

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

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Rm. A3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

D 6

PUBLIC COPY




FILE:

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: OCT 02 2006

IN RE:

Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) Pursuant to § 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, Chief  
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 citizen of Morocco, as the fiancée of a United States citizen pursuant to § 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 and the beneficiary had not personally met within two years before the date of filing the petition, as required by § 214(d) of the Act, or that compliance with the meeting requirement would result in extreme hardship to the petitioner or would violate the beneficiary's customs.

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 § 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 October 12, 2005; thus, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on October 12, 2003 and ended on October 12, 2005. The two have never met. On appeal, the petitioner explains more fully the reasons for which he contends he would experience extreme hardship if required to meet his fiancée in person. He states that he cannot find anyone to take over his responsibilities at work. He submits a letter from the medical director of his place of employment, where the petitioner works as the general manager. The medical director, [REDACTED], writes that the petitioner's absence from the workplace, without a suitable substitute, could cause undesirable financial consequences. The petitioner also asserts that the expenses involved in travelling to Morocco would be prohibitive, as would those involved in meeting his fiancée in a third country. The petitioner mentions projections of possible airfare, lodging, and food costs; however, no evidence is provided to substantiate his figures.

The AAO notes that the financial and time commitments required for travel to a foreign country are a common requirement to those filing the Form I-129F petition, and the evidence of record does not support a finding that such burdens would constitute extreme hardship to the petitioner. Moreover, although § 214(d) of the Act requires the petitioner and the beneficiary to meet, it does not require the petitioner to travel outside the United States or North America. The petitioner, in fact, resides very near the Canadian province of Ontario. The record does not establish that the petitioner and beneficiary explored the possibility of meeting in Canada, for example, which would not present the types of inconveniences and expenses on the petitioner's part as he describes on appeal.

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 of having met the beneficiary is available.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. *See* § 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.