






U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

Date: **OCT 04 2013**

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

File: 

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 (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,


Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center (the director), denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will remain denied.

The petitioner is a citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and a citizen of Ethiopia, as the fiancé of a United States citizen pursuant to section 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 pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii) because the petitioner failed to submit required initial evidence. On appeal, the petitioner submits additional evidence.

Applicable Law

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:

shall 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, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security in [her] discretion may waive the requirement that the parties have previously met in person. . . .

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2):

As a matter of discretion, the director may exempt the petitioner from this requirement only if it is established that compliance would result in extreme hardship to the petitioner or that compliance would violate strict and long-established customs of the K-1 beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice, as where marriages are traditionally arranged by the parties 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. Failure to establish that the petitioner and K-1 beneficiary have met within the required period or that compliance with the requirement should be waived shall result in the denial of the petition. Such denial shall be without prejudice to the filing of a new petition once the petitioner and K-1 beneficiary have met in person.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8)(ii) states that if all required initial evidence is not submitted with the petition or does not demonstrate eligibility, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, in its discretion, deny the petition for lack of initial evidence. The specific requirements for filing a Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) (Form I-129F), including a description of the required initial evidence, may be found in the *Instructions* to the Form I-129F.

Factual and Procedural History

The petitioner filed the Petition for Alien Fiancé(e) (Form I-129F) with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on September 4, 2012 without any supporting evidence. For this reason, the director denied the petition on April 29, 2013. On the Form I-129F, the petitioner indicated “no” to the question about whether she and the beneficiary had met in person within the two-year period preceding the filing of the petition.

On appeal, the petitioner provides additional evidence which includes the following: the petitioner’s divorce certificate from her prior husband; evidence of the petitioner’s United States citizenship; electronic mail correspondence between the petitioner and the beneficiary; Forms G-325A, Biographic Information, for the petitioner and the beneficiary; and two passport-style color photographs of the petitioner and beneficiary. The petitioner also submits a new Form I-129F on which she briefly states that she first met the beneficiary in Ethiopia in June of 2008 but has not seen him in person since then for financial reasons. She explains that she is a single mother who cannot afford to travel to Ethiopia with her children and also does not have anyone who can care for them.

Analysis

The petitioner has not submitted all of the required initial evidence and the record still lacks the original statements from the petitioner and the beneficiary to establish their mutual intent to marry within 90 days of the beneficiary’s admission into the United States in K-1 status. Additionally, the petitioner indicated on the Form I-129F that she and the beneficiary did not meet in person between September 4, 2010 and September 4, 2012, the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. She did not, however, submit evidence that she merits a favorable exercise of discretion to exempt her from such requirement pursuant to section 214(d)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2). The petitioner submitted no supporting documentation of the beneficiary’s inability to leave Ethiopia or of her inability to travel due to her personal circumstances such that meeting the beneficiary in Ethiopia or a third country would be an extreme hardship. Without additional evidence, the record does not establish that the petitioner merits an exemption from the requisite in-person meeting.

Conclusion

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 214(d)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(d)(1); *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition remains denied.