

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: [Redacted]  
WAC 06 215 51673

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 03 2007

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California 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 Mongolia, 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 November 6, 2006.

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 July 17, 2006. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on September July 17, 2004 and ended on July 17, 2006.

At the time of filing, the petitioner indicated that he and the beneficiary had never met. Therefore, the evidence of record does not establish that the petitioner has complied with the meeting requirement of section 214(d) of the Act.

On appeal, the petitioner stated that he is unable to make the trip to Mongolia due to several handicaps and even if he were healthy enough to travel, he would not be able to leave his job for the required time to travel. *Form I-290B*. In support of his assertions, the petitioner submitted a statement from his physician stating that he is advised not to travel to Asia or any long distance as he has chronic low back pain due to an injury he sustained at work. *Statement from Dr. J. [REDACTED]*, dated November 11, 2006.

While the AAO acknowledges the health conditions of the petitioner, it notes that section 214(d) of the Act does not require the petitioner to meet his fiancée in Mongolia. The petitioner has not presented any evidence that he and his fiancée have explored meeting in another country, including the United States, to satisfy the requirements of section 214(d) of the Act. Additionally, having to take time off from work to travel to meet the beneficiary is a challenge faced by many individuals who file the Form I-129F and does not constitute an extreme hardship to the petitioner. 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 him or that such a meeting would have violated the customs of the beneficiary's culture or social practice. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

On appeal, the applicant requests the opportunity to make an oral argument regarding the issues in this case. Regulation, however, requires the requesting party to explain in writing why an oral argument is necessary. Further, CIS, which has the sole authority to grant or deny a request for oral argument, will grant such argument only in cases involving unique factors or issues of law that cannot be adequately addressed in writing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(b). In this instance, the applicant has identified no such factors or issues, nor offered any specific reasons why oral argument should be held. The AAO finds the written record of proceedings to fully represent the facts and issues in this case and, consequently, denies the request for oral argument.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. Once the petitioner and beneficiary have met, he may file a new Form 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.