

PUBLIC COPY

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

DL

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted]
WAC 05 061 53948

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 31 2005**

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 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, 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 Ethiopia, 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 because he found the beneficiary's marriage to the petitioner prior to the filing of the petition prevented him from benefiting as a fiancé under section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act. *Decision of the Director*, dated February 1, 2005.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act defines a nonimmigrant in this category 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 admission, and the minor children of such fiancée or fiancé accompanying him or following to join him.

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 2 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, except that the Attorney General in his discretion may waive the requirement that the parties have previously met in person....

The record reflects that the petition was filed with the service center on December 27, 2004. At the time of filing, the petitioner submitted a document entitled "Marriage Certificate," which appears to establish a September 9, 2004 marriage between the petitioner and beneficiary. On appeal, the petitioner contends that this certificate does not document her marriage to the beneficiary, but, instead, represents evidence of their engagement. She states that the Addis Ababa city government uses the same certificate for both engagement and marriage. However, the petitioner's statements, do not establish that the certificate she has submitted documents only her engagement to the beneficiary. She provides no evidence to document the dual use of the marriage certificate by the Addis Ababa city government, nor any other proof that the certificate she has submitted indicates only evidence of an engagement. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). The certificate submitted by the petitioner will, therefore, be viewed as documenting the petitioner's marriage to the beneficiary.

However, the petitioner's marriage to the beneficiary prior to the date of filing does not preclude her from filing a Form I-129F on his behalf. The Legal Immigration Family Equity (LIFE) Act of 2000, Pub. L. 106-553, 114 Stat. 2762 (2000), amended by LIFE Act Amendments, Pub. L. 106-554, 114 Stat. 2763 (2000) has

amended the language of section 101(a)(15)(k) of the Act to allow U.S. citizens to file Form I-129F fiancé(e) petitions for their spouses if they have already filed Form I-130 alien relative petitions on their behalf.

Section 101(a)(15)(k)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(k)(ii), states, in part, that an alien who—

(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....

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(7) provides, in part:

To be classified as a K-3 spouse as defined in section 101(a)(15)(k)(ii) of the Act, or the K-4 child of such alien defined in section 101(a)(15)(k)(ii) of the Act, the alien spouse must be the beneficiary of an immigrant visa petition filed by a U.S. citizen on Form I-130, Petition for Alien Relative, and the beneficiary of an approved petition for a K-3 nonimmigrant visa filed on Form I-129F....

There is no evidence in the record that a Form I-130 visa petition was filed by the petitioner on behalf of her spouse prior to her submission of the Form I-129F, nor does a check of Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) databases indicate that this is the case. As a result, the beneficiary cannot benefit from the instant petition and the appeal is dismissed. However, CIS databases do show that the beneficiary filed a Form I-130 for her spouse on June 9, 2005, subsequent to the filing of the Form I-129F.

The denial of this petition is without prejudice. As the petitioner has filed a Form I-130 for her spouse, she may file a new I-129F petition on his behalf in accordance with the statutory requirements.

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.