

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

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

MATTER OF:

Nejla Kassandra LANE, D2023-0038

Respondent

FILED

DEC 10 2024

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Pro se

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Toinette M. Mitchell, Disciplinary Counsel

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Paul A. Rodrigues, Disciplinary Counsel

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS
On Motion from a Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Before: Malphrus, Deputy Chief Appellate Immigration Judge; Clark, Appellate Immigration Judge; Creppy, Appellate Immigration Judge

Opinion by Creppy, Appellate Immigration Judge

CREPPY, Appellate Immigration Judge

In a decision dated March 14, 2023, we immediately suspended the respondent from practice before the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) and the Executive Office for Immigration Review (“EOIR”). This suspension was based on the respondent’s suspension from the practice of law in Illinois. On April 17, 2023, we issued a final order, suspending the respondent from practice before DHS and EOIR for six months, effective March 14, 2023. On August 9, 2023, the respondent filed a motion seeking an earlier effective date of suspension and/or reinstatement to practice, which we denied on September 15, 2023. On September 25, 2023, the respondent filed a second motion for reinstatement to practice, which we denied on November 1, 2023. On October 9, 2024, the respondent filed her third motion for reinstatement to practice. The Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR and the Disciplinary Counsel for DHS opposed the respondent’s third motion for reinstatement. On November 5, 2024, the respondent filed a supplemental motion requesting that we stay our decision on her pending motion for reinstatement for 30 days, or in the alternate, for immediate reinstatement. The Disciplinary Counsels did not respond to the supplemental motion. On November 8, 2024, the respondent filed an amended motion for immediate reinstatement, supported by evidence that she had been reinstated to practice before the United States District Court and Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. The amended motion will be granted.

The respondent has presented evidence showing that she again is authorized to practice law in Illinois, and she maintains that she meets the definition of attorney contained in 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f). *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(a)(1) (discussing requirements for reinstatement).

The Disciplinary Counsels for EOIR and DHS do not dispute that the respondent meets the definition of attorney at 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f). The Disciplinary Counsels further do not oppose the respondent's amended motion for reinstatement. We therefore will grant the respondent's motion for reinstatement. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(a)(3).

ORDER: The respondent is reinstated to practice before EOIR and DHS, as of the date of this order.

FURTHER ORDER: This reinstatement should be reflected in any public notices maintained and disseminated by EOIR regarding attorney discipline.

FURTHER ORDER: If the respondent wishes to represent a party before DHS, the Immigration Courts or the Board, she must file a Notice of Appearance (Form G-28, Form EOIR-26, or Form EOIR-27), even in cases in which she was counsel prior to her suspension.