

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

---

---

File: D2005-288

Date: FEB - 3 2006

In re: JAMES EDUARD WHITE, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Rachel A. McCarthy, Ethics Counsel

ON BEHALF OF GENERAL COUNSEL: Jennifer J. Barnes, Bar Counsel

ORDER:

PER CURIAM. On November 23, 2005, the respondent was suspended from the practice of law for a period of 6 months, effective December 10, 2005, by the Supreme Court of Oregon.

Consequently, on December 15, 2005, the Department of Homeland Security (the "DHS," formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service), initiated disciplinary proceedings against the respondent and petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the DHS. On December 19, 2005, the Office of General Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before EOIR, including the Board and immigration courts. Therefore, on January 11, 2006, we suspended the respondent from practicing before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS 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. §§ 1003.105(c)(1); 1292.3(e)(3)(ii). 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. § 1292.3(e)(3)(ii).

The Notice recommends that the respondent be expelled from practice before the DHS. The Office of General Counsel of EOIR asks that we extend that discipline to practice before the Board and immigration courts as well. As the respondent failed to file a timely 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. §§ 1003.105(d)(2); 1292.3(e)(3)(ii). Since the recommendation is appropriate in light of the respondent's suspension in Oregon, and the fact that "Respondent's conduct also violated 8 C.F.R. § 1292.3, as set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(m), in that respondent, an attorney admitted to practice law in Oregon, assisted a person, other than a practitioner as defined in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.101(b), in the performance of activity that constituted the unauthorized practice of law", and "Respondent's professional misconduct resulted in serious adverse consequences to his immigration clients", Notice at ¶ 5, we will honor it. Accordingly, we hereby expel the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS.

As the respondent is currently under our January 11, 2006, order of suspension, we will deem the respondent's expulsion 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 him.

The respondent may petition this Board for reinstatement to practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and DHS under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107(b). In order to be reinstated, the respondent must demonstrate that he meets the definition of an attorney or representative, as set forth in 8 C.F.R. §§ 1001.1(f) and (j). *Id.* Therefore, the respondent must show that he has been reinstated to practice law in Oregon before he may be reinstated by the Board. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(f) (stating that term "attorney" does not include any individual under order suspending him from the practice of law).

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
FOR THE BOARD