

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

PUBLIC COPY

06

[Redacted]

FILE:

EAC 07 119 50666

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

FEB 04 2008

IN RE:

Petitioner:
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, Vermont Service Center, and is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be sustained.

The petitioner is a naturalized citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of Nigeria, 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 failed to establish that he and the beneficiary had met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, as required under section 214(d) of the Act or that such a meeting would have constituted an extreme hardship or violated the customs of the beneficiary's culture or social practice. *Decision of the Director*, dated June 12, 2007.

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 March 26, 2007. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on March 26, 2005 and ended on March 26, 2007.

At the time of filing, the petitioner indicated that he and the beneficiary had not previously met and that he was applying for a hardship exemption because of his medical condition. *Form I-129*, undated. A medical note was submitted with the Form I-129F, which states that the petitioner suffers from severe bilateral lung disease and is at a high risk for complications during airplane travel. *Letter from* [REDACTED] dated March 16, 2007.

On April 18, 2007, the Director requested additional documentation showing that meeting the beneficiary during the two-year period prior to filing would have resulted in extreme hardship or would have violated the customs of the beneficiary's culture or social practice. In response to the director's request for documentation, the petitioner again submitted the medical note from his doctor.

On appeal, the petitioner submits evidence that the beneficiary attempted to obtain a tourist visa to visit the United States. The record contains a letter from the U.S. Consulate in Lagos, Nigeria addressing an appeal letter filed in regards to the beneficiary's nonimmigrant visa denial. *Letter from U.S. Consulate*, dated December 4, 2006. The letter states that the beneficiary's nonimmigrant visa had been denied because she could not overcome the presumption of being an intending immigrant. The consular officer also states that there is no appeal for a nonimmigrant visa denial. *Id.*

The AAO recognizes that the petitioner's medical condition precludes him from traveling to meet the beneficiary. The AAO also recognizes that the beneficiary is unable to travel to the United States to meet the petitioner. Thus, the record supports a finding that a meeting between the petitioner and beneficiary would have resulted in extreme hardship.

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 met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be sustained.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.