

DC

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
Citizenship and Immigration Services

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE  
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F  
425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20536

[REDACTED]

File [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 28 2003

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

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

**PUBLIC COPY**

**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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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 nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). 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 Philippines, as the fiancée 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 failed to establish that he and the beneficiary had 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 Act defines "fiancé(e)" as:

An alien who is the fiancée or fiancé 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 fiancé(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 bona fide 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 petitioner filed the Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) (Form I-129F) on February 18, 2003. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on February 18, 2001 and ended on February 18, 2003.

The record reflects that the petitioner and beneficiary personally met when the petitioner traveled to the Philippines from March 19, 2003 through April 2, 2003, one month after having filed the petition. On appeal, the petitioner states that he was unaware and was never informed of the requirement that he and the beneficiary personally meet during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing date of the petition.

The petitioner's reasons for not having personally met the beneficiary within the time period specified in section 214(d) of

[REDACTED]

the Act are not persuasive. Ignorance of the law is not an excuse. Furthermore, the Form I-129F and attached instructions contain all of the information required concerning eligibility requirements.

The petitioner has failed to establish that he and the beneficiary personally met during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing date of the petition or that extreme hardship or unique circumstances exist to warrant a favorable exercise of discretion to waive the statutory requirement. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2), the denial of the petition is without prejudice. Now that the petitioner and the beneficiary have met, 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.

It is also noted that the petitioner has failed to submit a final divorce decree concerning his prior marriage to [REDACTED]. Without the submission of this document, a petition filed on behalf of the beneficiary may not be approved.

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.