

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



D6

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: MAR 21 2011

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 \$630. 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 citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of Iran, 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 evidence that she and the beneficiary personally met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. On appeal the petitioner states, in part, that she plans to travel to Turkey on August 17, 2010, to visit the beneficiary

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

The petitioner filed the Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) (Form I-129F) with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on March 11, 2010. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between March 11, 2008 and March 11, 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. The petitioner stated, in part, that her father's friend told her family about the beneficiary, and since then, she and the beneficiary have communicated by computer and phone.

On May 10, 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.

In her response to the director's RFE, the petitioner submitted additional documentation, but did not submit the requested evidence.

The director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition because the petitioner failed to submit evidence that she and the beneficiary personally met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's statement that she planned to travel to Turkey on August 17, 2010, to visit the beneficiary. The petition may not be approved, however, because the petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. USCIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1). A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). In this case, the petition was filed on March 11, 2010, and thus the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met between March 11, 2008 and March 11, 2010. Since this has not occurred, it is concluded that the petition may not be approved. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

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 all of the required supporting documentation, and thus the director denied the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner 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.

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 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.