## U.S. Department of Justice

**Executive Office for Immigrat** 

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

File:

D2001-110

Date: DEC 3 1 2001

In re: JOHN J. KOZLOWSKI, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

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

ON BEHALF OF SERVICE:

Javier Balasquide, Appellate Counsel

## ORDER:

PER CURIAM. On March 14, 2001, the respondent was suspended from the practice of law for one year, stayed, with an actual suspension of 90 days, and probation for two years, by the Supreme Court of California. The respondent has not been reinstated to the practice of law in California.

Consequently, on October 5, 2001, 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 October 15, 2001, the Immigration and Naturalization Service asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency. Therefore, on October 29, 2001, 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 90 days. 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 Supreme Court of California, 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 90 days. 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 seek reinstatement under appropriate circumstances. See 8 C.F.R. § 3.107(b).