identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Rm. A3042
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 29 200
LIN 03 164 52987

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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 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 Director, Nebraska 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 China, 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 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. *Decision of the Director*, dated February 26, 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 the Immigration and Naturalization Service [now Citizenship and Immigration Services] on April 24, 2003. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on April 24, 2001 and ended on April 24, 2003.

The petitioner submitted a letter from a physician indicating that the writer recommends that the petitioner not travel to China. The director determined that the petitioner and the beneficiary could have met in a third country in order to decrease the burden of travel on the petitioner.

On appeal, the petitioner asserts that he was able to obtain approval of a petition for his previous spouse without fulfilling the meeting requirement so he should be granted approval on this petition as well. *Letter from Terry L. Pratt*, dated March 1, 2004. The petitioner further contends that he suffers persistent medical problems and that it would be almost impossible for the beneficiary to "get out of China" even if he were able to meet her half way. *Id.*

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 does not demonstrate that the petitioner and the beneficiary explored options for a meeting beyond the petitioner traveling to China, including, but not limited to the beneficiary traveling to meet the petitioner in the United States or a bordering country. Although the petitioner asserts that it would be difficult for the beneficiary to obtain a visa to travel, the record does not demonstrate that the beneficiary has attempted to obtain a visa. The inability of the petitioner to travel to the home country of the beneficiary standing alone does not warrant a finding of extreme hardship. The AAO further notes that the proffered letters establishing the petitioner's medical condition recommend that he not travel overseas or travel to a location "where medical therapy is not easily accessible." *Letter from Steven T. Linsenbardt,* DO, dated January 30, 2003. *See also Letter from James F. Tritz, MD*, dated March 18, 2002. The submitted letters do not indicate that the petitioner is unable to travel outside of the United States.

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 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.