

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: D2011-283

Date:

DEC 21 2011

In re: LAWRENCE M. PERLMUTTER, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Jennifer J. Barnes, Disciplinary Counsel

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Diane H. Kier
Associate Legal Advisor

The respondent will be indefinitely suspended from practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and Department of Homeland Security (the "DHS").

On October 5, 2011, the respondent entered into a plea agreement in which he pled guilty to one count of money laundering conspiracy, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h), one count of money laundering, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(3), and three counts of failure to file forms 8300, in violation of 31 U.S.C. § 5324(b)(1), in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. This is a "serious crime" within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(h). Consequently, on November 8, 2011, the Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals and the Immigration Courts. The DHS then asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency.

Therefore, on November 22, 2011, the Board suspended the respondent from practicing before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS pending final disposition of this proceeding.

The respondent was required to file a timely answer to the allegations contained in the Notice of Intent to Discipline but has failed to do so. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(c)(1). The respondent's failure to file a response within the time period prescribed in the Notice constitutes an admission of the allegations therein, and the respondent is now precluded from requesting a hearing on the matter. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(1), (2).

The Notice proposes that the respondent be indefinitely suspended from practicing before the Board and the Immigration Courts. Because the respondent has failed to file an answer, the regulations direct the Board to adopt the proposed sanction contained in the Notice, unless there are considerations that compel us to digress from that proposal. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(2).


Since the proposed sanction is appropriate in light of the respondent's being convicted of a serious crime, Notice of Intent to Discipline, at 2, we will honor it. As the respondent is currently under our November 22, 2011, order of suspension, we will deem the respondent's suspension to have commenced on that date.

ORDER: The Board hereby indefinitely suspends the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS.

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent is instructed to maintain compliance with the directives set forth in our prior order. The respondent is also instructed to notify the Board of any further disciplinary action against him.

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent may petition this Board for reinstatement to practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and DHS under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107.

FURTHER ORDER: As the Board earlier imposed an immediate suspension order in this case, today's order of the Board becomes effective immediately. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(2)(2010); *Matter of Kronegold*, 25 I&N Dec. 157, 163 (BIA 2010).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "N. J. P.", written over a horizontal line.

FOR THE BOARD