

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

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

MATTER OF:

Conrad G. BADAR, D2022-0037

Respondent

FILED

SEP 02 2022

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

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

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

Before: Malphrus, Chief Appellate Immigration Judge, Creppy, Appellate Immigration Judge,
Liebowitz, Appellate Immigration Judge

Opinion by Liebowitz, Appellate Immigration Judge

LIEBOWITZ, Appellate Immigration Judge

The respondent was suspended from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) for 3 months, effective April 12, 2022, and remains suspended. On July 11, 2022, he filed a motion seeking reinstatement to practice, which we denied on August 5, 2022. He has now filed a new motion seeking reinstatement to practice, which will be granted.

On March 10, 2022, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County, issued an order that suspended the respondent from the practice of law in Massachusetts for three months, effective April 9, 2022. On March 17, 2022, the Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review (“EOIR”) and the Disciplinary Counsel for DHS jointly petitioned for the respondent’s immediate suspension from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS. We granted the petition on April 12, 2022.

The respondent did not file a timely answer to the Notice of Intent to Discipline and did not dispute the allegations in the Notice. Given the respondent’s 3-month suspension from the practice of law in Massachusetts, our May 27, 2022, final order of discipline suspended the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and DHS for 3 months, effective April 12, 2022, the date of our immediate suspension order.

The respondent has presented evidence showing that he again is authorized to practice law in Massachusetts, and he maintains that he 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 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, he must file a Notice of Appearance (Form G-28, Form EOIR-26, or Form EOIR-27), even in cases in which he was counsel prior to his suspension.