

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

---

File: D2016-0250

Date: **MAR 08 2017**

In re: RUBEN DANIEL SANCHEZ, ATTORNEY  
IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS  
FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Jennifer J. Barnes  
Disciplinary Counsel

ON BEHALF OF DHS: Cathy Ng  
Associate Legal Advisor

The respondent will be suspended from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board"), the Immigration Courts, and the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") for a period of 1 year.

On June 19, 2015, the Supreme Court of California issued an order suspending the respondent from the practice of law in that state for a period of one year. On October 12, 2016, the Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review ("Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR") petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") and the Immigration Courts. The Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") then asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before that agency.

We denied the petition on December 15, 2016, because it appeared that the respondent's period of suspension in California was complete. The Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR, however, submitted additional information establishing that the respondent remains suspended in California. We therefore granted the petition for immediate suspension on February 24, 2017.

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. The respondent's failure to file a response within the time period prescribed in the Notice of Intent to Discipline 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(d)(1).

The Notice of Intent to Discipline proposes that the respondent be suspended from practicing before the Board and the Immigration Courts for 1 year. The DHS asks the Board to extend that discipline to practice before that agency as well. Because the respondent has failed to file an answer, the regulations direct the Board to adopt the proposed sanction contained in the Notice of Intent to Discipline, unless there are considerations that compel us to digress from that proposal. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.105(d)(2). The proposed sanction is appropriate in light of the respondent's suspension in California. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.101(a)(2) (suspension is a disciplinary sanction that may be imposed by the Board); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(e) (practitioner who has been suspended is subject to discipline by the Board). Further, as the respondent is currently under

our February 24, 2017, order of suspension, we will deem the respondent's suspension to have commenced on that date.

ORDER: The Board suspends the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS for 1 year. The suspension is deemed to have commenced on February 24, 2017.

FURTHER ORDER: The respondent must maintain compliance with the directives set forth in our prior order. The respondent must notify the Board of any further disciplinary action against him.

FURTHER ORDER: The contents of the order shall be made available to the public, including at the Immigration Courts and appropriate offices of the DHS.

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



---

FOR THE BOARD