

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:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

MAR 22 2011

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:

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 the Philippines, 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 initial evidence or supporting documentation. On appeal, the petitioner states, in part, that he began dating the beneficiary in the United States in November 2007, and that the beneficiary left the United States on February 10, 2008. The petitioner also states that he will visit the beneficiary in the Philippines from November 19 – December 6, 2010. As supporting documentation, the petitioner submits the following items: proof of his U.S. citizenship; passport-style color photographs for himself and the beneficiary; completed G-325A, Biographic Information forms for himself and the beneficiary; photographs film-dated November 2010, of himself with the beneficiary; an invoice addressed to himself for an engagement ring; a travel itinerary for his November 2010 trip to the Philippines; and a copy of a passport page.

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 25, 2010. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between May 25, 2008 and May 25, 2010.

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 the United States when she was doing her internship for the Hilton Downtown Saint Louis.

On appeal the petitioner submits the documentation listed above. The petition may not be approved, however, because the record does not contain: original statements from himself 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; and evidence that he and the beneficiary personally met within the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, or that an in-person meeting would violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice. As indicated above, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between May 25, 2008 and May 25, 2010. On appeal, the petitioner submits the documentation listed above, including a travel itinerary of his plans to visit the beneficiary in November 2010. 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 May 25, 2010, and thus the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met between May 25, 2008 and May 25, 2010. Since this has not occurred and the petitioner also has not submitted the original statements of intent, as discussed above, it is concluded that the petition may not be approved. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

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.