

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. 3000  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**PUBLIC COPY**

63

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: LOS ANGELES Date: **APR 09 2008**

IN RE: Obligor: [REDACTED]  
Bonded Alien: [REDACTED]

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.

  
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 on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The record indicates that on April 13, 2004, an immigration judge (IJ) issued an order granting the alien voluntary departure in lieu of removal on or before June 10, 2004. On April 16, 2004, the obligor posted a \$500.00 bond conditioned for his voluntary departure. The bonded alien appealed the IJ's decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On September 12, 2005, the BIA dismissed the appeal, and granted the alien voluntary departure within 60 days from the date of the order. On October 12, 2005, the alien filed a petition for review and a motion to stay removal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Ninth Circuit). On September 26, 2006, the Ninth Circuit dismissed the petition for failure to prosecute and indicated that its order shall act as and for the mandate of this court. On October 2, 2007, the field office director concluded that the bond had been breached on October 25, 2006.

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 merely indicated that he would need 30 days in which to submit a brief and/or evidence. However, more than five 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.