D6

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

identification data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

[redacted]

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: LIN 01 219 53576 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: MAY 13 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary: [redacted]

Petition: Petition for Alien Fiance(e) Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of $110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Helen E. Crawford for

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations 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 Kazakhstan, as the fiance(e) 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 petition after determining that the petitioner and the beneficiary had not personally met within two years before the date of filing the petition, as required by section 214(d) of the Act. In reaching this conclusion, the director found that the petitioner's failure to comply with the statutory requirement was not the result of extreme hardship to the petitioner or unique circumstances.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Act defines "fiance(e)" as:

> An alien who is the fiancee or fiance 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 entry. . . .

Section 214(d) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(d), states in pertinent part that a fiance(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 two years before the date of filing the petition**, have a bonafide 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. . . [emphasis added].

The petitioner filed the Petition for Alien Fiance(e) (Form I-129F) with the Service on June 11, 2001. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on June 11, 1999 and ended on June 11, 2001.

On appeal, the petitioner states that due to current conditions in muslim countries, he is afraid to travel to see the beneficiary and that if he were detained abroad, he would lose his job. He also asserts that as a veteran, he would like to have love and companionship in his old age and would be very grateful for his appeal to be viewed favorably.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(k)(2), a director may exercise discretion and waive the requirement of a personal meeting between the two parties if it is established that compliance would:

(1) Result in extreme hardship to the petitioner; or

(2) Violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice.

The regulation at section 214.2(k)(2) does not define what may constitute extreme hardship to a 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.

In the instant case, the reasons given by the petitioner for not having met the beneficiary within two years prior to filing the petition do not support a finding that compliance with the requirement would cause extreme hardship to the petitioner. The time away from one's employment involved in traveling to a foreign country is a normal difficulty encountered in complying with the requirement and is not considered extreme hardship. No evidence establishing that travel to Kazakhstan is dangerous has been submitted and the petitioner has not established why he could not travel to a third, non-muslim country to meet the beneficiary.

The petitioner has failed to establish that he and the beneficiary have personally met within the time period specified in section 214(d) of the Act, or that extreme hardship or unique circumstances exist to qualify him for a waiver of the statutory requirement.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(k)(2), the denial of the petition is without prejudice. Once the petitioner and the beneficiary have met in person, the petitioner may file a new I-129F petition in the beneficiary's behalf so that the two-year period in which the parties are required to have met will apply. The petitioner should submit evidence that he and the beneficiary have met within the two-year period that immediately precedes the filing of a new petition. Without the submission of documentary evidence that clearly establishes that the petitioner and the beneficiary have met in person during the requisite two-year period, the petition may not be approved unless the director grants a waiver of such requirement.

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.