

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 20 MASS, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536



File:  Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JUL 02 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



Petition: Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:




INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a church. It seeks classification of the beneficiary as a special immigrant minister pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), in order to employ him as a minister at an annual salary of \$17,640.

The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary had been continuously engaged as a minister for at least the two years preceding the filing of the petition.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the petitioner believes that his "full-time work as pastor for [the petitioner] from 1998 to the present has never been 'volunteer work.'"

The record of proceeding consists of a petition and supporting documents, the director's request for additional evidence and the petitioner's response, the director's decision, and an appeal.

Section 203(b)(4) of the Act provides classification to qualified special immigrant religious workers as described in section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C), which pertains to an immigrant who:

(i) for at least 2 years immediately preceding the time of application for admission, has been a member of a religious denomination having a bona fide nonprofit, religious organization in the United States;

(ii) seeks to enter the United States--

(I) solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of a minister of that religious denomination,

(II) before October 1, 2003, in order to work for the organization at the request of the organization in a professional capacity in a religious vocation or occupation, or

(III) before October 1, 2003, in order to work for the organization (or for a bona fide organization which is affiliated with the religious denomination and is exempt from taxation as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Code of 1986) at the request of the organization in a religious vocation or occupation; and

(iii) has been carrying on such vocation, professional work, or other work continuously for at least the 2-year period described in clause (i).

The beneficiary founded the petitioning church in January 1998. The petitioner states that the beneficiary entered the United States in 1994 without inspection, and subsequently applied for asylum and a diversity visa and was ordered deported.

The primary issue to be addressed in this proceeding is whether the beneficiary had been continuously engaged as a minister for the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m) (1) states, in pertinent part, that:

All three types of religious workers must have been performing the vocation, professional work, or other work continuously (either abroad or in the United States) for at least the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

In the case of special immigrant ministers, the alien must have been engaged solely as a minister of the religious denomination for the two-year period in order to qualify for the benefit sought and must intend to be engaged solely in the work of a minister of religion in the United States. *Matter of Faith Assembly Church*, 19 I&N 391 (Comm. 1986).

The petition was filed on April 31, 2001. Therefore, the petitioner must establish that the beneficiary had been continuously and solely carrying on the vocation of a minister of religion since at least April 31, 1999.

In this case, an official of the petitioning church wrote the Bureau that the beneficiary has been serving as senior pastor and minister of the petitioning church since he founded the church in January 1998. The official writes further that:

[the beneficiary has been] living on donations and arms from the members whiles the church paid his rent. The beginning of year 2000, was the first time the church was able to pay him a salary. He has been living on a fixed salary since then. [sic.]

The petitioner included copies of the beneficiary's 2000 and 2001 income tax returns and W-2's showing that the petitioner paid the beneficiary in those years.

The evidence on the record also contains a copy of the beneficiary's certificate of ordination issued in January 2000, less than two years prior to the filing of the petition.

The director found that the evidence on the record insufficient to establish that the beneficiary has the required two years of qualifying experience. The AAO concurs. In the absence of corroborating evidence such as certified tax documents for the entire two year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary has the two-years of qualifying experience.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has not shown that the beneficiary is qualified as a minister in the petitioner's denomination. The petitioner submitted the beneficiary's "certificate of ordination," dated January 2000, issued by the Living Faith Ministries Inc. International, and a diploma the beneficiary received from the Christian Faith Seminary in London, England dated June 1996. In order to establish that an alien is qualified as a minister of religion for the purpose of special immigrant classification, simply producing documents purported to be certificates of ordination, which are not based on theological training or education, is not proof that an alien is entitled to perform the duties of a minister. *Matter of Rhee*, 16 I&N Dec. 607 (BIA 1978). Since the appeal will be dismissed for the reason stated above, this issue need not be discussed further.

Further, while the determination of an individual's status or duties within a religious organization is not under the Bureau's purview, the determination as to the individual's qualifications to receive benefits under the immigration laws of the United States rests within the Bureau. Authority over the latter determination lies not with any ecclesiastical body but with the secular authorities of the United States. *Matter of Hall*, 18 I&N Dec. 203 (BIA 1982); *Matter of Rhee*, 16 I&N Dec. 607 (BIA 1978).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.