U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

G1

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

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: Houston Date: SEP 14 2000

IN RE: Obligor: [redacted]
Bonded Alien:

IMMIGRATION 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:

[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

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

Terrance M. O'Reilly, Director
Administrative 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 sustained.

The record indicates that on August 12, 1997 the obligor posted a $2,500 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated December 3, 1999 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 9:00 a.m. on January 5, 2000 at 126 Northpoint Drive, Houston,TX 77060. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On January 19, 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 1-166), 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 I-352 (Rev. 5!27!97)N is unenforceable because the Service failed to obtain. the required OMBapproval 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 1-352 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 toa government agency. Here, the obligor did fi!le the information requested on Form 1-352, 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;8. 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 sur ender. notice is null and void because, contrary to the directive, the ervice 1 a questionnaire to the surrender demand.

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

Delivery bonds are violated if the obligor fails to causle 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 1&N Dec. 1461 (Reg. Corom. 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(6) (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 offlceof 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 I-352 listed 407 Fannin St., Houston,TX 77002 as the obligor's address.

contained in the record is a certified mail receipt which indicates that the Notice to D iv Alien was sent to the obligor at on December 3, 1999. This no lCe demanded tha e 0 igor pro uce the bonded alien for removal on January 5, 2000. The receipt also indicates the obligor received notice to produce the bonded alien on December 8, 1999. Consequently, the record clearly establishes/that thenotite 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. Counsel asserts 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 [redacted] entered into on June 22, 1995 by t e Service and [redacted] the Service agreed' that a proper y comp e e ques ionnaire wou e. attached to all Form 1-34,Os (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 I-I 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 [redacted] the fact that! the record fails to show that a properly completed questionnaire' was sent to the obligor, the appeal will be sustained arid the; district director's decision declaring the bond breached will be rescinded 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 rescinded and the ,bond is continued in full force and effect.