

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. 20-BG-270

IN RE WAYNE ROBERT ROHDE, RESPONDENT.

A Member of the Bar
of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals
(Bar Registration No. 421213)

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility

(BDN-336-13)

(Decided August 13, 2020)

Before BECKWITH and MCLEESE, *Associate Judges*, and NEBEKER, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: The Board on Professional Responsibility adopted a Hearing Committee's findings that respondent Wayne Robert Rohde violated Virginia Rules 3.3(a)(1) and 8.4(c), and the Board recommends that respondent be publicly censured. Specifically, the Committee found by clear and convincing evidence that respondent knowingly made a false statement to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in connection with an application to be admitted to that court pro hac vice, by representing that there had not been any action in any court pertaining to his conduct or fitness as a member of the bar, even though

respondent knew that this court had referred his criminal felony conviction to the Board on Professional Responsibility in 2006 to determine what action should be taken. The Committee also found by clear and convincing evidence that respondent misled the attorney sponsoring his pro hac vice application, by failing to disclose to her the prior conviction and the related disciplinary proceedings.

Under D.C. Bar R. XI, § 9(h)(2), “if no exceptions are filed to the Board’s report, the [c]ourt will enter an order imposing the discipline recommended by the Board upon the expiration of the time permitted for filing exceptions.” *See also In re Viehe*, 762 A.2d 542, 543 (D.C. 2000) (per curiam) (“When . . . there are no exceptions to the Board’s report and recommendation, our deferential standard of review becomes even more deferential.”). Neither respondent nor Disciplinary Counsel has filed exceptions to the Board’s Report and Recommendation, and we are satisfied that the Board’s recommendation is supported by substantial evidence. We see no reason to reject the discipline recommended by the Board. *See id.* at 543.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that respondent Wayne Robert Rohde is hereby publicly censured.

So ordered.