

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


PUBLIC COPY

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

87



FILE:



Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

MAR 29 2010

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:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. 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. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required by 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

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 the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 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 states, in part, that he was unable to visit the beneficiary during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition because the beneficiary's tribe does not allow for the "couple-to-be" to meet in person before the marriage. The petitioner also states that although he has already met the beneficiary, he had no intentions of marrying her at that time. The petitioner states further that the tribal customs and social practices regarding marriage are not included in the Family Law of the Democratic Republic of the Congo "because of their number and differences." As supporting documentation, the petitioner submits a personal statement and a printout from the website of the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of African Affairs regarding the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

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, 2007. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met in person between May 25, 2005 and May 25, 2007.

When he filed the petition, the petitioner responded "No" 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 first met the beneficiary in her high school where he was teaching, and that, after his first marriage, he finally reconnected with her in March of 2005. The petitioner stated further that the meeting requirement should not apply to him and the beneficiary because of "her parents' tribe traditions, practices, and customs ruling the marriage institution." The petitioner submitted a copy of the Family Code of the Democratic Republic of the Congo as supporting documentation, and explained that the lawmakers were not able to include all of the customs in that publication because the Democratic Republic of the Congo has over 200 ethnic groups. The petitioner also stated that he did not feel safe in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where he lost all of his family members.

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.

As discussed above, the petitioner states on appeal that he was unable to visit the beneficiary during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition because the beneficiary's tribe does not allow for the "couple-to-be" to meet in person before the marriage.

Upon review of the record in its entirety, none of the evidence establishes that compliance with the meeting requirement would violate the beneficiary's traditions, practices, and customs ruling the marriage institution. The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's assertions regarding the beneficiary's traditions, practices, and customs ruling the marriage institution, and his additional assertion that the tribal customs and social practices regarding marriage are not included in the Family Law of the Democratic Republic of the Congo "because of their number and differences." Going on record without supporting documentary evidence, however, is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

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 violate the beneficiary's traditions, practices, and customs ruling the marriage institution. The AAO also acknowledges the petitioner's safety concerns that he mentioned at the time of filing regarding travel to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The AAO notes that although section 214(d) of the Act requires the petitioner and the beneficiary to meet, it does not require the petitioner to travel to the beneficiary's home country. The record on appeal does not demonstrate that the petitioner and the beneficiary explored options for a meeting beyond the petitioner traveling to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including, but not limited to, the beneficiary traveling to meet the petitioner in the United States or a bordering 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 or would violate the beneficiary's traditions, practices, and customs ruling the marriage institution. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. The petition must be denied.

The denial of the petition is without prejudice. Should the petitioner wish to file a new I-129F Petition, he should ensure that he has documentary evidence of having met the beneficiary in person within the two years before the filing of the petition, or sufficient evidence to establish that the requirement should be waived. If necessary, the petitioner should consult the instructions to the Form I-129F to understand the specific documents that he should file along with the petition. The petitioner may download the I-129F petition with the instructions from the USCIS website at www.uscis.gov, or he may call the USCIS National Customer Service Center (NCSC) at 1-800-375-5283 to have the form and the instructions mailed to his 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.