U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

File: D2007-119

Date: JUN 28 2007

In re: CARL M. WEIDEMAN, III, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE/MOTION

ON BEHALF OF GENERAL COUNSEL: Jennifer J. Barnes, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Eileen M. Connolly, Appellate Counsel

ORDER:

PER CURIAM. On March 30, 2007, the Michigan Attorney Discipline Board suspended the respondent from the practice of law in that state for 30 days, effective April 21, 2007.

Consequently, on May 3, 2007, the Office of General 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. On May 16, 2007, the Department of Homeland Security (the "DHS") asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency. Therefore, on May 23, 2007, the Board suspended the respondent from practicing before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS pending final disposition of this proceeding.

The respondent moves that the Board reinstate him to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, and states that he was reinstated to the Michigan State Bar on May 22, 2007. The Office of General Counsel does not oppose the request for reinstatement, although it argues that the Board should issue a final order of discipline against the respondent first.

As for the final order of discipline, the Notice of Intent to Discipline recommends that the respondent be suspended from practicing before the Board and the Immigration Courts, for a period of 30 days. The DHS asks that the Board extend that discipline to practice before it as well. Since the recommendation is appropriate in light of the respondent's suspension from the practice of law in Michigan, the Board honors that recommendation. Accordingly, the Board hereby suspends the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS for a period of 30 days, effective *nunc pro tunc* to April 21, 2007, the effective date of the suspension order in Michigan.

As for the respondent's request for reinstatement, given that the respondent's request is unopposed, we find that the respondent should be and hereby is reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, as of the date of this order. Because the respondent has been reinstated, public notices regarding the respondent's suspension should be withdrawn. If the respondent wishes to represent a party before the DHS or Board, he must file a Notice of Appearance (Form G-28 or Form EOIR-27), including any case in which he was formerly counsel, prior to his suspension.

FOR THE BOARD