

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

---

File: D2008-287

Date:

In re: YOHAN PARK, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

~~==~~ FEB 23 2011

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

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

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Jennifer J. Barnes, Disciplinary Counsel

The respondent will be suspended from practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and Department of Homeland Security (the "DHS"), for two years.

On October 17, 2008, the New York Supreme Court's Appellate Division for the Second Judicial Department immediately suspended the respondent from the practice of law in New York, pending further order of the court.

Consequently, on February 2, 2009, the DHS initiated disciplinary proceedings against the respondent and petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the DHS. The Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) then asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before EOIR, including the Board and Immigration Courts. Therefore, on February 19, 2009, we suspended the respondent from practicing before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS pending final disposition of this proceeding.

On August 3, 2010, the New York Supreme Court's Appellate Division for the Second Judicial Department suspended the respondent from the practice of law for two years, with credit for the time elapsed under the interim suspension.

The respondent was required to file a timely answer to the allegations contained in the Notice of Intent to Discipline (Revised). 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 of Intent to Discipline (Revised) proposes that the respondent be suspended from practice before the DHS for two years. The Disciplinary Counsel for 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 proposed sanction contained in the Notice, unless there are considerations that compel us to digress from that proposal. 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.105(d)(2); 1292.3(e)(3)(ii).


Since the proposed sanction is appropriate in light of the respondent's suspension in New York, we will honor it. Accordingly, we hereby suspend the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, for two years. As the respondent is currently under our February 19, 2009, order of suspension, we will deem the respondent's suspension to have commenced on that date.

ORDER: The Board hereby suspends the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, for two years.

FURTHER ORDER: 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.

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent may petition this Board for reinstatement to practice before the Board, Immigration Courts, and DHS under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.107.

FURTHER ORDER: As the Board earlier imposed an immediate suspension order in this case, today's order of the Board becomes effective immediately. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(2)(2010); *Matter of Kronegold*, 25 I&N Dec. 157, 163 (BIA 2010).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'D. J. ...', is written above a horizontal line.

FOR THE BOARD