



DG

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Information is being released to
prevent identity theft and
invasion of personal privacy

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



File: [Redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAY 13 2002**

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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

EXHIBIT COPY

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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a naturalized citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of the Filipinos, 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 personally met within two years before the date of filing the petition, 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 fiancée 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 fiance(e) 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
[emphasis added]

The Petition for Alien Fiance(e) (Form I-129F) was filed with the Service on July 6, 2001. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on July 6, 1999 and ended on July 6, 2001.

In response to Question #19 on the Form I-129F, the petitioner indicated that he and the beneficiary had never met. In response to a request for additional information, the petitioner stated that he was unable to travel to the Philippines to meet the beneficiary because he could not close his meat market for more than one week because the products he sells would not keep and he would suffer financial loss. The director concluded that no extreme hardship or unique circumstances existed to waive the requirement of a personal

meeting between the petitioner and the beneficiary within the two years that immediately preceded the filing of the petition and denied the application accordingly.

On appeal, the petitioner submits evidence that he traveled to the Philippines to meet the beneficiary from November 26 through December 2, 2001.

It is important to emphasize that the regulation at section 214.2(k)(2) requires the petitioner to prove that he last met the beneficiary no more than two years prior to the filing of the petition. In the instant case, the relevant two-year period is July 6, 1999 to July 6, 2001. The evidence submitted indicates that the petitioner personally met the beneficiary in November 2001, more than four months after the filing date of the petition. Therefore, although the petitioner and beneficiary have now met, the meeting did not occur within the relevant two-year period. The director's decision to deny the petition is therefore affirmed.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(k)(2), the denial of the petition is without prejudice. Now that the petitioner and beneficiary have met in person, the petitioner may file a new I-129F petition in the beneficiary's behalf so that the two-year period in which the parties are required to have met will apply. The petitioner should submit evidence that he and the beneficiary have met within the two-year period that immediately precedes the filing of a new petition. Without the submission of documentary evidence that clearly establishes that the petitioner and the beneficiary have met in person during the requisite two-year period, the petition may not be approved unless the director grants a waiver of such 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 not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.