



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

G

[Redacted]

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: Self-represented

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

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 District Director, San Antonio, Texas. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion will be dismissed. The order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed.

The record indicates that on February 27, 2001, 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 February 22, 2002, 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 legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service, now Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), at 10:00 a.m. on March 15, 2002, at [REDACTED]. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On March 19, 2002, the district director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that a motion to reopen a proceeding or reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the underlying decision, and that a motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days except that failure to file a motion to reopen during this period may be excused when the obligor has demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the obligor.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4), a motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed.

The AAO rendered its decision on August 26, 2002. This motion, dated October 3, 2003, was received by the San Antonio District Office on October 7, 2003, 13 months after the date of the AAO's decision. The obligor has not set forth any reason for the delay. The motion is untimely.

ORDER: The motion is dismissed. The order of August 12, 2002, dismissing the appeal is affirmed.