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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

A4

[redacted]

FILE: [redacted] Office: SAN FRANCISCO Date: AUG 02 2004

IN RE: Obligor: [redacted]
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:

[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.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

DISCUSSION: The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the Field Office Director, Detention and Removal, San Francisco, California, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be rejected.

The record indicates that on November 18, 2002, the obligor posted a $7,500 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated November 7, 2003, 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 9:30 a.m. on December 4, 2003, at The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On December 31, 2003, the field office director informed the co-obligor 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 field office director issued the Notice-Immigration Bond Breached on December 31, 2003. It is noted that the field office director properly gave notice to the obligor that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Although counsel dated the appeal January 23, 2004, it was received by ICE on February 5, 2004, or 35 days after the decision was issued. 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 field office director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The field office 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.