

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529

**ADMITTED FOR INSPECTION TO U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
OFFICE OF INSPECTION AND INSURANCE
OF PORTS AND AIRPORTS**



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D6



FILE: [REDACTED]
WAC 02 151 53053

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **11 06 2004**

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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was approved by the Director, California Service Center. The director subsequently reopened and denied the petition based on information received from the American Consulate/Embassy in New Delhi, India. The petition 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 fiancé 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 she and the beneficiary share a bona fide fiancé relationship. *Decision of the Director*, dated December 22, 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 consular officer noted that the photographs provided as proof of engagement were not convincing based on the formal engagement ceremonies that characterize Indian society. The consular officer also noted that the beneficiary did not produce correspondence between himself and the petitioner or evidence of seeing the petitioner since their engagement.

In response to the director's Intent to Deny Notice, the petitioner submitted a letter indicating that a formal engagement ceremony did not occur because she has been previously married. The petitioner also submitted a copy of the petitioner's passport reflecting entry stamps to India in 2001 and 2003 and copies of telephone invoices reflecting calls made by the petitioner to the beneficiary during 2002 and 2003.

On appeal, the petitioner submits six color photographs of the petitioner and the beneficiary together. The petitioner states that she was unable to obtain additional evidence in the timeframe provided. *Form I-290B*, dated February 9, 2004.

Taking into account the totality of the circumstances as the petitioner has presented them, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not submitted credible documentary evidence to establish the fiancé relationship within the meaning of section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act. 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.