

7
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

G3



FILE:

Office: COW Date:

JUL 23 2008

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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The voluntary departure bond in this matter was declared breached by the Director, Headquarters, Bonds, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The record indicates that on December 19, 2005, an immigration judge (IJ) issued an order granting the alien voluntary departure in lieu of removal on or before February 17, 2006. On December 20, 2005, 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 May 21, 2007, the BIA affirmed, without opinion, the IJ's decision, and granted the alien voluntary departure within 60 days from the date of the order. On February 4, 2008, 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 merely requested 30 days in which to submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO. 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.