



**U.S. Department of Justice**

Executive Office for Immigration Review

*Board of Immigration Appeals*

---

Office of the Clerk  
5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2000  
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

William B. Rounds  
Sethi Law Group-US Law Center  
625 N Main Street  
Orange, CA 92868

Catherine M. O'Connell  
Disciplinary Counsel  
USCIS/Department of Homeland Security  
5900 Capital Gateway Dr.  
Camp Springs, MD 20588

**Re: William B. Rounds  
D2026-0243**

**Date: September 16, 2026**

Enclosed is a copy of the Board's decision and order in the above-referenced case.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rachel D. Alvarado".

Rachel Alvarado  
Chief Clerk

**Panel Members:**

**HUGH G. MULLANE  
MICHAEL J. CREPPY  
DAVID WHITE**

**CC:**

Nathan S. Henriksen  
Disciplinary Counsel  
OGC/EOIR  
5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 2600  
Falls Church, VA 22041

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

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

---

MATTER OF:

William B. ROUNDS, D2026-0243

RESPONDENT

---

**FILED**

**SEP 16 2026**

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Pro se

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Nathan S. Henriksen, Disciplinary Counsel

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

**IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS**  
On Notice of Intent to Discipline Before the Board of Immigration Appeals

Before: Creppy, Appellate Immigration Judge; Mullane, Appellate Immigration Judge; White,  
Temporary Appellate Immigration Judge<sup>1</sup>

Opinion by Mullane, Appellate Immigration Judge

MULLANE, Appellate Immigration Judge

The respondent will be suspended from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") for a period of 6 months, effective June 13, 2026.

On June 3, 2026, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ("Ninth Circuit") issued a decision suspending the respondent from the practice of law in the Ninth Circuit for a period of 6 months, effective 10 days from the date of its decision, or on June 13, 2026. *Malkeet Lnu v. Blanche*, 177 F.4th 1014 (9th Cir. 2026). On June 15, 2026, the Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review ("EOIR") and the Disciplinary Counsel for DHS filed a Joint Notice of Intent to Discipline ("Initial NID"), as well as a Joint Petition for Immediate Suspension, based upon the respondent's suspension in the Ninth Circuit. On June 25, 2026, Disciplinary Counsels for EOIR and DHS filed an Amended Joint Notice of Intent to Discipline ("Amended NID").<sup>2</sup> On July 1, 2026, the Board granted the Joint Petition for Immediate

---

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

<sup>2</sup> The Amended NID omitted the allegation in the Initial NID that the respondent had not timely notified EOIR or DHS Disciplinary Counsels of the Ninth Circuit's suspension order, as required by 8 C.F.R. §§ 293.3(c)(4) and 1003.103(c). In lieu of that allegation, the Amended NID clarified that the respondent had timely notified Disciplinary Counsels of the Ninth Circuit's suspension  
(continued...)

Suspension. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.103(a)(1) and (4) (discussing grounds for immediate suspension).

On July 24, 2026, the respondent filed a timely Answer to the Amended NID. Finally, on July 29, 2026, Disciplinary Counsels for EOIR and DHS filed a Motion for Summary Adjudication.

In their Amended NID, Disciplinary Counsels charge the respondent with being subject to summary discipline based on his suspension in the Ninth Circuit. In his Answer to the Amended NID, the respondent admits most of the allegations made by Disciplinary Counsels but denies any explicit or implied allegations that the Ninth Circuit found that he violated Rules 1.1, 1.3, 3.1(a)(2) or 5.3 or 5.5 of the California Rules of Professional Conduct (Answer to Amended NID at 1). Notwithstanding these partial denials, the respondent does not oppose a suspension that would run concurrently with the Ninth Circuit's June 3, 2026, suspension order (*Id.* at 4). The respondent requests a hearing under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(c)(3) limited to certain delineated issues, but he "is prepared to withdraw that limited hearing request" if the Board tailors its suspension order to his specific misconduct and confirms that any suspension we impose will run concurrently with the Ninth Circuit's suspension period (*Id.* at 1-2).

We conclude that a hearing is not necessary in this case. The respondent has not made a *prima facie* showing that there is a material issue of fact in dispute regarding the basis for summary disciplinary proceedings, or as to the exceptions to reciprocal discipline, as to warrant referral to an adjudicating official for a hearing. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.106(a). The Ninth Circuit determined that the respondent was subject to discipline (1) for violating his duty of candor to a tribunal, in contravention of Rule 3.3(a)(1) of the California Rules of Professional Conduct; and (2) for conduct unbecoming a member of the court's bar under section 46(b)(1)(B) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. *Malkeet Lnu v. Blanche*, 177 F.4th at 1029-31. The respondent does not dispute those determinations. Nor does he dispute his 6-month suspension by the Ninth Circuit.

The respondent has admitted that he has been suspended by the Ninth Circuit for 6 months, and this fact is sufficient to establish that disciplinary proceedings are appropriate. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.103(b)(2); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(e). Disciplinary Counsels' Amended NID and Motion for Summary Adjudication request that the respondent be suspended from practicing before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS for 6 months, effective June 13, 2026. This sanction is unopposed by the respondent, and it is appropriate in light of his suspension in the Ninth Circuit. *See Matter of Kronegold*, 25 I&N Dec. 157, 161 (BIA 2010) (discussing our deferential approach and the imposition of identical reciprocal discipline against practitioners who have been suspended or disbarred). The respondent will therefore be suspended from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS for 6 months. The respondent's suspension will be effective on June 13, 2026, the effective

order. The Amended NID also newly proposed that Disciplinary Counsels' proposed suspension period should run from the effective date of the Ninth Circuit's suspension order, instead of from the date of issuance of the Board's immediate suspension order. The Amended NID did not otherwise substantively change the contents of the Initial NID.

date of the Ninth Circuit's June 3, 2026, suspension order. Accordingly, the following orders will be entered.

**ORDER:** The Board hereby suspends the respondent from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Immigration Courts, and DHS for 6 months, effective June 13, 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.