

U.S. Department of Justice  
Immigration and Naturalization Service

D6

**PUBLIC COPY**

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536



FEB 13 2001

File:  Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: Petitioner:   
Beneficiary: 

identification data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

Petition: Petition for Alien Fiance(e) Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which 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 which 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 Service 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 which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner is a citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of the Ukraine, as the fiance(e) of a United States citizen pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K).

The director denied the petition after determining that the petitioner and the beneficiary had not previously met in person, as required by section 214(d) of the Act. In reaching this conclusion, the director found that the petitioner's failure to comply with the statutory requirement was not the result of extreme hardship to the petitioner, or unique circumstances.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K), defines "fiance(e)" as:

An alien who is the fiancee or fiance of a citizen of the United States and who seeks to enter the United States solely to conclude a valid marriage with the petitioner within ninety days after entry....

Section 214(d) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(d) states in pertinent part that a fiancee petition:

shall be approved only after satisfactory evidence is submitted by the petitioner to establish that the parties have previously met in person within two years before the date of filing the petition, have a bonafide intention to marry, and are legally able and actually willing to conclude a valid marriage in the United States within a period of ninety days after the alien's arrival...

The petition was filed with the Service on February 18, 1999. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on February 18, 1997 and ended on February 18, 1999.

On the petition for Alien Fiance(e) (Form I-129F), the petitioner specified that he and beneficiary had met in person; however, the petitioner did not specify the date and place of their last meeting. Therefore, on May 3, 1999, the director requested additional information from the petitioner about the last meeting between the petitioner and the beneficiary. In response, the petitioner stated that he met the beneficiary in July and August of 1994 in Ukraine, but they had not seen each other since that time because the petitioner had several surgeries that prevented him

from traveling. Citing that no extreme hardship or unique circumstances existed to warrant a waiver of the requirement to meet in person, the director denied the petition because the meeting between the petitioner and the beneficiary had occurred prior to the two-year period in which they were required to have met.

On appeal, the petitioner submits additional documentation from his physician and a psychologist. According to the physician's letter, the petitioner has a history of illnesses from complications due to diabetes. The petitioner recently suffered a stroke and as of August of 2000, he was residing in the rehabilitation unit of the hospital.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(k)(2), a district director may exercise discretion and waive the requirement of a personal meeting between the two parties if it is established that compliance would:

- (1) Result in extreme hardship to the petitioner; or
- (2) Violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice.

The record contains sufficient evidence that a personal meeting between the petitioner and the beneficiary would result in extreme hardship to the petitioner. The petitioner has presented persuasive documentation that during the two-year period before filing the petition, the petitioner had been under the care of a physician for illnesses due to complications of diabetes, which prevented him from meeting the beneficiary in person. Therefore, extreme hardship qualifies the petitioner for a waiver of the statutory requirement.

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 met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained.