

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: D2001-063

Date: JUL - 2 2002

In re: ALEXANDER C. VRBANOFF, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

MOTION

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

ON BEHALF OF SERVICE: Barry O'Melinn, Appellate Counsel

ORDER:

PER CURIAM. We will grant the respondent's motion for reinstatement, filed June 4, 2002.

On March 22, 2001, the Supreme Court of Illinois entered an order suspending the respondent from the practice of law in that state for a period of 2 years, with the suspension stayed after 1 year and probation imposed for 5 years thereafter, subject to certain conditions. Based upon that event, the Office of General Counsel petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice, and the Service asked for similar discipline before it. Accordingly, on May 30, 2001, we suspended the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service, pending final disposition of disciplinary proceedings, as directed by the regulations. See 8 C.F.R. § 3.103(a)(2).¹

The respondent requested a hearing on the matter before an Immigration Judge. On October 10, 2001, the parties entered into a consent order whereby the respondent accepted a 1 year suspension from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service, effective *nunc pro tunc* to June 25, 2001. The respondent acknowledged that he would not be eligible for reinstatement unless and until he was readmitted to practice law in Illinois.

The respondent moves that we reinstate him to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service. The respondent asserts that he has been reinstated to practice in Illinois, where he was disciplined. A May 30, 2002, letter from the Attorney Registration and Discipline Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois, stating that the respondent has been reinstated to the practice of law, is in the record. The Office of General Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review, who initiated these disciplinary proceedings, does not oppose the motion and notes that the respondent appears to meet the definition of attorney as provided in 8 C.F.R. § 1.1(f).

Given that the respondent has been reinstated to practice law in Illinois, his motion is unopposed, and there appear to be no adverse factors in his case, we find that the respondent should be and hereby is reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service, as of the date of this order. Because the respondent has been reinstated, public notices regarding the

¹On June 7, 2001, we temporarily stayed our order of immediate suspension until June 25, 2001.

respondent's suspension by the Board should be withdrawn. If the respondent wishes to represent a party before the Board, he must file a Notice of Appearance (Form EOIR-27), including any case in which he was formerly counsel, prior to his suspension.



FOR THE BOARD