Executive Office for Immigration Review

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: D2010-101

Date: MAY 1 4 2013

In re: SHANGE H. PETRINI, ATTORNEY

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Catherine M. O'Connell, Disciplinary Counsel

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

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

On December 20, 2010, the Supreme Court of Washington disbarred the respondent. Consequently, on March 28, 2013, 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 April 8, 2013, 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. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105 (2012); 8 C.F.R. § 292.3(e). See 77 Fed. Reg. 2011, 2014-15 (Jan. 13, 2012); see also 78 Fed. Reg. 24669 (April 26, 2013). 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. § 1003.105(2012); 8 C.F.R. § 292.3(e). See 77 Fed. Reg. 2011, 2014-15 (Jan. 13, 2012); see also 78 Fed. Reg. 24669 (April 26, 2013).

The Notice of Intent to Discipline proposes that the respondent be disbarred from practice before the DHS, and 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(2012); 8 C.F.R. § 292.3(e). See 77 Fed. Reg. 2011, 2014-15 (Jan. 13, 2012); see also 78 Fed. Reg. 24669 (April 26, 2013).

·D2010-101

Since the proposed sanction is appropriate in light of the fact that the respondent was disbarred 8 in Washington, we will honor it. Accordingly, we hereby disbar the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS. As the respondent is currently under our April 8, 2013, order of suspension, we will deem the respondent's disbarment to have commenced on that date.

ORDER: The Board hereby disbars the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS.

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(2012). See 77 Fed. Reg. 2011, 2015 (Jan. 13, 2012); see also 78 Fed. Reg. 24669 (April 26, 2013).

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)(2012). See 77 Fed. Reg. 2011, 2015 (Jan. 13, 2012); see also 78 Fed. Reg. 24669 (April 26, 2013).

FOR THE BOARD