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

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: D2016-0333

Date: SEP 0 5 2017

In re: Thomas Alan STANLEY, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

MOTION

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Jennifer J. Barnes

Disciplinary Counsel

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Jeannette V. Dever

Associate Legal Advisor

The respondent, who has been suspended from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board), the Immigration Courts, and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") for a period of 6 months, effective January 4, 2017, has sought reinstatement to practice. The Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review (Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR) does not oppose the respondent's motion for reinstatement. The respondent's motion for reinstatement will be granted.

On September 15, 2016, the Supreme Court of California issued a final order suspending the respondent from the practice of law in that state for a period of 6 months. Consequently, on December 15, 2016, the Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the Board and the Immigration Courts. The DHS then asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency. We granted the petition on January 4, 2017.

The respondent did not file a timely answer to the Notice of Intent to Discipline and did not dispute the allegations in the Notice. Given the respondent's 6-month suspension from the practice of law in California, our February 10, 2017, final order of discipline suspended the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS for 6 months, effective January 4, 2017, the date of our immediate suspension order.

The respondent now asks to be reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts and the DHS, and presents evidence that he is again authorized to practice law in California. The respondent now meets the definition of attorney as set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f) (2017) and has complied with the reinstatement requirements set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107. Further, the Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR does not oppose his reinstatement. We therefore grant the respondent's motion for reinstatement and reinstate the respondent to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts and the DHS, effective immediately.

A Same

ORDER: The respondent is reinstated to practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, effective immediately upon the issuance of this order.

FURTHER ORDER: Because the respondent has been reinstated, public notices regarding the respondent's suspension should reflect this reinstatement.

FURTHER ORDER: If the respondent wishes to represent a party before the Immigration Courts, the Board, or the DHS, he must file a Notice of Appearance (Form EOIR-28, Form EOIR-27, or Form G-28) even in cases in which he was counsel prior to his suspension.

FOR THE BOARD