

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

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

MATTER OF:

Jibran S. MUHAMMAD, D2024-0136

Respondent

FILED

MAR 11 2025

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Pro se

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Amy S. Paulick, 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: Clark, Appellate Immigration Judge; Creppy, Appellate Immigration Judge; Liebowitz,
Appellate Immigration Judge

Opinion by Creppy, Appellate Immigration Judge

CREPPY, 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 six months, effective June 10, 2024, and remains suspended. On February 14, 2025, he filed a motion seeking reinstatement to practice. The Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review ("EOIR") and the Disciplinary Counsel for DHS oppose the respondent's motion for reinstatement. The respondent's motion for reinstatement will be denied.

On May 6, 2024, the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board issued an order suspending the respondent from the practice of law for a period of six months with terms, effective May 6, 2024. On May 23, 2024, 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 June 10, 2024.

On July 16, 2024, we issued a final order of discipline suspended the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and DHS for that six months, effective June 10, 2024, the date of our immediate suspension order.

The respondent now seeks reinstatement, asserting that the Board's six month period of suspension has expired, and he now meets the definition of "attorney" set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f) because he has been reinstated to practice law in Virginia (Respondent's Mot.) (unpaginated).

The Disciplinary Counsels for EOIR and DHS agree that the respondent has been reinstated to practice law in Virginia. However, they contend that the respondent is suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia, and therefore does not meet the definition of attorney set forth in the regulations. 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f). The Disciplinary Counsels for EOIR and DHS have submitted a copy of a November 27, 2024, order of suspension from the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the respondent's District of Columbia Bar website attorney profile in support of their argument, and the Disciplinary Counsels oppose reinstatement.

The evidence submitted by the Disciplinary Counsels for EOIR and DHS is sufficient to establish that the respondent does not meet the definition of attorney contained in 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f). The respondent accordingly is not entitled to reinstatement at this time. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(a)(3) (stating that the Board "shall deny the motion for reinstatement without further consideration" if an individual does not meet the definition of attorney). We therefore deny the respondent's motion for reinstatement.

ORDER: The respondent's motion for reinstatement is denied.