identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

D7

FILE: [redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 29 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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:

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. 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 Cuba, as the fiancé(e) 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 because the record contains no evidence that the petitioner and the beneficiary personally met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition or that the petitioner qualified for a waiver of that requirement. On appeal, the petitioner submits additional documentation, including evidence of her travel to Cuba in November of 2009.

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:

> [s]hall 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 . . . .

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 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on March 10, 2009. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between March 10, 2007 and March 10, 2009.

When she filed the petition, the petitioner responded "No" to question #18 on the I-129F Petition that asks whether she and the beneficiary had met in person within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The petitioner stated, in part, that she met the beneficiary in Cuba in 2002, and saw him again in Cuba in 2003.

On September 3, 2009, the director issued a Request for Evidence (RFE), requesting that the petitioner submit evidence that she and the beneficiary had met in person within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition or, in the alternative, evidence to establish why the requirement of an in-person meeting should be waived.

In her September 25, 2009 response to the director's RFE, the petitioner stated that she had not gone to Cuba to visit the beneficiary because the law prohibited her to do so, and that, when the law changed, the university would not allow her time off for travel.

The director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition because the record contains no evidence that the petitioner and the beneficiary personally met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition or that the petitioner qualified for a waiver of that requirement.

On appeal, the petitioner submits evidence of her travel to Cuba in November of 2009. The petitioner states again that she had not gone to Cuba to visit the beneficiary because the law prohibited her from doing so, and that, when the law changed, the university would not allow her time off for travel.

The petition is not approvable. The AAO recognizes that during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, travel regulations established by the U.S. government prohibited individuals from visiting family members in Cuba more than once every three years (31 C.F.R. § 515.561).[1] When she filed the petition, however, the petitioner indicated that she had traveled to Cuba in 2002 and 2003. Thus, the petitioner has not demonstrated that she was prohibited from traveling to Cuba within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, that is, between March 10, 2007 and March 10, 2009, as she indicated on the petition that she has relatives living there. Accordingly, the evidence of record indicates that the petitioner could have returned to Cuba within the specified two-year time period while complying with U.S. travel regulations. The AAO does not find that the petitioner has offered evidence to establish that compliance with the meeting requirement during the specified period would have constituted an extreme hardship for her or that such a meeting would have violated the customs of the beneficiary's culture or social practice.

[1] On April 13, 2009, President Obama lifted restrictions on the ability of individuals to visit relatives in Cuba, as well as to send them remittances.

The AAO also acknowledges the petitioner's trip to Cuba in November of 2009, to visit the beneficiary. The petition may not be approved, however, because the petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. USCIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(1). A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). In this case, the petition was filed on March 10, 2009, and thus the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met between March 10, 2007 and March 10, 2009. Since this has not occurred, it is concluded that the petition may not be approved. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. Should the petitioner wish to file a new I-129F Petition, she should consult the instructions to the Form I-129F to understand the specific documents that she should file along with the petition. The petitioner may download the I-129F petition with the instructions from the USCIS website at www.uscis.gov, or she may call the USCIS National Customer Service Center (NCSC) at 1-800-375-5283 to have the form and the instructions mailed to her home.

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. The petition is denied.