

Defence Afghan Relocation and Resettlement

Fraud & False Representation Policy

Version	Update	Chapter	Date
1.3			12.06.26

Introduction

The purpose of this policy is to set out the standards and procedures by which the Defence Afghan Relocation and Resettlement (DARR) Directorate identifies and addresses instances of false information, false evidence, or false representations submitted by individuals under the Afghan Relocations and Assistance Policy (ARAP) and the Afghanistan Response Route (ARR).

This policy establishes the threshold, governance framework, and decision-making processes through which DARR may refuse eligibility or, where appropriate, withdraw an existing eligibility decision where false information or representations are identified prior to confirmation of eligibility.

This policy should be read in conjunction with the Assessing Evidence in DARR Eligibility Casework Guidance and the DARR Withdrawal of Eligibility Policy. It is intended to be self-contained and applies solely to the determination of eligibility by the Ministry of Defence, distinct from any subsequent consideration of suitability for entry clearance.

This guidance applies solely to casework undertaken by the Ministry of Defence and does not extend to, or inform, decision-making by other departments involved in subsequent stages of the process, including entry clearance or suitability assessments.

Definitions of False Information, False Evidence, and False Representations

False information, false evidence and false representations refer to information, documentation, statements or material that are either not true or misleading, whether provided expressly or by omission. These concepts are distinct but overlapping:

- a. Information or evidence may be *not true* where it is factually incorrect.
- b. Information or evidence may be *misleading* where, although not demonstrably incorrect, it creates a false impression or conceals material facts.

False information, false evidence or false representations may arise with or without deliberate intent. A finding that information is not true or misleading does not, of itself, require a finding of deception.

Deception, for the purposes of this policy, refers to conduct involving a deliberate intention to cause another to believe something that is not true. A finding of deception must only be made where, on the balance of probabilities, there is evidence of such deliberate intent.

All assessments must be conducted fairly and reasonably on the balance of probabilities. Decision makers must consider whether incorrect or misleading information may reasonably be attributable to innocent mistake, misunderstanding, or lack of access to information or documentation before reaching any conclusion about deception.

False information, false evidence, and false representations refer to information, documentation, statements or material that are not true or are misleading. This includes inaccuracies arising from deliberate deception, errors, or omissions. A finding of deception requires evidence of a deliberate intention to mislead.

Deception means an act which deliberately causes another to believe something that is not true.

All assessments must be conducted fairly and reasonably on the balance of probabilities. The decision maker must consider whether incorrect information results from an innocent mistake, misunderstanding, or lack of access to documents before concluding that deception has occurred. They must be satisfied, on the basis of the relevant information, that it is more likely than not that the material falls within this category.

Assessments of evidence should be approached with an open mind, and all relevant information needs to be considered when reaching a decision on whether it is not true or misleading.

Forms of False Information, False Evidence and False Representations

The categories set out at A–E below, and the examples provided under each category, are illustrative only. They are intended to support consistent identification and assessment of potential indicators of false information, false evidence or false representations. Neither the categories nor the examples are

exhaustive, and the presence or absence of any category or indicator does not, of itself, determine the outcome of an eligibility decision:

a. False, forged, or altered documents

This includes documents that have been manipulated, fabricated, or altered without authority.

Examples include manipulated identity details (such as edited dates of birth, ages, or ID numbers), falsified certificates or reference letters, altered or “photoshopped” ID cards, or documents purporting to be issued by authorities that did not create them.

b. Misleading or impossible factual claims

These are claims that contradict verified information, known timelines, or established records.

Examples include employment or training histories that are not feasible; family relationship claims contradicted by biometric or documentary evidence, or duplicate or conflicting marital/relationship claims.

c. Omission of material information

This refers to withholding information that is relevant to eligibility, including information that would alter the assessment of the individual circumstances.

Examples include concealing key identity details, role details, failing to disclose previous decisions or case outcomes, or not declaring prior applications or sponsorship arrangements.

d. Misuse of identity or imposters

This occurs where an individual uses another person’s identity credentials or submits evidence for an individual who cannot be reliably verified.

Examples include the misuse of Labour Support Unit (LSU) numbers, mismatched identity photos, or documentation that cannot be linked to the claimed individual.

e. Pattern-based or linked-case indicators

These arise where individual pieces of evidence appear plausible, but form part of a wider pattern associated with coordinated or replicated misrepresentation.

Examples include but are not limited to repeated or duplicated Labour Support Unit (LSU) numbers across unrelated cases, identification cards, certificates of appreciation, letters of employment, matching narrative templates or reference letters, or clusters of relationship claims that significantly diverge from normal familial structures.

The categories and examples set out in A–E above are illustrative only and do not constitute exhaustive or standalone grounds for refusal. Decisions must not be based solely on whether a case falls within a particular category, but on the application of this policy as a whole, having regard to all the individual facts and circumstances.

Considering the circumstances of each individual case

DARR recognises that individuals may provide information in challenging circumstances, including limited access to documentation, fear, stress, or reliance on third parties. Applications must therefore be assessed on a fair and reasonable basis, having regard to the circumstances of the individual case and all relevant information available.

False information, false evidence or false representations may arise with or without deliberate intent. A finding that information is false or misleading does not, of itself, require a conclusion that the applicant intended to mislead. In line with this approach, caseworkers must consider whether inaccuracies or omissions may reasonably be attributable to innocent mistake, misunderstanding, or lack of access to information, before reaching any conclusion about deception.

For the purposes of this policy, deception refers to conduct involving a deliberate intention to cause another to believe something that is not true. Allegations or findings of deception must only be made where, on the balance of probabilities, there is evidence of such deliberate intent.

To support consistent and proportionate decision-making, DARR applies a structured framework of severity indicators:

- a. Low-severity indicators reflect minor or contextual inaccuracies that do not undermine the overall assessment of eligibility and do not indicate deception. These should normally be addressed through clarification and appropriate record-keeping.
- b. Medium-severity indicators may indicate uncertainty, misunderstanding, or partial inaccuracy in relation to material facts. These require proportionate further enquiries to determine whether the information can be substantiated.

- c. High-severity indicators reflect strong evidence that false information or representations have been provided and may include evidence capable of supporting a finding of deliberate deception. Where such indicators are present, escalation for senior review may be appropriate.

This framework enables decision-makers to distinguish between innocent error, false information without intent, and deliberate deception, ensuring that decisions are taken consistently, fairly, and in accordance with the civil standard of proof on the balance of probabilities.

Where an individual would otherwise appear to meet the published eligibility criteria, but has provided false information, false evidence or false representations in support of their application (including in relation to claimed dependants), this may be treated as a relevant consideration in the eligibility assessment.

Decision makers must consider:

- a. whether the false information, false evidence or false representations is material to the assessment of eligibility.
- b. whether, when the false information, false evidence or false representations is discounted, the applicant has demonstrated on the balance of probabilities that they meet the eligibility criteria; and
- c. whether the nature and circumstances of the false information, false evidence or false representations indicate a deliberate attempt to influence the eligibility decision.

Not all instances of false or misleading information will justify refusal of eligibility where eligibility would otherwise be met. However, where, on the balance of probabilities, there is evidence of deliberate deception, a refusal of eligibility may be justified and proportionate in order to protect the integrity of the scheme.

All such decisions must be taken on a case-by-case basis and be clearly reasoned.

Where false information, false evidence or false representations are identified, this policy applies equally whether the information relates to:

- the Principal Applicant (PA); or
- persons claimed as immediate family members or additional family members in support of the PA's application.

False information provided about dependants may be treated as false information provided in support of the PA's eligibility and may therefore be relevant to the overall eligibility determination.

Authority to Determine Fraud and Delegated Decision-Making

The authority to determine eligibility under ARAP or the ARR sits with the Ministry of Defence, acting through the Secretary of State for Defence and the Defence Minister with responsibility for the Afghanistan Relocation Programme. This authority has been delegated to the Senior Civil Service (SCS) to ensure timely, consistent, and legally defensible decision-making where concerns arise regarding the accuracy or integrity of information submitted by individuals.

Decision makers may refuse eligibility, or recommend the withdrawal of an existing eligibility decision, where they are satisfied on the balance of probabilities that false information, false evidence or false representations have been provided which are material to the assessment of eligibility, such that the applicant has not demonstrated that they meet the published eligibility criteria.

Where false information is not material to the eligibility criteria, decision makers must nonetheless consider whether the circumstances indicate deliberate deception capable of justifying refusal on integrity grounds, in accordance with this policy.

Where the evidence indicates a deliberate intention to mislead, amounting to deception as defined in this policy, and where severe fraud indicators are identified including, but not limited to, compelling evidence of document falsification, identity misuse, or coordinated misrepresentation. The case must be escalated in accordance with DARR's governance arrangements, as set out in the DARR Caseworker Guidance. Where the severity, scale, or potential impact of the conduct warrants, the case must be further escalated to the delegated SCS for a formal eligibility determination.

Decisions taken under this process must be clearly reasoned, based on all relevant evidence, and recorded in a manner that demonstrates how the conclusion has been reached that the individual is not eligible under the relevant policy. This escalation pathway ensures that the most serious fraud concerns are considered at the appropriate senior level and that decisions remain consistent with DARR's governance expectations.

Decision Standards for Fraud-Based Eligibility Rejections

These decision standards apply equally to decisions to refuse eligibility on fraud-related grounds and to decisions to withdraw an existing eligibility determination where false information, false evidence or false representations are identified after an initial eligibility decision has been made.

Rejecting eligibility on fraud-related grounds is a significant decision that can impact individuals and, where relevant, their family members. Decision makers

must ensure that the rationale for such decisions is fully and clearly documented on the Defence Afghanistan Casework System (DACS).

Where concerns arise in relation to the accuracy, reliability or consistency of documents or information, decision makers must first consider whether these may reasonably be attributable to innocent or honest mistake, misunderstanding, or the practical difficulties of obtaining documentation in Afghanistan. In cases involving low or medium severity concerns, individuals should normally be given the opportunity, where appropriate, to provide further information or clarification before a final decision is taken. This process is intended to allow such issues to be resolved prior to refusal where possible.

When communicating a rejection, decision makers must clearly state the reasons for the decision and the policy basis on which eligibility has been refused. If a principal applicant or family member is rejected or their eligibility is withdrawn on basis of fraud, they do not get a right of review

Right to Make Representations

PAs – or their family members where the PA is deceased – should generally be given the opportunity to provide further information and/or explanations and/or make representations in relation to a proposed decision. Any relevant information, evidence and representation received must be reviewed and considered as part of the overall assessment.

In these instances, caseworkers should send out a Request for Further Information before referring the case to their team leaders. Individuals will have 14 days to respond to requests for information. Failure to respond to any request for information within this timescale, unless exceptional circumstances apply, will result in caseworkers using the evidence already available to escalate the case through the appropriate decision-making route.