

91

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]

Office: HOUSTON

Date: NOV 18 2004

IN RE: Obligor:  
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

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.

*Maiphuson*

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**PUBLIC COPY**

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**DISCUSSION:** The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the Field Office Director, Detention and Removal, Houston, Texas, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal.<sup>1</sup> The appeal will be rejected.

The record indicates that on February 20, 2003, the obligor posted a \$15,000 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated September 16, 2003, 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 Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at 9:00 a.m. on December 5, 2003, at [REDACTED]. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On January 26, 2004, the field office director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party must file the complete appeal within 30 days after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The record indicates that the field office director issued the Notice-Immigration Bond Breached on January 26, 2004. It is noted that the field office director properly gave notice to the obligor that it had 33 days to file the appeal. The obligor dated the appeal February 17, 2004, and it was properly received by ICE on March 4, 2004, or 38 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

It is noted that the obligor asserts that the breach notice was not postmarked until January 27, 2004. The obligor, however, provides no evidence to support its argument. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *See Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). Assuming, arguendo, the obligor is correct, the appeal would have still been untimely filed.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2) states that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the field office director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The field office director declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.

---

<sup>1</sup> Capital Bonding Corporation executed a settlement agreement with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (legacy INS) on February 21, 2003 in which it agreed that any appeals to the AAO subsequent to the execution of this Agreement shall be filed by counsel of record. The AAO will adjudicate the appeal notwithstanding Capital Bonding Corporation's failure to comply with the settlement agreement in this case.