

**identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy**

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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**



GI

FILE: 

Office: MIAMI

Date: MAR 07 2005

IN RE: Obligor:  
Bonded Alien:



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:



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.

*Mari Johnson*

Robert P. Wisniewski, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the Field Office Director, Detention and Removal, Miami, Florida, and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The matter is before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion will be dismissed, and the order dismissing the appeal will be affirmed.

The record indicates that on June 3, 2003, the obligor posted a \$5,000 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated April 29, 2004, was sent 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 May 13, 2004 at 7880 Biscayne Blvd., 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Miami, FL 33138. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On June 10, 2004, the field office director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

The Form I-352 provides that the obligor and co-obligor are jointly and severally liable for the obligations imposed by the bond contract. As such, ICE may pursue a breach of bond against one or both of the contracting parties. *See Restatement (Third) of Suretyship and Guaranty* § 50 (1996). Consequently, the record clearly establishes that the notice was properly served on either the obligor or the co-obligor in compliance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(a)(2)(iv). Reference in this decision to the obligor is equally applicable to the co-obligor and vice versa.

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 September 29, 2004. This motion, dated October 28, 2004 was received by the Miami District Office on November 2, 2004, 34 days 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 decision of the AAO dated September 29, 2004 is affirmed.