

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




Date: Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE:



MAY 20 2013

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:

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 with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a 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,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will remain denied.

The petitioner is a citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of the Philippines, as the fiancé 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 nonimmigrant visa petition pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii) because the petitioner failed to submit required initial evidence. On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement and additional evidence.

Applicable Law

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

subject to subsections (d) and (p) of section 214, 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 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 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.

Factual and Procedural History

The petitioner filed the fiancé(e) petition with USCIS on January 26, 2012 without any supporting evidence. For this reason, the director denied the petition on July 16, 2012. On appeal, the petitioner asserts that she has been in a relationship with the beneficiary for five years. The petitioner provides the following relevant evidence: the petitioner's California birth certificate; a photocopy of the biographic page from the petitioner's U.S. passport; one (1) passport-style color photograph of the petitioner and the beneficiary; and color photocopies of numerous undated photographs of the petitioner with the beneficiary.

Analysis

The petitioner has submitted some, but not all, of the required initial evidence. The record still lacks the following documentation: a Form G-325A, Biographic Information, for the petitioner and the beneficiary; one (1) additional passport-style color photograph of the petitioner and the beneficiary; evidence that the petitioner and the beneficiary have met in person between January 26, 2010 and January 26, 2012, which is the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, or evidence that the petitioner merits a favorable exercise of discretion to exempt her from such requirement pursuant to section 214(d)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2); and original statements from the petitioner and the beneficiary to establish their mutual intent to marry within 90 days of the beneficiary's admission into the United States in K-1 status.

On the Form I-129F, the petitioner stated that she resided with the beneficiary in the Philippines for three years prior to filing the petition. Although the petitioner submitted copies of photographs of herself with the beneficiary, the photographs are not film-dated. The petitioner has not submitted admission stamps from her passport, or airline ticket stubs and receipts as evidence of meeting the beneficiary within the requisite period.

Conclusion

As the petitioner still has not submitted all of the required initial evidence on appeal, the director's decision to deny the petition shall not be disturbed. As always, the burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375 (AAO 2010). Here, the petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition remains denied.