

***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. 03-BG-997

IN RE MURRAY L. DEUTCHMAN, RESPONDENT.

A Member of the Bar of the  
District of Columbia Court of Appeals  
Bar Registration No. 161729

On Report and Recommendation of the  
Board on Professional Responsibility

(BDN 263-03)

(Submitted November 10, 2004

Decided November 24, 2004)

Before FARRELL and WASHINGTON, *Associate Judges*, and NEWMAN, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: On August 4, 2003, the Court of Appeals of Maryland disbarred respondent Murray L. Deutchman based on a joint petition for disbarment by consent.<sup>1</sup> In the petition he acknowledged that he was under investigation for conversion of client funds and that there was evidence sufficient to support the allegations.<sup>2</sup>

Bar Counsel notified us of this action and we temporarily suspended respondent on October 1, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (d), and referred the matter to the Board on Professional Responsibility (“Board”) for a determination of whether identical, greater

---

<sup>1</sup> In the joint petition, respondent stated erroneously that he was not admitted to the bars of any other states. However, Bar Counsel advises us that respondent was a member of the District of Columbia Bar, having been admitted by motion of April 13, 1971; however, he has been administratively suspended since November 30, 1992, for non-payment of dues. Bar Counsel further informs us that based on his Maryland disbarment, respondent has also been disbarred by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

<sup>2</sup> In violation of Rules 1.15, 8.4 (c) and (d) of the Maryland Rules of Professional Conduct, and Maryland Rule 16-609.

or lesser discipline should be imposed as reciprocal discipline, or whether the Board would proceed *de novo*. The Board now recommends that we disbar respondent as identical reciprocal discipline. Bar Counsel has not taken exception to the Board's report and recommendation and respondent has not filed a response.<sup>3</sup>

Our review in uncontested disciplinary cases is limited and the presumption is in favor of identical reciprocal discipline. See *In re Goldsborough*, 654 A.2d 1285 (D.C. 1995); *In re Zilberberg*, 612 A.2d 832, 834 (D.C. 1992); D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (f). Respondent's conduct in Maryland (namely conversion of client funds) entailed intentional misappropriation and dishonesty which, if committed here, would warrant disbarment.<sup>4</sup>

The Board thus recommends disbarment. Since no exception has been taken, we give heightened deference to the Board's recommendation. See D.C. Bar Rule XI, § 9 (g)(2); *In re Delaney*, 697 A.2d 1212, 1214 (D.C. 1997). Moreover, as there is substantial support in the record for the Board's findings, we accept them and adopt the recommended sanction since it is not inconsistent with discipline imposed in similar cases.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Murray L. Deutchman is disbarred from the practice of law in the District of Columbia. Moreover, since respondent has not filed the affidavit required by D.C.

---

<sup>3</sup> Respondent also did not participate in any proceedings before the Board.

<sup>4</sup> See *In re Addams*, 579 A.2d 190 (D.C. 1990) (en banc).

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., *In re Steely*, 806 A.2d 1236 (D.C. 2002).

Bar R. XI, § 14 (g), we direct his 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.*