

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

File: D2019-0009

Date: APR 16 2019

In re: Frank Patrick SPROULS, Attorney

IN PRACTITIONER DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE

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

ON BEHALF OF EOIR: Paul Rodrigues
Disciplinary Counsel

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 6 months.

On December 12, 2018, the respondent was suspended from the practice of law for 2 years, stayed, with an imposed suspension of 6 months, and probation for 3 years, by the Supreme Court of California. The basis for the suspension involved misconduct concerning an immigration matter. The Disciplinary Counsel for the DHS petitioned for the respondent's immediate suspension from practice before that agency on February 25, 2019. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.103(a). The DHS Disciplinary Counsel stated that the respondent remains suspended from the practice of law in California, as of the date of its filing.

The Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office for Immigration Review asked that the respondent be similarly suspended from practice before the Board and the Immigration Courts. We granted the petition on March 5, 2019.

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. 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 DHS for 6 months. The Disciplinary Counsel for EOIR asks the Board to extend that discipline to practice before the Board and the Immigration Courts 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 discipline imposed against the respondent in California. Based on representations by the DHS Disciplinary Counsel in the Notice of Intent to Discipline, we will deem our suspension to have commenced on January 11, 2019, the effective date of the respondent's suspension in California.

ORDER: The Board hereby suspends the respondent from practice before the Board, the Immigration Courts, and the DHS, for 6 months. The suspension is deemed to have commenced on January 11, 2019.

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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. J. [unclear]", is written above a horizontal line.

FOR THE BOARD