

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

---

---

File: D2005-297

Date: August 1, 2006

In re: JUAN ANTONIO MOLINA, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

MOTION

ON BEHALF OF GENERAL COUNSEL: Jennifer J. Barnes, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Eileen M. Connolly, Appellate Counsel

ORDER:

PER CURIAM. On January 6, 2006, the State Bar Court in Los Angeles, California entered an order suspending the respondent indefinitely from the practice of law.

Consequently, on March 21, 2006, the Office of General Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals and the Immigration Courts. On March 23, 2006, the Department of Homeland Security (the "DHS," formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service) asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency. Therefore, on April 11, 2006, we suspended the respondent from practicing before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS pending final disposition of this proceeding.

On July 18, 2006, the respondent filed an answer to the allegations in the Notice of Intent to Discipline filed by the Office of General Counsel. The respondent stated that he had been reinstated to practice law in California. He submitted an April 28, 2006, order of the Review Department of the California State Bar Court, In Bank. The order stated that the January 6, 2006, suspension order was terminated, as the respondent had passed the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination.

The Office of General Counsel submitted a response to the respondent's answer on July 20, 2006. The Office of General Counsel appropriately urges the Board to consider the respondent's filing as a motion that we reinstate him to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS. The Office of General Counsel does not oppose the motion for reinstatement to practice. The DHS also states that it is not opposed to the respondent's reinstatement to practice.

Given that the respondent's motion is unopposed, we find that the respondent should be and hereby is reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, as of the date of this order. Because the respondent has been reinstated, public notices regarding the respondent's suspension by the Board should be withdrawn. If the respondent wishes to represent a party before the DHS or Board, he must file a Notice of Appearance (Form G-28 or Form EOIR-27), including any case in which he was formerly counsel, prior to his suspension.



---

FOR THE BOARD