

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PUBLIC COPY

C1



FILE:

SRC 05 150 52052

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 30 2008


IN RE:

Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant 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 of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed the denial to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO), but has since withdrawn the appeal. The AAO will acknowledge the withdrawal of the appeal. The AAO will also enter a finding of fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact.

The petitioner is said to be a church. It seeks to classify 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), to perform services as a Bible teacher. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the position offered to the beneficiary qualifies as a religious occupation. On appeal, the petitioner contests the director's reasoning in reaching the decision.

In a letter dated September 19, 2008, the petitioner, through counsel, requested withdrawal of the appeal, and therefore the AAO need not address the merits of the appeal here. The petitioner, however, sought to contest the AAO's finding of fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact, and we shall discuss that issue here.

Throughout the record of proceeding, [REDACTED] identified himself as Pastor of the petitioning entity. On September 3, 2008, the AAO issued a notice to [REDACTED] that read, in part:

The AAO is currently reviewing the appeals relating to two petitions filed from your address and under your signature. In one petition, found in the file for [REDACTED], you identified yourself as the pastor of Chodae Church of Dallas, which is said to have four paid employees. In the other petition, found in the file for [REDACTED], you identified yourself as the pastor of World Peace Mission, which is said to have four other paid employees. Both churches are said to be at [REDACTED], Irving, Texas. The two churches are incorporated separately, with different Federal Employer Identification Numbers and different lists of claimed employees and volunteers. Clearly, they are two distinct entities and not simply a single church that uses more than one name. You have submitted identical unaudited financial statements for both churches, with each church claiming exactly \$980,471 in total assets as of December 30, 2004, including the \$230,000 building. Your use of identical financial statements for two distinct entities leads us to doubt the credibility and authenticity of both statements.

Citizenship and Immigration Services [CIS] records show that 32 immigrant and 29 nonimmigrant petitions have been filed from [REDACTED] since 1994. 18 of these petitions identify the petitioner as Chodae Church of Dallas, 19 as World Peace Mission, and 24 as Korean Bible Baptist Church of Dallas. The AAO considers this to be an unrealistically high volume of petitions for a church that supposedly has only four employees at a time. . . .

Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 586 (BIA 1988).

Absent independent and objective evidence to overcome, fully and persuasively, our above findings, the AAO will dismiss the appeal and enter a formal finding of fraud into the record. You may choose to withdraw your appeal, but this will not prevent a finding of fraud.

In response, \_\_\_\_\_ asserts that the number of petitions filed is inflated because one alien may have been the beneficiary of multiple filings. He also states:

Chodae was established by \_\_\_\_\_ and it changed locations several times, and eventually began sharing the building at \_\_\_\_\_ because they needed a place to worship. So I let them come to \_\_\_\_\_, and began sharing pastoral duties. Over time the Chodae membership became less, and now it is not an independent church. . . . Chodae has not petitioned for a religious worker for several years.

\_\_\_\_\_ letter does not explain the petitioner's submission of matching financial statements for two different entities (signed by \_\_\_\_\_ and two different "deacons"). As late as 2005, \_\_\_\_\_ signed and filed a petition naming the employer as Chodae Church of Dallas, and Chodae Church of Dallas purportedly issued paychecks as late as 2006. Also, contrary to his claim that the two churches had effectively merged, he had submitted completely different employee lists for the two claimed churches. The claim that Chodae Church of Dallas was a near-defunct church, absorbed by World Peace Mission, is inconsistent with the petitioner's prior claims and submissions.

The petitioner has not resolved the very serious credibility issues relating to its filings from \_\_\_\_\_. The AAO finds that the petitioner knowingly submitted documents containing false statements in an effort to mislead CIS and the AAO on an element material to the beneficiary's eligibility for a benefit sought under the immigration laws of the United States. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001, 1546. The AAO will enter a finding of fraud and willful misrepresentation of a material fact.

Additionally, the evidence is not credible and will not be given any weight in this proceeding. If CIS fails to believe that a fact stated in the petition is true, CIS may reject that fact. Section 204(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b); *see also Anetekhai v. I.N.S.*, 876 F.2d 1218, 1220 (5th Cir.1989); *Lu-Ann Bakery Shop, Inc. v. Nelson*, 705 F. Supp. 7, 10 (D.D.C.1988); *Systronics Corp. v. INS*, 153 F. Supp. 2d 7, 15 (D.D.C. 2001). Moreover, the petitioner's submission of a fraudulent document brings into question the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988).

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed based on its withdrawal by the petitioner.

**FURTHER ORDER:** The AAO finds that the petitioner knowingly submitted documents containing false statements in an effort to mislead CIS and the AAO on an element material to the beneficiary's eligibility for a benefit sought under the immigration laws of the United States.