

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

[REDACTED]

86

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 08 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California 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 Somalia, 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 a statement.

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 8, 2010. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between March 8, 2008 and March 8, 2010.

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.

On April 27, 2010, 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 that she qualified for a waiver of that requirement. The director also requested evidence that the petitioner's prior marriages were legally terminated.

In her May 3, 2010 letter submitted in response to the director's RFE, the petitioner stated, in part, that she had known the beneficiary in Somalia from the time they were children. The petitioner also stated that she tried to meet the beneficiary in 2009 and 2010, but she was unable to be absent from her job for more than two weeks. The petitioner also submitted the requested divorce decrees.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that she and the beneficiary had met, as required under section 214(d)(1) of the Act, or that she qualified for an exemption from this meeting requirement, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2).

On appeal, the petitioner states, in part, that, if she travels to Ethiopia to see the beneficiary, she would also have to visit her grandmother in Somaliland, which would require too much time and expense. The petitioner also states that she cannot afford to take her child to Ethiopia and Somaliland.

As discussed above, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between March 8, 2008 and March 8, 2010. The petitioner states that a trip to visit the beneficiary requires too much time and expense; however, the time and financial commitments required for travel to a foreign country are common requirements to those filing the Form I-129F petition and do not constitute extreme hardship to the petitioner. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that she was unable to comply with the meeting requirement. In addition, section 214(d) of the Act does not require that the petitioner travel to the beneficiary's home country for the requisite meeting. The record does not demonstrate that the petitioner and the beneficiary explored options for a meeting beyond the petitioner traveling to Ethiopia, including, but not limited to, the beneficiary and the petitioner both traveling to a third country. The evidence of record does not establish that the petitioner and the beneficiary met as required. Taking into account the totality of the circumstances as the petitioner has presented them, the AAO does not find that compliance with the meeting requirement would result in extreme hardship to the petitioner. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. The petition must be denied.

Beyond the decision of the director, the record also 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.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. Should the petitioner wish to file a new I-129F Petition, she should ensure that she 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 she should file along with the petition. The petitioner may download the I-129F petition with the instructions from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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.