

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



FILE:

WAC 05 108 54654

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 18 2006

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for Alien Fiancé(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: 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The application was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a naturalized citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of The Philippines, as the fiancée 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 had failed to comply with the meeting requirement of section 214(d) of the Act and that the record did not establish a basis for exempting him from that requirement. *Decision of the Director*, dated July 1, 2005.

The petitioner submitted a timely Form I-290B on July 20, 2005, indicating that he had misunderstood the meeting requirement of section 214(d) of the Act. He states that, prior to his receipt of the director's denial, he believed he was required to meet the beneficiary within a two-year period after filing the Form I-129F, not before. The petitioner also notes that he intends to submit a brief and/or other evidence within 30 days. The record, however, contains no additional materials submitted by the petitioner.

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v). The appeal in the instant case states that the petitioner misunderstood the meeting requirement of section 214(d) of the Act, not that the director made an erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact in denying the petition. Accordingly, the appeal will be summarily dismissed in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v).

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 summarily dismissed.