

PUBLIC COPY

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



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D6

OCT 27 2005

FILE: [REDACTED]
LIN 04 222 50950

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Acting Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic, 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 acting 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, and had not submitted credible documentary evidence to establish the fiancée relationship within the meaning of section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act. *Decision of the Acting Director*, dated September 8, 2004.

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 Citizenship and Immigration Services on July 28, 2004. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on July 28, 2002 and ended on July 28, 2004.

The director determined that the petitioner and the beneficiary had not met as required and noted that the petitioner failed to provide evidence of the termination of his previous marriage to Santa Rivera.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a letter indicating that he has requested a copy of the documentation terminating his marriage to [REDACTED] and will forward it expeditiously. *Letter from Hector Lebron Bones*, dated October 7, 2004. The petitioner further contends that he has pending legal matters that require his continuous presence in Massachusetts until they are resolved and that travel is not financially feasible for him. *Form I-290B*, dated October 8, 2004. The AAO noted that the petitioner requested 30 days in which to submit a brief and or additional evidence in support of his appeal. Approximately one year has elapsed since the filing of the Form I-290B appeal and no further documentation has been submitted into the record.

Although section 214(d) of the Act requires the petitioner and the beneficiary to meet, it does not require the petitioner to travel to the beneficiary's home country. The record on appeal does not demonstrate that the petitioner and the beneficiary explored options for a meeting beyond the petitioner traveling to the Dominican Republic, including, but not limited to the beneficiary traveling to meet the petitioner in the United States or a bordering country. The inability of the petitioner to travel to the home country of the beneficiary standing alone does not warrant a finding of extreme hardship to the petitioner. Further, the AAO notes that the record fails to reflect the duration or nature of the restrictions placed on the petitioner's movements and therefore, the AAO cannot establish that the petitioner's situation is likely to last for a considerable duration thereby warranting a waiver of the meeting requirement. The time and financial commitments required for travel to a foreign country are requirements common to those filing the Form I-129F petition and do not constitute extreme hardship to the petitioner.

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.

In addition, the record on appeal fails to contain evidence of the termination of the petitioner's marriage to Santa Rivera and therefore fails to establish that the petitioner was legally able to conclude a valid marriage in the United States at the time of the filing of the Form I-129F petition. 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.