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

[redacted]

FILE: Office: Houston Date: AUG 2 B2000

IN RE: Obligor:
Bonded Alien:

IMMIGRATION BOND ry Al under § 103 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1103 .

IN BEHALF OF OBUGOR:

[redacted]

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

Public Copy

INSTRU0T10NS:

This is the decision in you' case. All documents have been returned to the 0 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. I03.5(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. 103.1.-

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Ter e M. O'Reilly, Director
Ad... 'strative Appeals Office

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

The record indicates that on July 27, 1998 the obligor posted a $4,000 bond coriditionedfor the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien' (Form I-340) dated September 4, 1999 was sent to the obligor via certified mail, return receipt requested. The not1ce demanded the bonded al1en's surrender 1nto the custody of an·officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the Service) for removal at 8:00 a.m. on September 23, 1999 at The obligor failed to pres e a 1en, an e a 1en a1 e to appear as require d. On December 3, 1999, 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: (I) 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 two reasons why the Administrative Appeals Office should sustain this appeal:

1. Form 1-352 (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 1-352 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 1-352,' therefore, the obligor cannot avail himself of the affirmative defense provision codifiediin 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 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 contains evidence that a properly completed questionnaire was forwarded to the obligor with the notice to surrender.

Delivery bonds are violated if the obligor fails to cause the bonded alien to be produced or to produce himself/herself Ito 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. Camm. 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 sha'll 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).

B 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 Ifagrees that any notice to him/her in connection with this bond may be accomplished by mail directed to him/he .at the. above address." In this case, the Form I-352 listed [redacted]

Contained in the record is a certified'mail receipt which indicates [redacted] was sent to the obligor at [redacted] September 4, 1999. This notice [redacted] the bonded alien for removal on

September 23, 1999. The receipt also indicates the obligor received notice to produce the bonded alien on September .10il 1999. 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 (The obligor states that it) 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 I-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.

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, arid the collateral has been forfeited. The decision of the district director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.