



U.S. Department of Justice  
Immigration and Naturalization Service

61

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



FILE: [Redacted] Office: San Antonio Date:

AUG 22 2000

IN RE: Obligor: [Redacted]  
Bonded Alien: [Redacted]

IMMIGRANON BOND: 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:



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.

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS  
*Terrance M. O'Reilly*  
Terrance M. O'Reilly, 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 sustained.

The record indicates that on November 22, 1999 the obligor posted a \$1,000 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated March 28) 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 t O on April 17, 2000 at 78 San Antonio, TX n, and the Jalien failed to appear as required. On April 25, 2000, the district director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

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

In a supplementary brief, counsel for the obligor states that there are at least three reasons why the Administrative Appeals Office should sustain this appeal:

1. Form I-352 (Rev. 5/27/97)N is unenforceable because the Service failed to obtain the required OMB approval prior to using this form.'

The Immigration Bond (Form I-352) is a collection of information as defined by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 5 C.F.R. 1320.3(3) (c). The Service is an agency for the purposes of the PRA and the Form I-352 falls under the PRA. In stating that the Form I-352 is unenforceable because the Service did not seek approval for the Form I-352 after its prior approval lapsed, counsel ignores the provision of the whole law and its plain meaning.

The PRA was intended to rein agency activity by not burdening the public, small businesses, corporations and other government agencies to submit information collection requests on forms that do not display control numbers approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The plain meaning of the PRA makes it clear that a person who fails to comply with a collection of information will not be subject to any penalty. See U.S. v. Burdett, 768 F. Supp. 409 (E.D.N.Y: 1991).

The PRA only protects the public from failing to provide information to a government agency. Here, the obligor did file the information requested on Form I-352, therefore, the obligor cannot avail himself of the affirmative defense provision codified in 44 U.S.C. § 3512. Only those persons who refuse to comply with a collection of information can raise the public protection provision as in Saco River Cellular, Inc. v. FCC, 133 F.3d. 25, 28 (D.C. Cir. 1998). See also U.S. v. Spitzauer, where the U.S. Court of Appeals

for the Ninth Circuit stated that the public protection provision is limited in scope and only protects individuals who fail to file information.' (1999 US App Lexis 6535)

2. The express language of the contract is so critically flawed that it fails to create an obligation binding on the obligor.

The bond contract clearly requires that the obligor deliver the alien into the custody of the Service upon demand. 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).

3. The Form 1-340 surrender notice is null and void because, contrary to the Amwest Settlement and nationwide Service directive, the Service did not attach a questionnaire to the surrender demand.

The present record fails to contain evidence that a properly completed questionnaire with the alien's photograph attached was forwarded to the obligor with the notice to surrender.

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 1-352) 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 1-352 listed [REDACTED] as the obligor's address.

Contained in the record is a certified mail receipt which indicates that the [REDACTED] Deliver Alien was sent to the obligor at [REDACTED] on March 28, 2000. This notice demanded that the obligor produce the bonded alien for removal on April 17, 2000. The receipt also indicates the obligor received notice to produce the bonded alien on April 3, 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.

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 1-166. The obligor states that this is contrary to current Service regulations.

Form 1-166 has not been required since July 25, 1986 which is the effective date of an amendment to former, 8 C.F.R. 243.3. That amendment had no effect on the obligor's agreement to produce the alien upon request. Notice to an alien that he or she has exhausted all due process and appeals and is subject to a final order of removal does not relieve the obligor from its obligation to fulfill the terms of the bond agreement.

Pursuant to the Amwest!Reno Settlement Agreement, entered into on June 22, 1995 by the Service and Far West Surety Insurance Company, the Service agreed that a properly completed questionnaire would be attached to all Form 1-340s (Notices to Surrender) going to the obligor on a surety bond. The failure to attach the questionnaire would result in rescission of any breach related to that Form 1-340. A properly completed questionnaire must include a copy of any picture of the alien found in the Service file.

Based on the provisions of the Amwest Agreement and the fact that the record fails to show that a properly completed questionnaire was sent to the obligor, the appeal will be sustained and the district director's decision declaring the bond breached will be withdrawn, and the bond will be continued in full force and effect.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained. The district director's decision declaring the bond breached is withdrawn and the bond is continued in full force and effect.