

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: [Redacted] Office: LOS ANGELES Date: JUL 25 2007


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.

  
for 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 August 6, 2004, the obligor posted a \$500.00 bond conditioned for the voluntary departure for the above referenced alien. On July 30, 2004, an immigration judge (IJ) issued an order granting the alien voluntary departure in lieu of removal within 30 days from the mailing of the order. The bonded alien appealed the IJ's decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). On November 18, 2005, the BIA affirmed, without opinion, the IJ's decision, and granted the alien voluntary departure within 30 days from the date of the order. On December 9, 2005, the alien filed a petition for review and motion for stay of removal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Ninth Circuit). On July 3, 2006, the Ninth Circuit denied in part and dismissed in part the petition for review and issued its mandate on August 28, 2006. On February 5, 2007, 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 180 days in which to submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO.

The Form I-290B clearly indicates that an extension of time may be granted *only* for good cause shown. The obligor did not submit a letter clarifying why such a lengthy extension is necessary. Therefore, the obligor's request is denied.<sup>1</sup>

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 summarily dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Four months have lapsed since the obligor filed the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal.