

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

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

---

MATTER OF:

Miguel A. HULL, D2020-0080

Respondent

---

**FILED**

**JUN 28 2024**

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

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

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS  
On Motion Before 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 August 17, 2020, we suspended the respondent indefinitely from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"), effective June 4, 2020. The respondent's suspension was based on his suspension in Maryland. The respondent now has filed a motion for reinstatement, which will be granted.

The respondent has presented evidence showing that he has been reinstated to the practice of law in Maryland (Respondent's Mot., Exh. G). He further has submitted clear and convincing evidence to establish that he possesses the moral and professional qualifications required to appear before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and DHS, and that her reinstatement will not be detrimental to the administration of justice ((Respondent' Mot, Exh. J-FF). *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.107(b)(1) and (2) (discussing requirements for reinstatement when suspension has not been completed).

The Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the Disciplinary Counsel for DHS filed an opposition to the respondent's motion. The Disciplinary Counsels opposed reinstatement because the respondent remained under "disciplinary suspension" with the District of Columbia bar (Gov't Opp. at 1-2). The Disciplinary Counsels, however, stated that, if the respondent could establish that he is no longer suspended in the District of Columbia, they would not oppose reinstatement (Gov't Opp. at 2). On June 3, 2024, the respondent submitted a certificate of good standing from the District of Columbia bar (Respondent's Certificate of Good Standing in the District of Columbia Bar). He therefore has eliminated the Disciplinary Counsels' opposition to his motion. Further, the respondent meets the definition of attorney at 8 C.F.R.



§ 1001.1(f) and there is nothing to indicate that the respondent has not complied with the conditions of his suspension. We therefore will grant the respondent's motion for reinstatement. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(b)(2).

ORDER: The respondent is reinstated to practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS, as of the date of this order.

FURTHER ORDER: This reinstatement should be reflected in any public notices maintained and disseminated by the Executive Office for Immigration Review 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.