to prepare their only meal for the day, and worked until 10:00 PM seven days a week. The sponsor would not permit the children to have contact with their mother or other relatives, threatened them with claims of pending removal orders and warrants for their arrest, and withheld information about pending immigration hearings.





In June 2024, the UACs' uncle contacted the ORR National Call Center to report that both UACs were living with him in [REDACTED] because they had run away from their sponsor's home in [REDACTED]. After they ran away, the sponsor/alleged father filed a missing children report with the local police, who located and returned both UACs to his care where they remain today. Despite the sponsor having a significant arrest record including a physical assault, Child Protective Services (CPS) deemed the minors were not in imminent danger and could return to the sponsor's care if he registered the UACs in school.

### **Example 3: Referral** [REDACTED]

This case involves non-disclosure of a criminal history and victimization by a sponsor due to lax fingerprinting requirements. Two UACs were released to their alleged father (Category 1) in April 2022 in accordance with Field Guidance #10, which expedited the release of UAC to eligible parental sponsors.

Background checks of the sponsor conducted later as part of the OIC3 initiative revealed the sponsor had past convictions for fraud and had used multiple aliases in 2015. These discoveries could have been identified with the current fingerprinting requirements, which may have led to further investigation, assessment and denial of his sponsorship. Additionally, the alleged paternal relationship would now be verified through the current policy requiring DNA testing.

According to a report from the UAC's alleged mother and confirmed by the UAC, the sponsor forced one of the children to sell drugs, and both children had their lives threatened at gunpoint during a home invasion. The sponsor then kidnapped his wife for 24 hours and threatened to kill her, after which Child Protective Services (CPS) intervened, and the children were removed from the sponsor's home. The children now reside with their alleged mother.

### **Example 4: Referral** [REDACTED]

A [REDACTED] female UAC entered ORR care in August 2022, and her alleged brother was identified as her potential sponsor. At the time, Field Guidance 11 was in effect, which facilitated expedited processing of close relatives (Category 2A sponsors). The proposed Category 2A sponsor (alleged brother) submitted the necessary documents, and the UAC was released to him. Three years later, during routine checks for a separate sponsorship, a case manager noticed discrepancies in the information provided and questioned the sponsor. The sponsor admitted to using his brother's identification documents for the sponsorship of his alleged sister three years prior, which was also confirmed by the sister.



While no harm was reported by the child in this case, had current fingerprinting requirements been applied the fraud by the brother would have been uncovered. Additionally, current procedures requiring DNA testing for all alleged biological relationships would have been done for this case and may also have revealed the fraud. This incident underscores the importance of enhanced identity and relationship verification measures, including fingerprinting and updated ID requirements, as critical tools to ensure the legitimacy of sponsors.

#### **Example 5: Referral** [REDACTED]

A four-year-old, male [REDACTED] UAC entered ORR care in September 2023. The potential sponsor/alleged father (Category 1) provided all documentation required, including a birth certificate for the UAC that listed him as the father. The sponsorship was approved, and the UAC was released to him after 11 days in ORR custody. In February 2024, the sponsor called the ORR National Call Center (NCC) to advise that he had taken a job out of state and his mother (UAC's alleged grandmother) would now be the child's caretaker. One month later the new caretaker confessed that her son was not the biological father of the boy. She explained that she had been taking care of the child in [REDACTED] because the boy's biological mother was unable to and developed a plan to get the child to the United States so she could continue to care for him. The sponsor (alleged father) and biological mother colluded to obtain a fraudulent birth certificate, which is what the sponsor (alleged father) used to obtain sponsorship. Under current procedures, any sponsor claiming to be a biological parent must undergo DNA testing to confirm the relationship with the UAC. DNA testing would have shown lack of familial relationship, revealing the fraud committed by the alleged father, and the sponsorship would have been denied.

The child continues to reside with the sponsor's mother who reports to be working through the process to legally adopt him.