G1

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

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

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: San Antonio Date: MAR 13 2001

IN RE: Obligor:
Bonded Alien: [redacted]

APPLICATION: Bond Conditioned for the Delivery of an Alien under § 103 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1103

IN BEHALF OF OBLIGOR:

[redacted]

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

Identification data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Robert P. Wiemann, Acting Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the District Director, San Antonio, Texas, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record indicates that on August 26 1998 the obligor posted a $4,000 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated October 11, 2000 was sent to the obligor via certified mail, return receipt requested. The notice demanded the bonded alien's surrender into the custody of an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the Service) for removal at 10:00 a.m. on November 13, 2000 at 8940 Fourwinds Drive, Room 2063, 2nd Floor, San Antonio, TX 78239. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On November 22, 2000, the district director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

On appeal, the obligor asserts that the district director erred in breaching the bond because: (1) he did not notify the obligor of the alien's scheduled hearing, and (2) he sent the alien notice to appear for removal (Form I-166), contrary to Service regulations.

On appeal, the obligor requests an additional 60 days in which to file a written brief based on the filing of a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request and states that the facts of the case, and the law applicable thereto, are complicated.

More than 60 days have elapsed since the filing of the appeal in this matter and no brief has been received from the obligor. It should be noted that the facts present in the case at hand are similar not only to numerous cases already presented to the Associate Commissioner by the obligor on previous appeals but to a myriad of similar cases adjudicated by the Associate Commissioner since the inception of the Office of Administrative Appeals in 1983. Therefore, the request is denied.

It should be noted that the present record contains evidence that a properly completed questionnaire with the alien's photograph attached was forwarded to the obligor with the notice to surrender pursuant to the Amwest/Reno Settlement Agreement, entered into on June 22, 1995 by the Service and Far West Surety Insurance Company.

Delivery bonds are violated if the obligor fails to cause the bonded alien to be produced or to produce himself/herself to an immigration officer or immigration judge upon each and every written request until removal proceedings are finally terminated, or until the alien is actually accepted by the immigration officer for detention or removal. Matter of Smith, 16 I&N Dec. 146 (Reg. Comm. 1977).

Although the obligor failed to produce the alien as required by the surrender demand, counsel stated on appeal that all the conditions imposed by the terms of the bond were substantially performed by the obligor. The regulations provide that an obligor shall be released from liability where there has been "substantial performance" of all conditions imposed by the terms of the bond. 8

C.F.R. 103.6(c)(3). A bond is breached when there has been a substantial violation of the stipulated conditions of the bond. 8 C.F.R. 103.6(e).

8 C.F.R. 103.5a(a)(2) provides that personal service may be effected by any of the following:

> (i) Delivery of a copy personally;
>
> (ii) Delivery of a copy at a person's dwelling house or usual place of abode by leaving it with some person of suitable age and discretion;
>
> (iii) Delivery of a copy at the office of an attorney or other person including a corporation, by leaving it with a person in charge;
>
> (iv) Mailing a copy by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, addressed to a person at his last known address.

The bond (Form I-352) provides in pertinent part that the obligor "agrees that any notice to him/her in connection with this bond may be accomplished by mail directed to him/her at the above address." In this case, the Form I-352 listed [redacted]., Houston, TX 77002 as the obligor's address.

Contained in the record is a certified mail receipt which indicates that the Notice to Deliver Alien was sent to the obligor at [redacted], Houston, TX 77002 on October 11, 2000. This notice demanded that the obligor produce the bonded alien for removal on November 13, 2000. The receipt also indicates the obligor received notice to produce the bonded alien on October 16, 2000. Consequently, the record clearly establishes that the notice was properly served on the obligor in compliance with 8 C.F.R. 103.5a(a)(2)(iv).

Furthermore, it is clear from the language used in the bond agreement that the obligor shall cause the alien to be produced or the alien shall produce himself to a Service officer upon each and every request of such officer until removal proceedings are either finally terminated or the alien is accepted by the Service for detention or removal. The bond agreement is silent as to any requirement compelling the Service to notify the obligor of all bond-related matters, despite counsel's assertion to the contrary. Similarly, neither the statute, the regulations, nor administrative case law provide support for counsel's allegation that the Service is required to notify the obligor of all bond-related matters.

Counsel states that the obligor has been relieved from liability on the bond because the Service sent the alien a notice to appear for removal on Form I-166. Counsel asserts that this is contrary to current Service regulations.

Form I-166 has not been required since July 25, 1986, which is the effective date of an amendment to 8 C.F.R. 243.3. That amendment

had no effect on the obligor's agreement to produce the alien upon request.

It must be noted that delivery bonds are exacted to insure that aliens will be produced when and where required by the Service for hearings or removal. Such bonds are necessary in order for the Service to function in an orderly manner. The courts have long considered the confusion which would result if aliens could be surrendered at any time or place it suited their or the surety's convenience. Matter of L-, 3 I&N Dec. 862 (C.O. 1950).

After a careful review of the record, it is concluded that the conditions of the bond have been substantially violated, and the collateral has been forfeited. The decision of the district director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.