

**PUBLIC COPY**

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



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

GI

[Redacted]

FILE:

[Redacted]

Office: HQ/DRO

Date: **NOV 07 2005**

IN RE:

Obligor:  
Bonded A

[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.

*Mari Johnson*

§ Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the Director, Headquarters, Detention and Removal, Washington, D.C., and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The record indicates that on August 11, 1986, the obligor posted a \$2,000 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated January 31, 2005, 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 10:00 a.m. on March 15, 2005, at 26 Federal Plaza, Room 9-110, New York, NY 10278. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On April 6, 2005, the obligor was informed 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 director mailed the Notice-Immigration Bond Breached on April 22, 2005. It is noted that the director properly gave notice to the obligor that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Although the obligor dated the appeal May 4, 2005, it was not received by ICE until June 17, 2005, or 56 days after the decision was mailed. Accordingly, the appeal was 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 director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The 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.