U.S. Department of Justice

Executive Office for Immigration eview

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: D2001-146

Date: MAY 2 1 2002

In re: WENDY B. GOLENBOCK, 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 August 4, 1999, the respondent was convicted in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts of bankruptcy fraud and conspiracy to commit bankruptcy fraud. She was sentenced to 21 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release. On May 30, 2001, the respondent was disbarred from the practice of law in Massachusetts.

Consequently, on March 25, 2002, 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 April 3, 2002, the Immigration and Naturalization Service asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency. Therefore, on April 17, 2002, 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 eight 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 courts in Massachusetts, 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 eight years. As the respondent is currently under our April 17, 2002, 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.

È D€001-146

After the eight-year suspension period expires, the respondent may petition this Board for reinstatement to practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and Service. See 8 C.F.R. \S 3.107(a). In order to be reinstated, the respondent must demonstrate that she meets the definition of an attorney or representative, as set forth in 8 C.F.R. \S 1.1(f) and (j). *Id.* Therefore, the respondent must show that she has been reinstated to the State Bar of Massachusetts before she may be reinstated by the Board. See 8 C.F.R. \S 1.1(f) (stating that term "attorney" does not include any individual under order suspending him from the practice of law). The respondent may seek earlier reinstatement under appropriate circumstances. See 8 C.F.R. \S 3.107(b).

THE BOARD FOR