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

[redacted]

File: [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUN 27 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
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:

[redacted]

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, California 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 an evangelist at a monthly salary of $2,000.

The director denied the petition, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary has had the requisite two years of continuous experience in a religious occupation.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief in support of the appeal, asserting that the beneficiary has been employed for the requisite two years.

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 is a native and citizen of Guatemala. According to

the petitioner, the beneficiary entered the United States in September 1981 in an undetermined status. The record of proceeding indicates that the beneficiary has work authorization.

The sole issue to be addressed in this proceeding is whether the beneficiary had been continuously carrying on a 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 February 9, 1999. Therefore, the petitioner must establish that the beneficiary was continuously carrying on a religious occupation since at least February 9, 1997.

The petitioner submitted a letter from its director and pastor dated January 29, 1999 stating:

> Up to this point the beneficiary has worked as a part-time Evangelist. For the remainder, he has been employed as a house painter which has supplemented his earnings form the Church, made in the form of special offerings from members.

The director determined that the petitioner had failed to establish that the beneficiary has the required two years of experience in the religious occupation given that he had been performing duties as an evangelist on a part-time basis.

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. Here, the record shows that the beneficiary has been volunteering at the petitioning church on a volunteer basis in addition to working as a house painter. Part-time experience is insufficient to satisfy this requirement.

The term "continuously" is not new to the context of religious workers. In 1980 the Board of Immigration Appeals determined that a minister of religion was not "continuously" carrying on the vocation of minister when he was a fulltime student who was devoting only nine hours a week to religious duties. *See Matter of Varughese*, 17 I&N Dec. 399 (BIA 1980). This conclusion is on point with the situation found in the current proceeding.

In review, the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's objection to approving the petition.

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.