




U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

DC



FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **APR 22 2008**  
WAC 07 187 53998

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:



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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
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 Cambodia, 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 record did not establish that the petitioner and beneficiary had personally met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, as required by section 214(d) of the Act or that such a meeting would have constituted an extreme hardship or violated the customs of the beneficiary's culture or social practice. *Decision of the Director*, dated November 16, 2007.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (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 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 June 4, 2007. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on June 4, 2005 and ended on June 4, 2007.

At the time of filing, the petitioner indicated that he and the beneficiary had not met, because of delays in processing his passport, but that they had been talking on the telephone every week and e-mailing.

On appeal, counsel states that the petitioner and the beneficiary previously met in 1998 and met again in June 2007 when the petitioner returned to Cambodia for his engagement ceremony. *Counsel's Letter*, dated November 28, 2007. The petitioner states that his school and work prevented him from returning to Cambodia to visit the beneficiary. *Petitioner's Statement*, dated December 10, 2007. The record includes undated photographs of the petitioner and beneficiary together, and copies of airline boarding passes and the petitioner's and beneficiary's passports. The AAO notes that the petitioner's passport and the airline boarding pass for Silk Air indicate that he traveled to Cambodia on June 20, 2007. While the AAO finds the petitioner to have established that he traveled to Cambodia to meet the applicant, he has not, however, established compliance with the meeting requirement of section 214(d) of the Act, as it relates to the instant petition.

The record demonstrates that the applicant visited Cambodia on June 20, 2007, approximately two weeks after the end of the specified period. Therefore, although he has established that he has met the beneficiary, this meeting did not occur within the two-year time period noted above and does not satisfy section 214(d) of the Act. Although the petitioner has claimed that his school and work commitments prevented him from traveling to meet the beneficiary during the specified period, the balancing of such personal obligations with overseas with overseas travel is a common challenge for individuals wishing to file I-129F petitions. Accordingly, the petitioner has not demonstrated that compliance with the meeting requirement of section 214(d) of the Act would have constituted an extreme hardship for him, as required for an exemption from the meeting requirement under the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2). Moreover, while the petitioner and the beneficiary are required to meet during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the Form I-129F, that meeting need not occur in 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 Cambodia, including the beneficiary traveling to meet the petitioner in the United States. Taking into account the totality of the circumstances, as presented by the petitioner, the AAO does not find that compliance with the meeting requirement would have resulted in extreme hardship to him or would have violated and strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. 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.