

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: D2000-014

MAY 7 2001

In re: ALAKE JOHNSON-FORD, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

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

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

ORDER:

PER CURIAM. On February 10, 2000, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals disbarred the respondent from the practice of law in that jurisdiction.

Consequently, on August 18, 2000, the Office of General Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review initiated disciplinary proceedings against the respondent and petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals and the Immigration Courts. On August 24, 2000, the Immigration and Naturalization Service moved to join that petition and asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency. Therefore, on September 15, 2000, we suspended the respondent from practicing before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service pending final disposition of this proceeding.

The respondent was required to file a timely answer to the allegations contained in the Notice of Intent to Discipline but has failed to do so. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 3.105(c)(1). The respondent's failure to file a response within the time period prescribed in the Notice constitutes an admission of the allegations therein, and the respondent is now precluded from requesting a hearing on the matter. 8 C.F.R. § 3.105(d)(1), (2).

The Notice recommends that the respondent be suspended from practicing before the Board and the Immigration Courts, for a period of 5 years. The Service asks that we extend that discipline to practice before it as well. Because the respondent has failed to file an answer, the regulations direct us to adopt the recommendation contained in the Notice, unless there are considerations that compel us to digress from that recommendation. 8 C.F.R. § 3.105(d)(2). Since the recommendation is appropriate in light of the sanctions imposed by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, we will honor that recommendation.

Accordingly, we hereby suspend the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service for a period of 5 years. As the respondent is currently under our September 15, 2000, order of suspension, we will deem the respondent's suspension to have commenced on that date. The respondent is instructed to maintain compliance with the directives

set forth in our prior order. The respondent is also instructed to notify the Board of any further disciplinary action against her.

After 2½ years from the effective date of the respondent's suspension, the respondent may be reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service, provided that she meets the definition of an attorney or representative set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1.1(f) and (j). 8 C.F.R. § 3.107(b). Therefore, should the respondent seek reinstatement, the respondent must notify the Board of her bar standing and her ability to practice law in the District of Columbia. We will consider the respondent for reinstatement once the respondent demonstrates by clear, unequivocal, and convincing evidence that she possesses the moral and professional qualifications required to appear before the Board, the Immigration Courts, the Service, or all three, and that the respondent's reinstatement will not be detrimental to the administration of justice. 8 C.F.R. § 3.107(b)(1).

Finally, given the reciprocal nature of the discipline we impose, we advise the respondent that, should she be reinstated to practice in the District of Columbia prior to completion of her period of suspension, we may entertain a request for reinstatement before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the Service if that request complies with the instructions set forth above.



FOR THE BOARD