

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: NOV 21 2005  
WAC 03 254 53230

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

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.

Σ Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, California Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be sustained and the petition will be approved.

The petitioner is the mother church of the Church of Scientology International. 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 member of the Sea Organization, a religious order of the Church of Scientology. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary's position qualifies as either a religious occupation or a religious vocation. The director also questioned the authenticity of a key document reproduced in the record.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(m)(2) offers the following pertinent definitions:

*Minister* means an individual duly authorized by a recognized religious denomination to conduct religious worship and to perform other duties usually performed by authorized members of the clergy of that religion. In all cases, there must be a reasonable connection between the activities performed and the religious calling of the minister. The term does not include a lay preacher not authorized to perform such duties.

*Religious occupation* means an activity which relates to a traditional religious function. Examples of individuals in religious occupations include, but are not limited to, liturgical workers, religious instructors, religious counselors, cantors, catechists, workers in religious hospitals or religious health care facilities, missionaries, religious translators, or religious broadcasters. This group does not include janitors, maintenance workers, clerks, fund raisers, or persons solely involved in the solicitation of donations.

*Religious vocation* means a calling to religious life evidenced by the demonstration of commitment practiced in the religious denomination, such as the taking of vows. Examples of individuals with a religious vocation include, but are not limited to, nuns, monks, and religious brothers and sisters.

The regulation reflects that positions whose duties are primarily administrative or secular in nature do not qualify as religious occupations. 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.

In a letter dated September 8, 2003, [REDACTED] the petitioner's legal officer, describes the beneficiary's work:

In January 1999, [the beneficiary] joined the Sea Organization and began her religious vocation at the Church's continental office in Copenhagen, Denmark. [The beneficiary] was made responsible for the procurement, establishment, [and] training of qualified staff

members for all of the Churches across Europe. In April 1999, [the beneficiary] was promoted to [the petitioning church], located in Los Angeles to carry on her religious vocation of overseeing the procurement, establishment, and training of qualified staff members for each of the Church's continental offices all over the world.

[The petitioner] has staff qualifications requiring Sea Organization membership. . . .

Sea Organization members devote their lives to their religion; they live in community with other Sea Organization members and wear specific uniforms. Their meals, housing, clothes, medical and dental care are provided by the Church. Each member additionally receives a small weekly allowance, currently \$50.00 per week and occasional small bonuses.

The director concluded that the petitioner did not adequately describe the beneficiary's duties, and that the petitioner has failed "to show that the Sea Organization has a governing structure, a formal legal organizing instrument, set theological education standards, or operates with its own budget and assets." The director did not explain the source of these requirements. The director acknowledged the members' "life-long commitment to their faith," but determined that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the Sea Organization is a religious order, whose members qualify as workers in a religious vocation.

The Church of Scientology has provided various documents and affidavits discussing the Sea Organization. Upon careful consideration of these materials, the AAO is satisfied that the Sea Organization qualifies as a religious order, and that its members practice a religious vocation. Because a discussion of specific duties is germane to religious occupations, but not religious vocations, we need not analyze the beneficiary's exact duties in any detail.

Having concluded that the Sea Organization is a religious order, we must now determine whether or not the beneficiary has been a full member of that order since at least two years prior to the petition's September 10, 2003 filing date, as required by section 101(a)(27)(C)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)(iii), and 8 C.F.R. §§ 204.5(m)(1) and (3)(ii)(A).

The record contains copies of several certificates, including a "Sea Organization Contract of Employment," which reads, in part, "I contract myself to the Sea Organization for the next billion years," signed by the beneficiary and dated January 11, 1985. There is also an illegible witness signature. The contract contains a separate section for signatures to show that the "Swearing In Ceremony" has taken place; the beneficiary signed under this section, but there is no recruiter's signature to verify that the oath had been administered. The director instructed the petitioner to "[s]ubmit the original document from which the photocopy was obtained," and the petitioner complied with this request. While the document thus submitted matches the photocopy submitted previously, [REDACTED] "The original certificate was lost in Denmark and a duplicate certificate was prepared with the same information contained on the original form, except that the recruiter's signature was not available."

The director, in denying the petition, observed that the Sea Org "Contract of Employment" is not a decisive instrument of membership in the Sea Org, and that "[t]he petitioner submitted no documentary evidence to

show that the beneficiary is in fact a full member” of the Sea Organization. The director also found that the petitioner’s explanation regarding the contract was not persuasive. The director stated: “it is unclear how the petitioner was able to make a duplicate copy without the original in its possession.” The director also asserted that the petitioner has not shown that the “witness” who signed the re-created contract is the same witness who had signed the now-lost original contract. The director concluded: “the fact remains that the petitioner initially submitted a document purported to be issued in 1985, when in fact it was not.”

On appeal, the petitioner submits materials concerning the various steps required to join the Sea Organization, such as completion of the Estates Project Force (EPF) and review by a Fitness Board. From materials made available to us, we have concluded that an individual who has successfully passed review by the Fitness Board can be considered a member of the Sea Organization (as opposed to a recruit, who is not a full member). Therefore, the petitioner can establish that the beneficiary possesses the relevant experience by submitting church records showing that the beneficiary passed the Fitness Board at least two years before September 10, 2003 and continuously engaged in the vocation during that time.

In a supplement to the appeal, the petitioner submits copies of church documents, including a document indicating that the beneficiary passed the Fitness Board on August 22, 1996, the same day she completed “Product Zero.” This indicates that the petitioner was a full member of the Sea Organization for more than seven years prior to the petition’s September 2003 filing date. One document bears the legend “Issued at: Los Angeles, California on 25 September 2005.” This demonstrates that the petitioner does, on occasion, reconstruct such certificates based on information in church records. Other documents date from the 1990s. While these are not contemporaneous evidence from 1985, they nevertheless predate the qualifying period. So long as the beneficiary was already a Sea Org member as of September 2001, it is of little importance whether she joined in 1985 or 1995. The director cites no contradictory evidence that would cast doubt on the information shown on the documents submitted on appeal, or show that the beneficiary engaged in disqualifying outside employment during the relevant two-year period.

While it is of some concern that the petitioner has submitted reconstructed documents without (initially) plainly labeling them as such, there remains sufficient additional documentation and information to support the petitioner’s claims and, thereby, a finding of eligibility. We see no evidence of fraudulent intent in the petitioner’s submission of a reconstructed contract. (Such concerns must be addressed case-by-case, rather than with the inflexible *a priori* presumption that reconstructed documents always, or never, denote attempted fraud.)

Pursuant to the above discussion, the petitioner has overcome the stated grounds for denial. Upon review of the record, we see no readily apparent obstacle to the approval of the petition. 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 sustained that burden. Accordingly, the decision of the director denying the petition will be withdrawn and the petition will be approved.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained and the petition is approved.