AMERICAN IMMIGRATION LAWYERS ASSOCIATION

October 30, 2020

Lauren Alder Reid
Assistant Director, Office of Policy
Executive Office for Immigration Review
5107 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1800
Falls Church, VA 22041

Submitted via http://www.regulations.gov

Re: Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: *Professional Conduct for Practitioners-Rules and Procedures, and Representation and Appearances*, (EOIR Docket No. 18-0301, RIN 1125-AA83)

Dear Ms. Reid,

The American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA) submits the following comments in response to the above-referenced Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) proposed rule, EOIR Docket No. 18-0301, Professional Conduct for Practitioners-Rules and Procedures, and Representation and Appearances, 85 FR 61610 (September 30, 2020) ("Proposed Rule").

Established in 1946, AILA is a voluntary bar association of more than 15,000 attorneys and law professors practicing, researching, and teaching in the field of immigration and nationality law. AILA's mission includes the advancement of the law pertaining to immigration and naturalization and the facilitation of justice in the field. AILA members regularly advise and represent businesses, U.S. citizens, U.S. lawful permanent residents, and foreign nationals regarding the application and interpretation of U.S. immigration laws.

AILA appreciates the opportunity to comment on EOIR's proposed rule changes that will clarify and promote limited scope representation for immigration clients. We recognize that within thirty states, state and local courts have implemented various forms of limited scope representation with the primary purpose of providing access to justice for underrepresented populations. AILA believes the new rules will help immigration courts work more efficiently and effectively, as more individuals will be represented at crucial moments of their immigration cases. We can also see a clear line to serving more underserved immigration clients in pro bono clinics and programs, and the proposed rules should actualize these goals. However, AILA does have points of serious concern, including the redefining of practice and preparation, which could create confusion and unintended burdens on immigration lawyers by failing to define the distinctions between a practice

AILA Doc. No. 20110234. (Posted 11/2/20)

and preparation directly on the forms, and by mandating disclosure of legal fees on every limited scope form.

DOJ Did Not Provide Sufficient Time to Comment on the Proposed Rule

While AILA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed rule, DOJ did not provide sufficient time to comment. Although this Comment is timely filed, we begin by requesting the full 60-day period that should be afforded for public comment to provide a meaningful opportunity to analyze and respond to the Proposed Rule, which threatens to further erode the fairness in our immigration courts. Moreover, the Proposed Rule was published on September 30, 2020, at a time when the COVID-19 pandemic continues to accelerate throughout the country and to exacerbate the difficulties of working full-time remotely, making the 30- day comment period even more untenable. The restrictive 30-day period and unprecedented pandemic have impeded our ability to thoroughly analyze the Proposed Rule and research all potentially relevant sources. If the comment period is extended, we reserve the right to supplement this Comment.

Approve of Defining Practice and Preparation with Reservations

AILA supports EOIR's measures to clarify the definitions of the practice and preparation of law before EOIR. By distinguishing between acts that involve legal advice or judgment (practice) and acts that consist of purely non-legal assistance (preparation), the proposed rule brings the regulations in line with contemporary understandings of the practice of law as well as those promulgated in legacy INS writings.[1] We agree with the position taken by INS since 1993 that form selection, the end-product of the primary legal analysis, should be specifically included in the definition, as it is the most common and consequential action taken by notarios[2] and others engaging in the unauthorized practice of immigration law.[3] Selection of, and assistance in the completion of, EOIR and USCIS forms is endemic to multi-service agencies where noncitizens often seek assistance with tax preparation and other government-related services. For this reason, the definitions of 'practice 'and 'preparation 'should specifically incorporate the notation from the

[1]" Under the proposed rule, an individual would engage in practice when he or she provides legal advice or uses legal judgment and either appears in person before EOIR, or drafts or files documents with EOIR. . . including both in-court and out-of-court representation. Such actions include legal research, the exercise of legal judgment regarding specific facts of a case, the provision of legal advice as to the appropriate action to take, drafting a document to effectuate the advice, or appearing on behalf of a respondent or petitioner, in person or through a filing."
'"Preparation, 'by contrast, would be limited to the completion of forms with information provided by the respondent or petitioner without any legal judgment, analysis, advice, or consideration as to the propriety of the form for a respondent or petitioner's circumstances. For example, individuals who appear before EOIR may have help completing applications or forms with such basic, factual information as their name, address, place of birth, etc."

[2] In the United States a "notary public" is only authorized to witness the signature on forms. In Latin American countries "notario publico," or "notary public," refers to an individual who has received the equivalent of a law license and is authorized to represent others before the government. In the U.S., a "notario" may obtain a notary public license in the U.S. and hold themselves out as able to do more in assisting on immigration form filling and filing than he/she is truly authorized.

[3] For example, where a visa consultant helps a client by "selecting a Form I-130 for a lay client, translating it, transcribing the responses, and then assisting in securing supporting documentation," that visa consultant "implicitly suggests to a client that this is the form that will best satisfy the request of securing legal status for his or her relative." Grover Joseph Rees III, General Counsel, Genco opinion 93-25 CO 202.2, April 20, 1993. Also see Office of the Commissioner: "Practice of law by unlicensed "immigration brokers," January 18, 1995.

comments regarding form selection. For the same reasons, we would include 'advice regarding one's legal status.

AILA likewise suggests incorporating the examples in the proposed rule of "advises a client on what details to include in an . . . application" and/or suggesting a "particular action," as well as the comments 'suggestion that those who do so who are "not actively licensed in law or fully accredited through EOIR's recognition and accreditation process" are engaging in "the unauthorized practice of law" (UPL).

We suggest that related language be included in forms that may be submitted to EOIR.[4] While the new definitions apply to such forms, they continue to only allow for designation of "preparer," which applies to both practitioners and non-practitioners.[5] As the comments note, authorized practitioners are subject to "the additional requirements to which practice is subject as compared to preparation." The only authority EOIR and DHS exercise over unauthorized practitioners is to preclude them from engaging in the practice of law before them. This is best accomplished by making clear the distinction between practice and preparation not just in the definitions (as the proposed rule accomplishes), but also in the required forms. By providing a means for preparers to complete a form designating their appearance before EOIR, the government is unwittingly encouraging UPL by providing an imprimatur of legitimacy upon notarios and other unauthorized providers.

Instances of preparation without practice should be quite rare. Few clients would request a form be prepared without the benefit of assistance in deciding which form to fill out and what should be included in and with that form. By attempting to regulate these non-legal services at all, such as translation, there is a risk of unwittingly legitimizing businesses that are hiding unauthorized legal practices. There are many instances in which officials, agencies, and various disciplinary bodies at local and state levels have refrained from taking action to protect consumers from illegal forms of immigration services because of confusion caused by the fact that non-practitioners are not just allowed, but required, to sign the same forms submitted before EOIR and DHS as authorized practitioners—without any language making clear that, unlike authorized practitioners, they are not permitted to engage in form selection or to provide advice on a person's status, answers to questions on the form, or advice on actions taken in regards to the person's immigration remedies.

There is little cost to making clear the distinction between practitioners and preparers. As the proposed rule states, "[t]he Department notes that it expects practitioners to engage only rarely in

[4] For example, "an Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal (Form I-589); Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status (Form I-485); Application for Suspension of Deportation (Form EOIR-40); Application for Cancellation of Removal for Certain Permanent Residents (Form EOIR 42A); Application for Cancellation of Removal and Adjustment of Status for Certain Nonpermanent Residents (Form EOIR-42B); or, Application for Suspension of Deportation or Special Rule Cancellation of Removal (Form I-881)."

[5]" This proposed rule would not relieve any such preparer from the requirements that the preparer complete the preparer identification or disclosure on the forms containing such request for information. . . In all cases in which an individual, either a practitioner or non-practitioner, assists an alien with filling out an application form that requires disclosure of the assistance . . . the person assisting would still be required to disclose the assistance on the form where indicated . . . Thus, the proposed rule covers scenarios in which practitioners or non-practitioners provide only preparation to assist a *pro se* alien only by drafting, writing, or otherwise completing documents for filing with EOIR; and the filing of those documents."

acts of preparation, because of the inherent likelihood that a practitioner will exercise legal judgment or provide legal advice while performing otherwise ministerial tasks such as serving as a scribe in filling out a form." It is difficult to imagine circumstances in which an individual would seek the help of an authorized representative, rather than a notario or other preparer, to request purely clerical, ministerial, or otherwise non-legal assistance such as mere translation or transcription. AILA therefore supports the inclusion of language on forms making clear that only authorized practitioners (accompanied by definitions of such) may engage in form selection, advise on a person's immigration status or on a particular action to be taken, etc., and that 'preparers ' may only engage in clerical activities, such as merely transcribing verbal responses onto a blank form for fees, with a signature only for practitioners.[6] We ask the Department to include a section on relevant forms for signature by 'practitioners, 'with appropriate definitions and warnings, and ask that the Department remove the section for signature by 'preparers, 'consistent with the amended (Forms EOIR-27 and EOIR-28, collectively, "NOEA forms"). Should the Department disagree and seek to include a signature section for preparers, we would support separate signature sections for 'practitioner 'and 'preparer, 'with the same attendant definitions and warnings.

Potential Unintended Consequences of Redefining Practice and Preparation

Although the proposed rule more specifically defines "practice" and "preparation" before the EOIR at 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(i) and 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(k), it leaves intact the confused definition of "practice" and "preparation" before the DHS rule under 8 C.F.R. §1.2. The definition of "practice" and "preparation" at 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 is incorporated in the new version of 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t). This is a disciplinary ground that sanctions practitioners who fail to submit a notice of entry of appearance when engaging in practice or preparation as defined under 8 C.F.R. § 1001(i) and 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(k) and under 8 C.F.R. § 1.2.

The broadness of the definition of "preparation," which includes practice under 8 C.F.R. §1.2, may snare a practitioner who does not submit a G-28 even when providing a brief consultation to a client regarding filing a form, who may then decide to submit the application *pro se*. This may happen in the lawyer's office or in a *pro bono* clinic. [7]

While the new definition of "practice" under 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(i) requires either an appearance in immigration court or assisting on any matter before the EOIR through the "drafting, writing, filing or completion of any pleading, brief, motion, form, application or other document that is submitted to the EOIR," the definition of "preparation" under 8 C.F.R. §1.2, which includes practice, is much more broad and opaque, and this is even acknowledged in the proposed rule.

For example, a lawyer may consult with a potential client regarding her eligibility for an application for relief, such as a Form I-589 application for asylum. No representation agreement is signed and the client leaves the private office or *pro bono* clinic without making any decisions

[6] *In re Am Paralegal Acad.*, 19 I&N Dec. 386, 387 (BIA 1986).

[7] On February 18, 2011, USCIS made a temporary accommodation for lawyers who participated in limited representation *pro bono* clinics by exempting them from 8 CFR 1003.102(t). The notification, which is now archived, is available at https://www.uscis.gov/archive-alerts/statement-of-intent-regarding-filing-requirement-for-attorneys-and-accredited-representatives. USCIS acknowledged that 8 C.F.R. §1003.102(t) would be a problem and thus made a temporary accommodation. It is not so clear whether this policy is still in effect, but proposed 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t) will provide more scope for DHS to sanction lawyers who engage in worthy *pro bono* endeavors.

as to how or if she will proceed. Several weeks later, she submitted an I-589 application for asylum *pro se*.

Proposed 8 C.F.R. §1003.102(t) deletes the requirement that there must be a pattern or practice for failing to file NOEA forms before a disciplinary sanction may result. Thus, a lawyer in the above example could potentially be sanctioned for not submitting a Form E-28 with EOIR, even though it would be impossible to do so and the individual in the above example has not even authorized the lawyer to make an appearance on her behalf. If interpreted and applied this broadly, the rule would infringe upon the attorney's ability to provide brief advice enshrined in ABA Model Rule 1.2(c). Moreover, it would be highly problematic to require the attorney to submit an E-28 in connection with an inchoate form. Doing so would require the attorney to disclose, without consent, the person's name, address, and the identity of the form/benefit discussed.

The new rule would have a chilling effect on *pro bono* clinics. Requiring an attorney to submit a Forms E-27 and E-28 with respect to every individual who is assisted at a *pro bono* clinic will effectively destroy this *pro bono* model, and will discourage lawyers from mobilizing in times of crisis or when tens of thousands seek to file complete and meritorious applications in a limited time frame. If a lawyer was compelled to provide the person with a signed E-27 or E-28, and then relinquish control over the application, the lawyer would have no idea if the applicant changed his or her answers on the application, or submitted a document that was incorrect. The lawyer could later be deemed liable for malpractice, despite the client having made an informed decision to seek only limited advice from the lawyer at the workshop. While the attorney could retain control over the application and accept the applicant as a full *pro bono* client, the attorney would then be required to dedicate more hours to *pro bono* service than he or she had originally intended, which would discourage the attorney from participating in future workshops.

Likewise, a lawyer in private practice may also be deterred from providing brief legal assistance to a client. Significantly, EOIR does not preclude an applicant from filing a benefit application *pro se*. It should be noted that when an applicant seeks advice from a lawyer, either paid or unpaid, the applicant benefits from such advice before proceeding *pro se*. But with the chilling effect of 8 CFR §1003.102(t) on limited representation, *pro se* applicants would cease receiving the benefit of quality legal assistance. Indeed, such applicants would not only be more vulnerable to the unauthorized practitioner, they would also be more likely to file flawed applications, resulting in the waste of government resources if additional processing was required, or the applicant was never eligible for the benefit sought.[8]

Unless and until the definition of "practice" and "preparation" under 8 C.F.R. §1.2 is amended and harmonized with the new definitions of "practice" and "preparation" under 8 C.F.R. §§1001.1(i) and 1001.1(k), new §1003.102(t), practitioners should not be disciplined for failing to submit Forms E-27 and E-28 based on the confused definition of "practice" and "preparation" under 8 C.F.R. §1.2.

AILA Opposes Required Disclosure of Fees Charged

[8] Please also refer to AILA's comments to DHS Docket No. USCIS-2009-0077 dated March 2, 2011.

AILA opposes any regulation requiring disclosure of legal fees to the immigration court. Disclosure of fees to the tribunal, especially when substantive and procedural matters remain pending, unduly interferes with the lawyer/client relationship. Robust rules are already in effect in all 50 states prevent charging unethical legal fees,[9] and federal regulations prohibit a "grossly excessive" fee.[10] Non-lawyer representatives are limited to charging "nominal" fees.[11] Furthermore, ABA Model Rule (MR) 1.5(b) requires the lawyer to communicate the details of fees and expenses to the client before or near the beginning of the representation. Lawyers already have obligations with limited scope under MR 1.2(c), which include communicating "adequate information and explanation about the material risks of and reasonably available alternatives."[12]

Determining the reasonableness of a fee without ancillary information is unfair and misleading. ABA Rule of Professional Conduct 1.5(a)(1-8), Fees, lays out ten factors to consider in determining fee reasonableness. They are "the time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly; the likelihood…that the acceptance of the particular employment will preclude other employment by the lawyer [if apparent to the client]; the fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services; the amount involved and the results obtained; the time limitations imposed by the client or by the circumstances; the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client; the experience, reputation, and ability of the lawyer or lawyers performing the services; and whether the fee is fixed or contingent."

The determination of legal fees is fact specific and varied. One lawyer may charge double or triple the rate of another because she has years more experience or an outstanding reputation that has put her services in the highest demand. A lawyer should charge a significant premium to a client who needs services done in a fraction of the time usually allotted. More work, skills needed, and pressure reasonably equates to a higher fee. In addition, client and lawyer have a relationship that informs the legal fees charge. In short, a single number on a form cannot account for valid variations in rate that are taken into account in relation to case, client, and lawyer.

While one may argue that this disclosure of fees is merely a deterrent measure for bad actors, this disclosure unfairly encroaches into the client-lawyer relationship and potentially breaches long standing duties of confidentiality and privilege.[13] This requirement of fee disclosure will be a deterrent to good lawyers, who may have little information about what is considered a reasonable fee in the marketplace and who fear repercussions for charging and disclosing nearly any fee. Many good lawyers might opt to avoid limited scope representation altogether because of the

[9] See ABA Model Rule 1.5(a).
[10] 8 CFR 1003.102(a)(1).
[11] *Matter of Ayuda*, 26 I&N Dec. 449 (BIA 2014), at https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/eoir/legacy/2014/11/20/3820.pdf, citing then-8 C.F.R. §292.2(a). Also see *Matter of Chaplain Services*, Inc., 21 I&N Dec. 578 (BIA 1996), *Matter of St. Francis Cabrini Immigration Law Center*, 26 I&N Dec. 445 (BIA 2014) and *Matter of Bay Area Legal Services*, Inc, 27 I&N Dec. 837 (DIR 2020).
[12] ABA Model Rule 1.0(e).
[13] ABA Model Rule 1.6(a), Confidentiality: "A lawyer shall not reveal information relating to the representation of a client unless the client gives informed consent, the disclosure is impliedly authorized in order to carry out the representation or the disclosure is permitted by [narrow exceptions]." Also see Comment 3 to 1.6: "…The confidentiality rule, for example, applies not only to matters communicated in confidence by the client but also to all information relating to the representation, whatever its source. A lawyer may not disclose such information except as authorized or required by the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law."

public disclosure and judgement upon fees and the misunderstanding of the inordinate amount of work a particular case takes.

The disclosure of fees on Forms E-27 and E-28 could give rise to anticompetitive behavior if the forms are made part of the public record. Lawyers frequently refrain from discussing their fees openly because they wish to avoid either the appearance of or the actual act of price fixing. If these forms become part of the public record, inscrutable lawyers or nonlawyers could aggregate that data and assess the fees to come up with set rates for services that they then use to price fix within the industry. Lawyers will feel less inclined to charge a fee that reasonably compensates for their work, potentially exacerbating a "race to the bottom" to stay competitive. Rather than being a "deterrent to overcharging," as stated in the comments, it will deter lawyers from engaging in limited scope representation altogether.

Importantly, disclosure of fees could unfairly influence the tribunal. Though judges are professionals trained to eliminate bias to the extent possible, there is an increased risk with disclosure of legal fees that they will be influenced by the disclosure. There may be unfair or inaccurate assumptions made about the client, based on the amount disclosed. Some may be more inclined to favorable discretion where the client is willing and able to pay a higher fee. Others might be biased against those who have paid higher fees or favor clients who could not afford to pay much.

Fee disclosure should not be required of immigration lawyers performing limited scope legal services. AILA is not aware of any other limited scope set of rules that requires disclosure of legal fees to the court. Indeed, it knows of no other practice area that requires disclosure of legal fees to the court unless there is a request for legal fees to be awarded or other case-specific circumstances. Even worse, fee disclosure at the outset, where the judge might be influenced, is far more troubling than fee issues addressed at the end of proceedings.

Limited Scope Representation in Court Appearances

On March 27, 2019, DOJ issued an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) requesting public comments on limited representation.[14] Question number two of ANPRM specifically requested comments on limited representation and the vast majority of stakeholders that submitted comments supported limited representation including AILA, the American Bar Association (ABA), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), nonprofit legal service providers, immigration clinics, private lawyers, and law students.[15] Despite the overwhelming majority of stakeholders supporting the expansion of limited scope of representation, this proposed rule specifically left out the expansion of the ability of lawyers to engage in limited, in-court representation.

[14] DOJ Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Soliciting Comments on Limited Representation Before EOIR,84 FR 11446, EOIR Docket No. 18-0301; RIN 1125-AA83, https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/03/27/2019-05838/professional-conduct-for-practitioners-scope-of-representation-and-appearances.
[15] AILA Comments, https://www.aila.org/infonet/aila-submits-comments-on-dojs-anprm-on-limited.

There has already been proven success with in-court limited scope representation. Before 2015, an attorney could not enter a notice of appearance for a bond hearing only. In 2015, a new rule was implemented that allowed bond only representation.[16] This dramatically changed how representation could take place in detained hearings. Not only were more respondents able to hire legal counsel and in turn be released from detention, but it dramatically increased lower cost services to respondents who could not afford to hire a lawyer for the entire case.

There is no question that in most cases, having attorney representation in immigration court is beneficial to not only the respondent but to the court as well. The case proceeds at a higher level with the immigration judge and lawyers, both private and government counsel, being able to navigate the case in a more predictable fashion. Attorneys also help facilitate more efficient court proceedings. The National Association of Immigration Judges 'President, Judge A. Ashley Tabaddor, previously stated, "when noncitizens are represented by competent counsel, Immigration Judges are able to conduct proceedings more expeditiously and resolve cases more quickly."[17]

The consequences for people who face removal without representation in court are severe. As explained in AILA's response to DOJ's ANPRM in April of 2019, EOIR should consider allowing lawyers and representatives to enter their appearance separately for the removability phase and/or the relief phase of a proceeding.[18] This increases access to competent attorneys or representatives who could not otherwise represent some individuals in removal proceedings. The American Immigration Council has found that "immigrants with attorneys fare better at every stage of the court process" – people with attorneys are more likely to be released from detention during their case, they are more likely to apply for some type of relief, and they are more likely to obtain relief from deportation.[19] The respondent's chances of success are significantly increased when a lawyer is able to make sure all safeguards are in place.[20] In the case of a *pro se* respondent, many times there are both language and cultural barriers while in court before the Immigration Judge. The respondent may not fully understand all their avenues of relief. They may be removed during hearings where, if represented by counsel, they would have a more solid legal basis to win their case.

In order to facilitate the expansion of limited scope of representation, safeguards should be put into place to ensure that attorneys do not leave a respondent without the proper warnings or instructions in a case. For example, attorneys participating in a limited appearance case could be required to sign and submit attestations and warnings to the client that could protect the integrity of the court process. Clients are also protected under ABA Model Rule 1.2 (c), "a lawyer may limit the scope of the representation if the limitation is reasonable under the circumstances and the client

---

[16] Separate Representation for Custody and Bond Proceedings, 80 FR 59500 (Oct. 1, 2015) (final rule) https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2015/10/01/2015-24016/separate-representation-for-custody-and-bond-proceedings.

[17] Sen. Mazie Hirono, Written Questions for the Record, U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Apr. 18, 2018

[18] AILA Submits Comments on DOJ's ANPRM on Limited Representation Before EOIR (Apr. 26, 2019), https://www.aila.org/infonet/aila-submits-comments-on-dojs-anprm-on-limited.

[19] Ingrid Eagly and Steven Shafer, Access to Counsel in Immigration Court, American Immigration Council, Sept. 28, 2016.

[20] EOIR will need to make the full file available to limited scope counsel, to ensure counsel can be fully prepared and not repeat arguments that were already fairly made and decided.

gives informed consent." Lawyers must adhere to the Rules of Professional Conduct (RPCs) and most states follow the model rules. A lawyer would have to clearly lay out the terms of limited representation and the client must understand the limitations and give the informed consent to proceed. The limitations for appearing in a master calendar hearing only may include preparation of the underlying applications, entering pleadings in a case, and appearing in court to orally argue eligibility for relief from removal. What it would not include would be future briefs, call-up dates, or representation in future hearings, unless the respondent hired the attorney.

Impact on Friend of Court Programs

The proposed regulations 'limitation on in-court representations will also impact and erode the function and necessity of "friend of court" programs, where nonprofit legal service providers and *pro bono* attorneys assist thousands of unrepresented respondents before the immigration courts. EOIR released a memorandum in November 2019, targeting legal service provider programs that provide assistance to individuals in removal proceedings, including countless children, through attorney-of-the-day programs.[21] The agency replaced earlier guidance that applied specifically to unaccompanied minors, but now warned attorneys serving as *amicus curiae* that they could not take part in legal advocacy on behalf of respondents, including, filing or accepting documents, helping individuals navigate and respond to factual allegations and legal charges, informing the court that a respondent would exercise her legal rights, or introducing new issues.[22] With EOIR's memorandum, the proposed regulation provides further limitations on friend of court programs, discourages representation before the immigration courts, and leave thousands without legal assistance.[23]

Conclusion

Thank you for considering further implementation of limited scope representation. We believe that by allowing limited representation, it would allow for more respondents to have a greater variety of representation at different stages of proceedings. In turn, this will lead to both a more efficient court as well as addressing the urgent need of increased access to competent legal services.

Sincerely,

The American Immigration Lawyers Association

[21] OOD. PM 20-05: Legal Advocacy by Non-Representatives in Immigration Court, Nov. 21, 2019, https://www.justice.gov/eoir/page/1219301/download.
[22] Kristin Macleod-Ball, Immigration Courts Further Limit Legal Help Available to People Facing Deportation, American Immigration Council, Dec. 3, 2019.
[23] TRAC, Asylum Representation Rates Have Fallen Amid Rising Denial Rates, November 28, 2017.