identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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

[redacted]

b6

FILE: [redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 06 2010

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

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 Ghana, 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 petitioner failed to submit any supporting documentation. On appeal, the petitioner states that he hopes to submit additional documentation within 30 days. As supporting documentation, he submits: evidence of his U.S. citizenship; completed G-325A, Biographic Information forms for himself and the beneficiary; passport-style color photographs for himself and the beneficiary; an itinerary reflecting a trip he made to Ghana from March to April 2009; a notarized statement from the beneficiary's father declaring that on March 15, 2009, the petitioner and the beneficiary became engaged in a customary ceremony held in Ghana; photographs; and money grams.

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 May 11, 2009. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between May 11, 2007 and May 11, 2009.

When he filed the petition, the petitioner responded "Yes" 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 met the beneficiary in 2007, and that during his recent trip on March 5, 2009, they decided to "move on to the next level."

On appeal, the petitioner submits the documentation listed above. The petition may not be approved, however, as the record still does not contain the following required documentation: 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; a copy of the petitioner's divorce decree for his marriage to [redacted]; and evidence that the petitioner and the beneficiary personally met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's itinerary for March and April 2009, the declaration from the beneficiary's father confirming the March 15, 2009 engagement ceremony of the petitioner and the beneficiary, and the photographs of the petitioner and the beneficiary; the record, however, does not contain sufficient corroborating evidence of the requisite in-person meeting, such as a copy of the petitioner's passport including the pages containing the pertinent entry and exit stamps.

The instructions to the I-129F petition at pages 2 and 3, items #5 and #6, state that the above described documentation must be submitted for both the petitioner and the beneficiary. When filing the petition, the petitioner did not submit any supporting documentation, and thus the director denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner submits the items listed above, but does not submit all of the required supporting documentation as described in the instructions to the I-129F petition. As a result, the beneficiary cannot benefit from the instant petition. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will be denied.

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, 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.