



(b)(6)


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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



Date: **SEP 24 2014** 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 claims to be a citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of Nigeria, as the fiancé 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 establish eligibility for the benefit sought. The director noted that the petitioner failed to submit the required evidence; specifically, the petitioner did not submit proof of citizenship, the required Forms G-325A and photographs, and did not demonstrate the couple's intent to marry within 90 days of the beneficiary's admission into the United States. 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. . . .

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 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 fiancé(e) petition with USCIS on April 23, 2013, 2013 without sufficient supporting evidence. For this reason, the director issued a request for additional evidence and, in

response, the petitioner submitted a photocopy of the Form I-129F. The director denied the petition. On appeal, the petitioner submitted letters from the petitioner and the beneficiary expressing their intent to marry, passport-style photographs, and the Forms G-325A for the beneficiary and the petitioner. The petitioner does not submit proof of her U.S. citizenship.

The petitioner indicated on the Form I-290F that the couple had not met within two years prior to the filing of the petition. *See* Form I-129F, Part B, Question 18. The petitioner explained that the couple met in 1987 while the beneficiary was a student in the United States and has reconnected since. On appeal, the petitioner adds that he has not visited the beneficiary “due to financial constraints.” *See* Petitioner’s Statement on Intention to Marry.

### *Analysis*

The petitioner has submitted some, but not all, of the required initial evidence. The record still lacks proof of her U.S. citizenship.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that she and the beneficiary met in person between April 23, 2011 and April 23, 2013, which is the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition, or evidence that the petitioner 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). On appeal, the petitioner states that she was unable to meet the beneficiary “due to financial constraints.” The petition, however, is not accompanied by evidence of the petitioner’s financial circumstances or any other probative evidence to establish that the meeting requirement would result in extreme hardship. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm’r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm’r 1972)).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2), the petitioner may be exempted from the requirement for a meeting with the beneficiary 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 petitioner has not established that her inability to meet the beneficiary before the filing of the petition was due to extreme hardship or strict, long-established customs of the beneficiary's culture or social practice.

*Conclusion*

The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons. In fiancé(e) visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met. As stated at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(k)(2), the denial of this petition is without prejudice to the filing of a new petition.

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