D6

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 I Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536

File [redacted] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: SEP 11 2003

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

PUBLIC COPY

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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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.

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 Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a 30-year old naturalized citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a 33-year old native and citizen of Afghanistan, 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 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 had failed to establish that she warranted a favorable exercise of discretion to waive this statutory requirement.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(K), defines "fiance(e)" as:

> An alien who 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 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) on January 16, 2003. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on January 16, 2001 and ended on January 16, 2003.

In response to Question #19 on the Form I-129F, the petitioner indicated that she had not met the beneficiary in person. She further indicated that her engagement to the beneficiary had been arranged with her consent.

The director denied the petition, finding that the beneficiary and the petitioner had not met one another in person during the two-

year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The director further noted that the petitioner had not provided sufficient evidence to establish that the beneficiary had legally terminated his first marriage.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement purportedly written by the beneficiary's first wife, stating that she accepts the divorce letter of the beneficiary. The petitioner also submits evidence that she had been previously married and that her marriage had been annulled. The petitioner also resubmitted a letter written by the director of public relations at the Afghan Coalition in Fremont, California that states that in an arranged marriage, there is no requirement that a couple should see or talk together before they commit to marriage.

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.

In the instant case, the petitioner did not claim that compliance would result in extreme hardship. In addition, the petitioner has failed to establish that compliance with the requirement would violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice.

The petitioner failed to overcome the director's objection to granting the petition.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R § 214.2(k)(2), the denial of this petition is without prejudice. The petitioner may file a new I-129F petition on behalf of the beneficiary. The petitioner will be required to submit evidence that she 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 that 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.