identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

G1

JAN 1 2 2005

FILE: [redacted] Office: NEW YORK Date:

IN RE: Obligor:
Bonded Alien: [redacted]

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

ON BEHALF OF OBLIGOR:

[redacted]

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.

Mari Johnson

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the Field Office Director, Detention and Removal, New York, New York, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The record indicates that on September 29, 1999, the obligor posted a $3,000 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated April 14, 2003, 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 Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at 9:30 a.m. on May 23, 2003; at The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On October 14, 2003, the field office director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party must file the complete appeal within 30 days after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The record indicates that the field office director issued the Notice-Immigration Bond Breached on October 14, 2003. It is noted that the field office director properly gave notice to the obligor that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Although counsel dated the appeal November 10, 2003, it was received by ICE on November 18, 2003, or 35 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

It is noted that counsel asserts that the breach notice was not postmarked until October 20, 2003. Counsel provides a copy of the envelope, which contained the breach notice; however, the envelope contains no postmarked date. The assertion of counsel does not constitute evidence. *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1, 3 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(*2*) states that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the field office director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The field office director declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.