

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

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

MATTER OF:

Alisa LACHOW CORREA, D2024-0234

Respondent

FILED

JUN 12 2025

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Catherine M. O'Connell, Disciplinary Counsel

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Amy S. Paulick, 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;
Mullane, Appellate Immigration Judge

Opinion by Creppy, Appellate Immigration Judge

CREPPY, Appellate Immigration Judge

The respondent was suspended from the practice of law before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") for 6 months, effective September 27, 2024. On April 16, 2025, she 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 August 29, 2024, the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board issued an Agreed Disposition Memorandum Order suspending the respondent from the practice of law in Virginia for 6 months, effective September 27, 2024. On September 12, 2024, the Disciplinary Counsel for 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 September 25, 2024, with an effective date of September 27, 2024. Further, because the respondent did not file a timely answer to the allegations contained in the Notice of Intent to Discipline and because the proposed sanction of a 6-month suspension was appropriate considering her suspension in Virginia, our November 5, 2024, final order suspended the respondent from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS for 6 months, effective September 27, 2024.

The respondent now asks to be reinstated to practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS. She claims that she has completed her suspension in Virginia and that she now is in good standing and has a license to practice law in Virginia. She further contends 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). In support of her motion, she has

presented evidence that she has been reinstated to the practice of law in Virginia (Respondent's Mot, Exh. A). *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(a)(1).

The Disciplinary Councils for EOIR and DHS do not dispute that the respondent is eligible to practice law in Virginia and meets the definition of attorney set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f). The Disciplinary Councils, however, oppose the respondent's motion for reinstatement on the ground that she has not complied with our prior order requiring her to notify, in writing, any clients with cases currently pending before the Board, the Immigration Courts or DHS of her suspension. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(a)(3) (indicating that, if a practitioner failed to comply with the terms of his or her suspension, the Board shall deny the motion for reinstatement). In support of this allegation, the Disciplinary Councils have submitted the transcripts of two separate proceedings in which clients of the respondent indicate that they are still in contact with the respondent and that she has not notified them of her suspension (Gov't Opp, Attachments 1 and 2).

The respondent has not responded to the Disciplinary Councils' allegations. The evidence submitted by the Disciplinary Councils is sufficient to indicate that the respondent did not comply with our prior order and to prevent the respondent from meeting her burden of establishing that reinstatement is warranted. We accordingly deny the respondent's motion for reinstatement. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(a)(3).

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

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent must maintain compliance with the directives set forth in our prior orders in his proceedings. The respondent must notify the Board of any further disciplinary action against her.

FURTHER ORDER: The contents of this order shall be made available to the public, including at the Immigration Courts and appropriate offices of DHS.

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent may petition this Board for reinstatement to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and DHS under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107.