




U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



CI

FILE: [REDACTED]
EAC 01 174 53573

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 21 2005

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

Maui Johnson

Robert P. Wiemann
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based 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 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 missionary. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it qualified as a bona fide nonprofit religious organization. The director further determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been engaged continuously in a qualifying religious vocation or occupation for two full years immediately preceding the filing of the petition or that the position qualified as that of a religious worker.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a letter and additional documentation. On the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Unit, the petitioner indicated that a brief and/or additional evidence would be submitted within 30 days of filing the appeal. As of the date of this decision, more than 19 months after the appeal was filed, no further documentation has been received by the AAO. Therefore, the record will be considered complete as presently constituted.

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, 2008, 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, 2008, 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 Revenue 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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(3)(i) states, in pertinent part:

(3) *Initial evidence.* Unless otherwise specified, each petition for a religious worker must be accompanied by:

- (i) Evidence that the organization qualifies as a nonprofit organization in the form of either:
 - (A) Documentation showing that it is exempt from taxation in accordance with § 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as it relates to religious organizations (in appropriate cases, evidence of the organization's assets and methods of operation and the organization's papers of incorporation under applicable state law may be requested); or
 - (B) Such documentation as is required by the Internal Revenue Service to establish eligibility for exemption under § 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as it relates to religious organization.

To meet the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(3)(i)(A), a copy of a letter of recognition of tax exemption issued by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is required. In the alternative, to meet the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(3)(i)(B), a petitioner may submit such documentation as is required by the IRS to establish eligibility for exemption under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC) of 1986 as it relates to religious organizations. This documentation includes, at a minimum, a completed IRS Form 1023, the Schedule A supplement, if applicable, and a copy of the organizing instrument of the organization that contains a proper dissolution clause and which specifies the purposes of the organization.

With the petition, the petitioner submitted a copy of an "Exempt Organization Certificate" issued by the state of New York, which exempts the petitioner from payment of state and local sales and use tax and a copy of a July 16, 1997 letter from the IRS assigning the petitioner an employer identification number. The petitioner also submitted a copy of its certificate of incorporation, which identifies the purpose of the organization and contains the dissolution clause required by the IRS when granting an organization tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the IRC.

In a request for evidence (RFE) dated July 29, 2002, the director instructed the petitioner to submit evidence of its tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the IRC. In response, the petitioner resubmitted copies of documents that it had previously submitted. On appeal, the petitioner resubmitted copies of the same documentation that the director had previously notified it was insufficient. Although the petitioner submitted a copy of its organizing instrument that contained the required information, it failed to submit a copy of a completed IRS Form 1023 as required by 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(3)(i)(B).

The evidence does not establish that the beneficiary is a bona fide nonprofit religious organization, exempt from taxation as required by the statute and regulation.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(1) states, in pertinent part, that "[a]n alien, or any person in behalf of the alien, may file a Form I-360 visa petition for classification under section 203(b)(4) of the Act as a section 101(a)(27)(C) special immigrant religious worker. Such a petition may be filed by or for an alien, who (either abroad or in the United States) for at least the two years immediately preceding the filing of the petition has been a member of a religious denomination which has a bona fide nonprofit religious organization in the United States." The regulation indicates that the "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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(3) states, in pertinent part, that each petition for a religious worker must be accompanied by:

(ii) A letter from an authorized official of the religious organization in the United States which (as applicable to the particular alien) establishes:

(A) That, immediately prior to the filing of the petition, the alien has the required two years of membership in the denomination and the required two years of experience in the religious vocation, professional religious work, or other religious work.

The petition was filed on April 19, 2001. Therefore, the petitioner must establish that the beneficiary was continuously working as a missionary throughout the two-year period immediately preceding that date.

In its documentation accompanying the petition, the petitioner submitted no evidence of the beneficiary's prior work experience. In an RFE dated January 25, 2002, the director instructed the petitioner to submit evidence to establish the beneficiary's work experience during the two years immediately preceding the date the petition was filed. In response, the petitioner submitted a letter from Reverend [REDACTED] the assistant bishop on the petitioner's trustee board, who "verifies" that the beneficiary "has full time responsibilities within the organization of the church. She is currently awaiting an opening to perform pastoral duties." The petitioner did not specify the nature of the beneficiary's responsibilities within the church.

In a joint letter dated February 21, 2002, Bishop [REDACTED] and the clerk for the petitioner stated that the beneficiary "has had on hand experience as Missionary in our organization." However, the petitioner failed to specify the details of the beneficiary's experience or when she became engaged in her activities for the petitioning organization.

In response to the director's second RFE dated July 29, 2002, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary had been trained as a health care nurse. The work schedule it submitted indicated that the beneficiary was expected to work a total of 16 ½ hours per week, with the majority of her duties (12 hours) involving in-home care to one specific patient. Other duties listed included two hours per week of counseling teenagers on topics such as teen pregnancy, sex before marriage and growth and change; one hour per week of arts and crafts skills; and one and half hours per week for Sunday school. The petitioner submitted another letter (undated) from Bishop [REDACTED] again stating that the beneficiary had "full time responsibilities" with the church and again failing to specify those duties.

The legislative history of the religious worker provision of the Immigration Act of 1990 states that a substantial amount of case law had developed on religious organizations and occupations, the implication being that Congress intended that this body of case law be employed in implementing the provision, with the addition of "a number of safeguards . . . to prevent abuse." See H.R. Rep. No. 101-723, at 75 (1990).

The statute states at section 101(a)(27)(C)(iii) that the religious worker must have been carrying on the religious vocation, professional work, or other work continuously for the immediately preceding two years. Under former Schedule A (prior to the Immigration Act of 1990), a person seeking entry to perform duties for a religious organization was required to be engaged "principally" in such duties. "Principally" was defined as more than 50 percent of the person's working time. Under prior law a minister of religion was required to demonstrate that he/she had been "continuously" carrying on the vocation of minister for the two years immediately preceding the time of application. The term "continuously" was interpreted to mean that one did not take up any other occupation or vocation. *Matter of B*, 3 I&N Dec. 162 (CO 1948).

Later decisions on religious workers conclude that, if the worker is to receive no salary for church work, the assumption is that he/she would be required to earn a living by obtaining other employment. *Matter of Bisulca*, 10 I&N Dec. 712 (Reg. Comm. 1963) and *Matter of Sinha*, 10 I&N Dec. 758 (Reg. Comm. 1963).

The term "continuously" also is discussed in a 1980 decision where the Board of Immigration Appeals determined that a minister of religion was not continuously carrying on the vocation of minister when he was a full-time student who was devoting only nine hours a week to religious duties. *Matter of Varughese*, 17 I&N Dec. 399 (BIA 1980).

In line with these past decisions and the intent of Congress, it is clear, therefore that to be continuously carrying on the religious work means to do so on a full-time basis. That the qualifying work should be paid employment, not volunteering, is inherent in those past decisions which hold that, if the religious worker is not paid, the assumption is that he/she is engaged in other, secular employment. The idea that a religious undertaking would be unsalaried is applicable only to those in a religious vocation who in accordance with their vocation live in a clearly unsalaried environment, the primary examples in the regulations being nuns, monks, and religious brothers and sisters. Clearly, therefore, the qualifying two years of religious work must be full-time and generally salaried. To hold otherwise would be contrary to the intent of Congress.

On appeal, the petitioner submitted a letter in which Bishop [REDACTED] "verified" that the beneficiary is currently working in a full-time position and that her work hours are from 10:00 am to 7:00 p.m. According to the letter, the beneficiary's duties include "conducting missionary training classes, teaching after school bible class, guidance counseling, marriage counseling, coordinating community outreach program, visiting and bringing the gospel to the elderly and shut ins, spiritual counseling classes for newly converted Christians, and teaching adult Sunday school class." The petitioner submitted no documentary evidence to corroborate the beneficiary's duties. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Furthermore, previous documentation submitted by the petitioner listed none of these duties and did not reflect a full-time work schedule. The petitioner failed to submit documentary evidence to resolve this inconsistency. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may, of course, lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591 (BIA 1988). If Citizenship and Immigration Services (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).

Further, a petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing; a petition cannot be approved at a future date after the petitioner becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971).

The evidence submitted by the petitioner is inconsistent as to the beneficiary's prior work experience and does not establish that she has worked continuously in a qualifying occupation for two full years preceding the filing date of the petition.

According to 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(1), the alien must be coming to the United States at the request of the religious organization to work in a religious occupation. To establish eligibility for special immigrant classification, the petitioner must establish that the specific position that it is offering qualifies as a religious occupation as defined in these proceedings.

The statute is silent on what constitutes a "religious occupation" and the regulation states only that it is an activity relating to a traditional religious function. The regulation does not define the term "traditional religious function" and instead provides a brief list of examples. The list reveals that not all employees of a religious organization are considered to be engaged in a religious occupation for the purpose of special immigrant classification. The regulation states that positions such as cantor, missionary, or religious instructor are examples of qualifying religious occupations. Persons in such positions would reasonably be expected to perform services directly related to the creed and practice of the religion. The regulation reflects that nonqualifying positions are those whose duties are primarily administrative or secular in nature. The lists of qualifying and nonqualifying occupations derive from the legislative history. H.R. Rpt. 101-723, at 75 (Sept. 19, 1990).

Citizenship and Immigration Services therefore interprets the term "traditional religious function" to require a demonstration that the duties of the position are directly related to the religious creed of the denomination, that the position is defined and recognized by the governing body of the denomination, and that the position is traditionally a permanent, full-time, salaried occupation within the denomination.

The petitioner does not identify the job duties of the proffered position and does not conclusively state that the beneficiary is currently employed in the position. As discussed above, while stating that the beneficiary was engaged full-time with the church, the petitioner submitted a work-schedule indicating that she worked 16 ½ hours per week with the majority of those hours involved providing in-home patient care for one specific individual. Although the petitioner stated that as part of her duties of patient care, the beneficiary was to "give communion and teach scripture," the description of the position reflects that the duties are primarily secular in nature.

Also as discussed above, the petitioner now states that the beneficiary's duties include missionary training classes, teaching after school bible classes, and spiritual counseling classes. We again note that these duties were first mentioned on appeal, and that the petitioner cannot change the duties of the position after the petition has been filed to make them comply with the statute and regulations. *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. at 49.

The evidence does not establish that the proffered position is a religious occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

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

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.