

**PUBLIC COPY**

**Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clear warranted  
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

**JUL 17 2003**

File:  Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date:

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, seeking classification of the beneficiary as a 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), in order to employ him as leader of the youth and family ministries.

The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner had failed to establish that the beneficiary had been continuously carrying on the religious occupation for at least the two years preceding the filing of the petition.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief.

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 petitioner in this matter is a Pentecostal church affiliated with the Church of God denomination. The beneficiary is a 36-year

old male citizen of Ecuador. The petitioner states it has one salaried employee, a minister, and 275 members in its congregation. The petitioner submitted evidence that it has the appropriate tax exempt recognition. The beneficiary entered the United States as a B-2 nonimmigrant visitor for pleasure on November 25, 1998.

At issue in this proceeding is whether the beneficiary had been continuously carrying on the religious occupation for the two years 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.

The petition was filed on July 24, 2001. Therefore, the petitioner must establish that the beneficiary was continuously carrying on the religious occupation since at least July 24, 1999.

The petitioner submitted a letter from its Senior Pastor, stating that the beneficiary had been working in the family and youth ministries since February 1999 on a volunteer basis. The Senior Pastor wrote that "the church has been providing housing and allowance, and for the food pantry, we have supported him in all his needs. Also since the year 2000 we have been collecting an offering to support him and his needs." The Senior Pastor added that the petitioner proposed to employ the beneficiary on a full-time basis (35-40 hours a week) at a weekly salary of \$300.

The director determined that the petitioner had failed to establish that the beneficiary has the required two years of continuous experience in the religious occupation in the absence of any evidence to show that the beneficiary had been paid for his services.

The statute and its implementing regulations require that a beneficiary had been continuously carrying on the religious occupation specified in the petition for the two years preceding filing. Because the statute requires two years of continuous experience in the same position for which special immigrant classification is sought, the Bureau interprets its own regulations to require that, in cases of lay persons seeking to engage in a religious occupation, the prior experience must have been full-time salaried employment in order to qualify.

The legislative history of the religious worker provision of the Immigration Act of 1990<sup>1</sup> states that a substantial amount of case had developed on religious organizations and occupations, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-649, 104 Stat. 4978 (1990).

implication being that Congress intended that this body of case law be employed in implementing the provision. See H.R. Rep. No. 101-723, at 75 (1990).

In *Matter of Sinha*, 10 I&N Dec. 758 (Reg. Com. 1963), the Commissioner determined that if the beneficiary were to receive no salary for church work, he would be required to earn a living by obtaining other employment. In analogous reasoning, the Bureau determines that unpaid experience does not qualify as the beneficiary must have sought outside employment to support himself. Further, without income tax returns and W-2's, the Bureau is unable to determine how and whether the beneficiary has been employed. It cannot be concluded that the petitioner has overcome the director's concerns.

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.