

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

G3



FILE: 

Office: LOS ANGELES

Date: **JAN 10 2007**

IN RE: Obligor: 
Bonded Alien

IMMIGRATION BOND: Bond Conditioned for Voluntary Departure under § 240B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1229c

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.

Σ Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The voluntary departure bond in this matter was declared breached by the Field Office Director, Detention and Removal, Los Angeles, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The record indicates that on September 17, 2004, the obligor posted a \$500.00 bond conditioned for his voluntary departure. On September 15, 2004, an immigration judge (IJ) issued an order granting the alien voluntary departure in lieu of removal on or before October 15, 2004. The bonded alien filed a motion to reopen and reconsider before the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On December 14, 2004, the BIA denied the alien's motion to reopen and reconsider. The bonded alien appealed the IJ's decision dated December 14, 2004 to the BIA. On August 12, 2005, the BIA dismissed the appeal, and granted the alien voluntary departure within 30 days from the date of the order. On March 24, 2006, the field office director concluded the bond had been breached.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

On appeal, the obligor indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days. However, more than eight months later, no additional correspondence has been presented by the obligor.

Inasmuch as the obligor has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.