

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. 17-BG-571

IN RE RUSSELL W. WARNOCK,
Respondent.
A Member of the Bar of the
District of Columbia Court of Appeals

DDN: 269-16

11/02/2017
FILED
District of Columbia
Court of Appeals
Julio Castillo
Julio Castillo
Clerk of Court

Bar Registration No. 418808

BEFORE: Thompson, Associate Judge, and Washington and Farrell, Senior Judges.

ORDER

(FILED – November 2, 2017)

On consideration of the certified order suspending respondent from the practice of law in the state of Colorado for three years with reinstatement conditioned upon a showing of fitness; this court’s June 9, 2017, order temporarily suspending respondent and directing him to show cause why identical reciprocal discipline should not be imposed; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel regarding reciprocal discipline; and it appearing that respondent did not file a response to the show cause order or file the required D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g) affidavit, it is

ORDERED that Russell W. Warnock is hereby suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for three years with reinstatement subject to a fitness requirement. *See In re Sibley*, 990 A.2d 483, 487-88 (D.C. 2010) (explaining that the presumption of identical discipline in D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (c) will prevail except in “rare” cases); *In re Cole*, 809 A.2d 1226, 1227 n.3 (D.C. 2002) (explaining that in unopposed reciprocal matters the “imposition of identical discipline should be close to automatic”). For the purpose of eligibility to petition for reinstatement, the suspension will not begin to run until such time as respondent files a D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g) affidavit.

PER CURIAM