

61

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: HOUSTON

Date:

NOV 2 6 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:

[Redacted]

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*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

Administrative Appeals Office  
prevent identity & unwanted  
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

**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 on appeal. The appeal will be sustained.

The record indicates that on January 7, 2002, 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 August 28, 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 the Immigration and Naturalization Service (legacy INS), now Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), at 9:00 a.m. on October 29, 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.

On appeal, counsel contends that the obligor is not bound by the obligations it freely undertook in submitting the bond in this case, and that ICE cannot enforce the terms of the Form I-352 because "its terms constitute regulations, and the INS [now ICE] did not submit it to Congress for review as required by the Congressional Review Act" (CRA), 5 U.S.C. § 801, et seq. This argument is meritless.

For purposes of the CRA, the term "rule" has, with three exceptions, the same meaning that the term has for purposes of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). 8 U.S.C. § 804(3). The relevant provision of the APA defines a "rule" as the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency. 5 U.S.C. § 551(4).

There are at least two reasons why Form I-352 is not a "rule" for purposes of the CRA. First, the Form I-352 is not a rule at all. It is a bonding agreement, in effect, a surety contract under which the appellant undertakes to guarantee an alien's appearance in the immigration court, and, if it comes to that, for removal. Section 236(a)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1226(a)(2), permits the Attorney General, now the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security (Secretary), to release on bond an alien subject to removal proceedings. This section also permits the Secretary to describe the conditions on such bonds, and to approve the security on them. Section 103(a)(3) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(3), permits the Secretary to prescribe bond forms. While Form I-352 may well be a form used to comply with rules relating to release of aliens on bond, the Form itself is not a rule. It is not an "agency statement," 5 U.S.C. § 551(4), but a surety agreement between the obligor and the Government.

Second, even if it can be said that Form I-352 is a "rule," the CRA does not apply. The CRA itself provides that its requirements do not apply to a "rule of particular applicability." 5 U.S.C. § 804(3)(A). Assuming, arguendo, that Form I-352 can be called a rule, it applies only to each particular case in which a person freely agrees to sign and file the Form I-352. Thus, even if the obligor were correct in saying Form I-352 is a rule, it would be a rule of particular applicability, exempt from the reporting requirement.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the immigration judge terminated proceedings on June 18, 2003. Counsel further asserts that ICE had no authority to demand the alien's surrender for removal, and had no authority to keep the bond in force.

The record reflects that the immigration judge terminated removal proceedings in the bonded alien's case on June 18, 2003. The alien filed a motion to rescind an in absentia order to terminate deportation proceedings and a motion to stay execution of deportation. On November 7, 2003, the Executive Office for Immigration Review

indicated that the alien's motion to stay execution of deportation was without merit and denied the motion to rescind an in absentia order to terminate deportation proceedings, as there was no in absentia order and the removal proceedings had in fact been terminated on June 18, 2003.

The Immigration Bond, Form I-352 provides that the obligor's duty to produce the alien terminates when removal proceedings in the alien's case are finally terminated. The bond breach in this case occurred over four months after the immigration judge terminated removal proceedings against the alien. The breach was thus in error and will be withdrawn. As the obligor has no further obligation to produce the alien, the delivery bond will be canceled.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained. The field office director's decision declaring the bond breached is withdrawn. The bond is canceled.