

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

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

MATTER OF:

Edgar Edward LIM, D2026-0186

Respondent

FILED

JUL 09 2026

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Nathan S. Henriksen, Acting Disciplinary Counsel

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Amy S. Paulick, Disciplinary Counsel

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

On Notice of Intent to Discipline from a Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Before: Mullane, Appellate Immigration Judge; Chaban, Appellate Immigration Judge; White,
Temporary Appellate Immigration Judge¹

Opinion by Mullane, Appellate Immigration Judge

MULLANE, Appellate Immigration Judge

The respondent will be suspended from the practice of law before the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board"), the Immigration Courts, and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") for an indefinite period of time, effective April 21, 2026.

On April 21, 2026, the Supreme Court of Missouri issued an order indefinitely suspending the respondent from the active practice of law in Missouri with no leave to apply for reinstatement for a period of two years, effective April 21, 2026. On May 13, 2026, the Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review and the Disciplinary Counsel for DHS filed a Joint Notice of Intent to Discipline ("NID"), as well as a Joint Petition for Immediate Suspension, based upon the respondent's indefinite suspension in Missouri. We granted the Joint Petition for Immediate Suspension on June 1, 2026.

The respondent was required to file a timely answer to the allegations contained in the NID but has failed to do so. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105. The respondent's failure to file a response within the time prescribed in the NID constitutes an admission of the allegations therein, and the respondent is now precluded from requesting a hearing on the matter. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(1).

The NID proposes that the respondent be indefinitely suspended from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS, effective April 21, 2026, the date of the Supreme Court of Missouri's suspension order. Because the respondent has failed to file an

¹ Temporary Appellate Immigration Judges sit pursuant to appointment by the Attorney General. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(a)(4).

answer, the regulations direct us to adopt the proposed sanction contained in the NID unless there are considerations that compel us to diverge from that proposal. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(2).

The proposed sanction is appropriate considering the respondent's indefinite suspension in Missouri. We will honor the proposed discipline and will order the respondent indefinitely suspended from the practice of law before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and DHS. The respondent's suspension will be effective as of April 21, 2026, the date of the Supreme Court of Missouri's suspension order.

ORDER: The Board hereby suspends the respondent from the practice of law before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS for an indefinite period, effective April 21, 2026.

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

FURTHER ORDER: The contents of the 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.