

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

D6



FILE:

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: MAR 24 2010

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:

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 naturalized citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of Laos, 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 states, in part, that he was unable to visit the beneficiary during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition because, due to his ethnic background, it is dangerous for him to travel to Laos. The petitioner also states that the beneficiary did not visit him in person because he was intent on having her to come to the United States via the fiancé(e) petition. As supporting documentation, the petitioner submits copies of excerpts from publications pertaining to safety concerns regarding travel to Laos.

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 August 17, 2009. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between August 17, 2007 and August 17, 2009.

When he filed the petition, the petitioner responded "No" to question #18 on the I-129F Petition that asks whether he 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 he and the beneficiary met through his cousin's wife, and that, via phone, they mutually agreed to marry.

On October 5, 2009, the director issued a Request for Evidence (RFE), requesting that the petitioner submit evidence that he and the beneficiary had met in person within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The director also requested evidence of the petitioner's U.S. citizenship.

In his October 23, 2009 response to the director's RFE, the petitioner submitted the following: a copy of his naturalization certificate; a personal letter explaining, in part, that it is too dangerous for him to travel to Laos; and copies of money gram and phone records.

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.

The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's safety concerns regarding travel to Laos. Section 214(d) of the Act, however, does not require that the petitioner travel to the beneficiary's home country for the requisite meeting. Without more details to substantiate the petitioner's claims that he could not travel during the requisite period because of hardship issues, the AAO cannot find that the petitioner should be exempt from the requirement of an in-person meeting between him and the beneficiary. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. The petition must be denied.

Beyond the decision of the director, the record does not contain original statements from the petitioner and the beneficiary or other evidence that establishes their mutual intent to marry within 90 days of the beneficiary's entry into the United States in K-1 status. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. Should the petitioner wish to file a new I-129F Petition, he should ensure that he submits all of the required supporting documentation. If necessary, the petitioner should consult the instructions to the Form I-129F to understand the specific documents that

he 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](http://www.uscis.gov), or he may call the USCIS National Customer Service Center (NCSC) at 1-800-375-5283 to have the form and the instructions mailed to his 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.