

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Citizenship and Immigration Services

Identifying data related to

Division of [redacted]
Division of [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
CIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
425 Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20536



G

JAN 13 2004

FILE: [redacted] Office: San Antonio Date:

IN RE: Obligor: [redacted]
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]

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision 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.

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 that 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 Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) 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 that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

for *Mari Johnson*
Robert P. Wiemann, 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 Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record indicates that on May 5, 2000, the obligor posted a \$3,500 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated April 22, 2002, was sent to the obligor via certified mail, return receipt requested. The notice demanded the bonded alien's surrender to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (legacy INS), now Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), at 10:00 a.m. on May 22, 2002, at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On June 4, 2002, the district director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

On appeal, counsel states that the bonded alien is a national of El Salvador. Counsel opines that the bonded alien is eligible for Temporary Protected Status (TPS). Counsel argues that a grant of TPS would terminate ICE's detention and removal authority and require cancellation of the delivery bond.

Jurisdiction to determine whether an alien is eligible for TPS lies with CIS or the immigration judge, not the obligor for the alien's delivery bond. Counsel has not submitted evidence that the bonded alien has been granted Temporary Protected Status by either CIS or an immigration judge.

Temporary Protected Status is by definition a temporary status for certain qualifying aliens from designated countries. At the expiration of a validly granted TPS period, absent some further change of the alien's status, the alien will be required to depart the United States.

The obligor is bound by the terms of the contract to which it obligated itself. It is noted that the terms of the Form I-352 for bonds conditioned upon the delivery of the alien establish the following condition: "the obligor shall cause the alien to be produced or to produce himself/herself . . . upon each and every written request until *exclusion/deportation/removal proceedings* . . . are finally terminated." (Emphasis added). Thus, the obligor is bound to deliver the alien by the express terms of the bond contract until either exclusion, deportation or removal proceedings are finally terminated, or one of the other conditions occurs.

Counsel posits that once ICE no longer has detention authority over the alien, the delivery bond must terminate by operation of law. However, this is contrary to the holdings of *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678 (2001) and *Doan v. INS*, 311 F.3d 1160 (9th Cir. 2002). In *Zadvydas*, the Supreme Court expressly recognized

the authority of the legacy INS to require the posting of a bond as a condition of release after it lost detention authority over the alien, even though a bond was not provided as a condition of release by the statute. In *Doan*, the 9th Circuit held the legacy INS had the authority to require a \$10,000 delivery bond in a supervised release context even though it did not have detention authority. Even though these cases arose in the post-removal period, it is obvious from the rulings that detention authority is not the sole determining factor as to whether ICE can require a delivery bond.

On appeal, counsel claims that "INS has an affirmative duty to inform him of his eligibility" for TPS.

Sections 244(a)(3)(B) and (C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) require notice to aliens in removal proceedings of their eligibility for Temporary Protected Status. While the alien within the context of removal proceedings must be provided notice of his or her eligibility for TPS, this requirement has no bearing on the obligor's contractual duty to deliver an alien. Even assuming that ICE were to lose detention authority over an alien who may be eligible for TPS, as noted above, this would not require cancellation of the delivery bond.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the alien was granted voluntary departure on October 30, 2001. Counsel indicates that the obligor does not know whether the immigration judge set a voluntary departure bond, whether the alien posted such a bond or whether the alien has departed the United States. Counsel states that one of these events constitutes sufficient grounds for sustaining the appeal and canceling the bond.

The record reflects that a removal hearing was held on October 30, 2000, and the alien was granted voluntary departure from the United States on or before February 27, 2001, with an alternate order of removal to take effect in the event that the alien failed to depart as required. The court did not order the alien to post a voluntary departure bond and did not set other conditions on the grant of voluntary departure. The right of appeal was waived.

The bond contract provides that it may be canceled when (1) exclusion/deportation/removal proceedings are finally terminated; (2) the alien is accepted by ICE for detention or deportation/removal; or (3) the bond is otherwise canceled. The circumstances under which the bond may be "otherwise canceled" occur when the Secretary or the Attorney General imposes a requirement for another bond, and the alien posts such a bond, or when an order of removal has been issued and the alien is taken into custody. As the obligor has not shown that any of these circumstances apply, the bond is not canceled.

The immigration court's failure to order the posting of a voluntary departure bond does not alter the terms of the bond

contract, and does not serve to extinguish the delivery bond despite ICE loss of detention authority during the period of voluntary departure. The delivery bond requires delivery of the alien to ICE upon demand or until proceedings have terminated, and is not conditioned upon a theory of constructive detention. Further, as stated above, courts have recently held that detention authority is not the sole determining factor as to whether ICE can require a delivery bond. *Zadvydas, supra; Doan, supra.*

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 INS 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.

The evidence of record indicates that the Notice to Deliver Alien was sent to the obligor at [REDACTED] on April 22, 2002 via certified mail. This notice demanded that the obligor produce the bonded alien on May 22, 2002. The domestic return receipt indicates the obligor received notice to

produce the bonded alien on April 29, 2003. 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).

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 district director will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.