

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

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[REDACTED]

D6

DATE: OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

JUL 18 2012

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director (the director) denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed a subsequent appeal. The matter is again before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion will be granted. The appeal will remain dismissed and the petition will remain denied.

The petitioner is a citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a citizen of the Republic of Korea, as the fiancé(e) 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, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii), because the petitioner did not submit required initial evidence. On motion to reopen, the petitioner submits additional evidence. The petitioner's submission qualifies as a motion to reopen under the requirements set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2).

Applicable Law

A "fiancé(e)" is defined at section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act as someone who:

subject to subsections (d) and (p) of section 214, [is] an alien who—

- (i) is the fiancée or fiancé of a citizen of the United States . . . and who seeks to enter the United States solely to conclude a valid marriage with the petitioner within ninety days after admission[.]

Section 214(d)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(d)(1), 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 2 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, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security in [her] discretion may waive the requirement that the parties have previously met in person. . . .

The statutory requirement for in-person meeting between the petitioner and the beneficiary is further explained at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2), which states the following:

The petitioner shall establish to the satisfaction of the director that the petitioner and K-1 beneficiary have met in person within the two years immediately preceding the filing of the petition. As a matter of discretion, the director may exempt the petitioner from this requirement only if it is established that compliance would result in extreme hardship to the petitioner or that compliance would violate strict and long-established customs of the K-1 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. Failure to establish that the petitioner and K-1 beneficiary have met within the required period or that compliance with the requirement should be waived shall result in the denial of the petition. Such denial shall be without prejudice to the filing of a new petition once the petitioner and K-1 beneficiary have met in person.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii) states that if all required initial evidence is not submitted with the petition or the petitioner does not demonstrate eligibility, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, in its discretion, deny the petition for lack of initial evidence. The specific requirements for filing a Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) (Form I-129F), including a description of the required initial evidence, may be found in the *Instructions* to the Form I-129F.¹

Pertinent Facts and Procedural History

The petitioner filed the instant petition on February 14, 2011. The director issued a subsequent request for additional evidence (RFE), and the petitioner submitted a timely response. After considering the evidence of record, including the petitioner's response to the RFE, the director denied the petition on September 28, 2011. We dismissed the petitioner's subsequent appeal on March 12, 2012.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). Upon reopening and review, we find that the petitioner has failed to overcome every ground of our decision dismissing the appeal.

Analysis

In our decision dismissing the appeal we notified the petitioner that the record lacked the following: (1) evidence establishing either that he met the beneficiary in person within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition or that he is eligible for an exemption from that requirement; and (2) a statement from the beneficiary regarding her intent to marry the petitioner within 90 days of her entry into the United States.

On motion to reopen, the petitioner submits the requisite statement from the beneficiary regarding her intent to marry the petitioner within 90 days of her entry into the United States. The petitioner has therefore overcome that portion of our prior decision. However, the petitioner does not address or submit any evidence to overcome our prior finding regarding his failure to establish either that he met the beneficiary in person within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition or that he is eligible for exemption from that requirement. He has therefore not established the beneficiary's eligibility for classification as his alien fiancée under section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act.

¹ The *Instructions* to the Form I-129F may be found online at the USCIS website at <http://www.uscis.gov/files/form/i-129finstr.pdf> (accessed July 10, 2012).

Conclusion

The petitioner has overcome one, but not both, grounds of our prior decision. Accordingly, the beneficiary remains ineligible for nonimmigrant classification under section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act and the appeal must remain dismissed.

In these proceedings, the petitioner bears the burden of proof to establish the beneficiary's eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375 (AAO 2010). He has not met his burden and the petition will remain denied.

ORDER: The motion is granted. The March 12, 2012 decision of the Administrative Appeals Office is affirmed and the petition remains denied.