



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent unauthorized
invasion of personal privacy

D6

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: FEB 02 2004
LIN 03 065 53680

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 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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska 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 India, 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, or that meeting as required would impose extreme hardship on the petitioner.

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 December 23, 2002. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on December 23, 2000 and ended on December 23, 2002.

In response to the director's request for evidence and additional information concerning the parties' last meeting, the petitioner submitted a statement affirming, "In Hinduism, by culture and by religious beliefs, marriages are arranged . . . I am doing my priesthood, therefore I am not able to go to India to visit my Fiance [sic]."

On appeal, the petitioner submits a letter dated August 26, 2003 and affidavits of two Hindu priests, dated August 5 and August 6, 2003, respectively. The petitioner states that during priesthood training, one is forbidden by culture and the high priest to gallivant. He also states that it would impose a financial hardship to him to travel to India to meet with the beneficiary. *See* Letter of Arun Battan, dated August 26, 2003.

The affidavit of the Hindu priest training the petitioner for priesthood states, "Now that the priest application of Arun Battan has been sent to India, we believe he can meet with the girl." *See* Affidavit of Mahant Purushottam Das Leckhraj Bundhoo, dated August 5, 2003. As the authorities overseeing the petitioner's religious training concede that he is now able to "meet with the girl", the AAO does not find that compliance with the two-year meeting requirement imposes extreme hardship on the petitioner. The time and expense involved in traveling to a foreign country are the normal difficulties encountered in complying with the requirement that the petitioner and the beneficiary meet and thus, do not constitute extreme hardship. 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.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.