




PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

D6

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



**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

File: WAC 01 218 54199 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

FEB 28 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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

INSTRUCTIONS:


This is the decision 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 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 that 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 that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, California 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 Venezuela, 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 fiancée 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 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
[emphasis added]

The Petition for Alien Fiance(e) (Form I-129F) was filed with the Service on June 21, 2001. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on June 21, 1999 and ended on June 21, 2001.

With the initial filing of the petition, the petitioner indicated that he had last met the beneficiary in Venezuela in August 1998. On appeal, the petitioner submits documentation to establish that he traveled to Venezuela to again meet the beneficiary from August 3, 2001 through August 12, 2001.

It is important to emphasize that the regulation at section 214.2(k)(2) requires the petitioner to prove that he last met the beneficiary no more than two years prior to the filing of the petition. In the instant case, the relevant two-year period is June 21, 1999 to June 21, 2001. The evidence submitted indicates that

the petitioner personally met the beneficiary in August 1998, two years and ten months prior to the filing date of the petition, and in August 2001, two months after the filing date of the petition. Therefore, although the petitioner and beneficiary have met on two occasions, the meetings did not occur within the relevant two-year period.

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. 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.

In the instant case, the petitioner has failed to establish that he and the beneficiary 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. Therefore, the appeal will be dismissed.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(k)(2), the denial of the petition is without prejudice. Now that the petitioner and beneficiary have again met in person, the petitioner may file a new I-129F petition in the beneficiary's behalf, on or before August 3, 2003, so that the two-year period in which the parties are required to have met will apply.

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.