

**PUBLIC COPY**

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

*DP*



U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20536

U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



FILE: [Redacted]  
EAC 02 242 52963

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

APR 26 2004  
Date:

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

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.

*Robert P. Wiemann*

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont 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 Kenya, 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 had not offered documentation evidencing 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. *See* Decision of the Director, dated January 28, 2003.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K), provides nonimmigrant classification to an alien who:

- (i) is the fiancé(e) of a U.S. citizen and who seeks to enter the United States solely to conclude a valid marriage with that citizen within 90 days after admission;
- (ii) has concluded a valid marriage with a citizen of the United States who is the petitioner, is the beneficiary of a petition to accord a status under section 201(b)(2)(A)(i) that was filed under section 204 by the petitioner, and seeks to enter the United States to await the approval of such petition and the availability to the alien of an immigrant visa; or
- (iii) is the minor child of an alien described in clause (i) or (ii) and is accompanying, or following to join, the alien.

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. . . .

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2), the petitioner may be exempted from this requirement for a meeting if it is established that compliance would:

- (1) result in extreme hardship to the petitioner; or
- (2) that compliance would violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice, as where marriages are traditionally arranged by the parents of the contracting parties and the prospective bride and groom are prohibited from meeting subsequent to the arrangement and prior to the wedding day. In addition to establishing that the required meeting would be a violation of custom or practice, the petitioner must also establish that any and all other aspects of the traditional arrangements have been or will be met in accordance with the custom or practice.

The regulation at section 214.2 does not define what may constitute extreme hardship to the petitioner. Therefore, each claim of extreme hardship must be judged on a case-by-case basis taking into account the totality of the petitioner's circumstances. Generally, a director looks at whether the petitioner can demonstrate the existence of circumstances that are (1) not within the power of the petitioner to control or change, and (2)

likely to last for a considerable duration or the duration cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

The petitioner filed the Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) (Form I-129F) with the Immigration and Naturalization Service [now Citizenship and Immigration Services] on July 17, 2002. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on July 17, 2000 and ended on July 17, 2002.

In response to the director's request for additional evidence, the petitioner submitted a letter stating that a meeting between the petitioner and the beneficiary in person may give rise to temptations and violate the couple's religious beliefs. See Letter from [REDACTED] dated October 14, 2002. The petitioner submits a letter from a bishop in Kenya indicating that the religious rules of the couple's faith will not allow them to meet prior to the completion of wedding preparations. See Letter from [REDACTED] dated October 4, 2002. The petitioner also submitted a letter from the parents of the beneficiary declaring their acceptance of a marriage between the petitioner and the beneficiary. See Letter from Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED] dated October 7, 2002. The AAO notes, however, that the Form I-129F petition includes a statement from the petitioner establishing that the petitioner and the beneficiary had previously met although the statement does not indicate when that meeting occurred. See Form I-129F, Question #19, dated July 17, 2002.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a letter stating that he traveled to Kenya and Uganda to meet the beneficiary. See Letter from [REDACTED] dated March 12, 2003. The petitioner evidences his trip by submitting the passenger receipt for airline tickets issued to him on February 6, 2003; a copy of the United States passport of the petitioner reflecting entry and exit stamps for Kenya during February 2003; a copy of the Kenyan passport of the beneficiary and color photographs of the petitioner and the beneficiary together.

The AAO notes that the evidence submitted on appeal seeks to establish that the petitioner and the beneficiary met during February 2003. Under section 214(d) of the Act, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met between July 17, 2000 and July 17, 2002. The evidence of record does not establish that the petitioner and the beneficiary met as required. Taking into account the totality of the circumstances as the petitioner has presented them, the AAO does not find that compliance with the meeting requirement would result in extreme hardship to the petitioner or would violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2), the denial of the petition is without prejudice. The petitioner may file a new Form I-129F petition on the beneficiary's behalf when sufficient evidence is available.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. See Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.