

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

86

PUBLIC COPY



FILE:



MSC 06 341 23266

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 11 2008

IN RE:

Petitioner:



Beneficiary:

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, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont 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 the Philippines, 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. He further determined that the record did not establish a basis on which to exempt the petitioner from this requirement. *Decision of the Director*, dated February 22, 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 September 6, 2006. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on September 6, 2004 and ended on September 6, 2006.

At the time of filing, the petitioner indicated that he and the beneficiary had not previously met because he was afraid to travel abroad as a result of the increasing threats made against Americans. *Letter from Petitioner*, dated September 1, 2006. In response to the director's November 22, 2006 request for evidence, the petitioner reiterated his concerns about hostility toward Americans abroad and stated that he was not emotionally prepared to travel outside the United States. *Letter from Petitioner*, dated January 12, 2007.

On appeal, the petitioner states that he met the beneficiary in the Philippines in March 2007 and submits evidence of his travel, including copies of his airline boarding passes, pages from his U.S. passport showing an entry stamp for the Philippines dated March 31, 2007, his hotel bill and photographs of the petitioner and the beneficiary together. While the AAO finds the petitioner to have established that he traveled to the Philippines in March 2007, he has not established compliance with the meeting requirement of section 214(d) of the Act, as it relates to the instant petition.

The petitioner's March 2007 trip to meet the beneficiary occurred over six months after he filed the Form I-129F on behalf of the beneficiary. Therefore, although he has established that he has met the beneficiary, this meeting did not occur within the two-year time period specified above – September 6, 2004 to September 6, 2006– and does not satisfy section 214(d) of the Act. Further, the petitioner's fears regarding hostilities towards Americans abroad do not constitute extreme hardship. The AAO notes that 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 Philippines, including, but not limited to the beneficiary traveling to meet the petitioner in the United States. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. As the petitioner and beneficiary have met, he may file a new I-129F petition on the beneficiary's behalf so that a new two-year meeting period will apply.

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.