

**PUBLIC COPY**

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



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

AKH

FILE:

Office: BOSTON

Date: JUL 30 2004

IN RE:

Obligor:  
Bonded Alien


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:

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.

  
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, Boston, Massachusetts, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record indicates that on August 5, 2002, the obligor posted a \$7,500 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated September 29, 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 9:00 a.m. on October 14, 2003, at [REDACTED]. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On January 15, 2004, the field office director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

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 legacy Immigration and Naturalization 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, as specified in the appearance notice, upon each and every written request until removal proceedings are finally terminated, or until the said alien is actually accepted by ICE for detention or removal. *Matter of Smith*, 16 I&N Dec. 146 (Reg. Comm. 1977).

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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the Form I-340 was untimely because it was received by the obligor on October 7, 2003 with a surrender date of October 14, 2003, in that service of the Form I-340 within 10 days of the surrender date constitutes unreasonable notice.

The evidence of record indicates that the Notice to Deliver Alien dated September 29, 2003 was sent to the obligor at [REDACTED] via certified mail. This notice demanded that the obligor produce the bonded alien on October 14, 2003. Although the record does not contain a domestic return receipt, counsel

acknowledges, on appeal, that the obligor received the notice. 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).

Counsel fails to explain how he arrived at 10 days as being reasonable notice or how a 10-day notification is more inherently reasonable than the seven days notice the obligor apparently received. In *International Fidelity Ins. Co. v. Crosland*, 516 F. Supp. 1249 (S.D.N.Y. 1981), the court determined that the surety received sufficient notice even though it did not receive the demand notice until one day before it was required to produce the alien. Furthermore, as in *International Fidelity*, there is no seven days.

The Form I-352 in this case requires notices to be sent to both the obligor and co-obligor. Counsel asserts that, as ICE mailed the Form I-340 only to the obligor, the breach must be rescinded. Counsel cites no statute, regulation or case law that would require the bond to be rescinded against the sureties.

The Form I-352 provides that the obligor and co-obligor are jointly and severally liable for the obligations imposed by the bond contract. As such, ICE may pursue a breach of bond against one or both of the contracting parties. It is not obligated to take action against any specific contracting party. *See Restatement (Third) of Suretyship and Guaranty* § 50 (1996).

ICE's failure to provide notice to both the obligor and co-obligor is not a material breach of the contract such as to require a rescission of the bond breach. The record reflects that both parties received timely notice of the demand to surrender the bonded alien. Counsel has not alleged, and the record does not reflect, that the obligor's ability to produce the bonded alien was adversely affected by ICE's failure to also serve a copy of the Form I-340 upon the co-obligor.

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 an ICE officer upon each and every request of such officer until removal proceedings are either finally terminated or the alien is accepted by ICE for detention or removal.

It must be noted that delivery bonds are exacted to insure that aliens will be produced when and where required by ICE for hearings or removal. Such bonds are necessary in order for ICE 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 the alien's 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 field office director will not be disturbed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.