

Notice: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the Atlantic and Maryland Reporters. Users are requested to notify the Clerk of the Court of any formal errors so that corrections may be made before the bound volumes go to press.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

No. 00-BG-1372

IN RE STEVEN H. HOFBERG, RESPONDENT.

A Member of the Bar
of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility

(Submitted December 6, 2001

Decided December 27, 2001)

Before REID and WASHINGTON, *Associate Judges*, and NEBEKER, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: Respondent Steven H. Hofberg was disbarred by the Court of Appeals of Maryland on October 11, 2000, for various acts of severe neglect and other misconduct in nine separate cases.¹ That court noted that respondent engaged in “a disturbing pattern of incompetence; lack of diligence in pursuing a legal matter; failure to apprise his clients of their legal matters and otherwise advise them timely and appropriately about those legal matters; failure to account for funds and property entrusted to him in a fiduciary capacity; and a practice of dissembling to both his clients and to the disciplinary agency charged with the investigation of his actions over a period of time.”

Respondent’s disbarment was reported to this court, and on October 30, 2000, we temporarily suspended him pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (d), and referred the matter to the Board on Professional Responsibility (“Board”). The Board now recommends that

¹ Respondent violated Rules 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 (a), 1.4 (b), 1.5 (a), 1.15 (a), 1.15 (b), 1.16 (d), 8.1 (b), 8.4 (b), 8.4 (c), and 8.4 (d) of the Maryland Rules of Professional Conduct, and § 10-306 of the Business Occupations and Professions Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

respondent be disbarred as reciprocal discipline. Bar Counsel does not oppose the Board's recommendation. Respondent did not participate in the proceedings before the Board and has not filed any exceptions to the Board's recommendation.

The record in this case does not reveal any of the conditions enumerated in D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (c), that might make reciprocal disbarment inappropriate. Given the rebuttable presumption in favor of identical reciprocal discipline, *see In re Zilberberg*, 612 A.2d 832, 834 (D.C. 1992), and our heightened deference to the Board when its recommendation is unopposed, *see In re Goldsborough*, 654 A.2d 1285 (D.C. 1995), and D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (f), we adopt the Board's recommendation. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Steven H. Hofberg is disbarred from the practice of law in the District of Columbia forthwith. We note that respondent has not filed the affidavit required by D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g); thus, we direct respondent's attention to the requirements of that rule and their effect on his eligibility for reinstatement. *See* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 16 (c).

So ordered.