

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. 99-BG-1490

IN RE JAMES V. HACKNEY, 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 March 28, 2001

Decided June 28, 2001)

Before TERRY, *Associate Judge*, and MACK and FERREN, *Senior Judges*.

PER CURIAM: On June 25, 1999, respondent James V. Hackney was convicted in federal court of four counts of wire fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343. The indictment indicates that respondent knowingly defrauded investors by urging them to invest in certain ventures in South Africa, collecting monies for that purpose, and then spending the monies on himself rather than investing them.

On December 13, 1999, this court temporarily suspended respondent pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 10 (c). We directed the Board on Professional Responsibility to institute a formal proceeding to determine the nature of the final discipline to be imposed and, specifically, to decide whether respondent's crime involved moral turpitude. The Board has now filed a report and recommendation. The Board finds that respondent's conviction

involves moral turpitude *per se*, and recommends disbarment pursuant to D.C. Code § 11-2503 (a) (1995). The Board's recommendation is unopposed.

We have previously held that wire fraud is a crime of moral turpitude *per se*. *See, e.g., In re Ferber*, 703 A.2d 142 (D.C. 1997); *In re Chuang*, 575 A.2d 725 (D.C. 1990). D.C. Code § 11-2503 (a) thus mandates respondent's disbarment. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that James V. Hackney is disbarred, pursuant to D.C. Code § 11-2503 (a) from the practice of law in the District of Columbia. This disbarment is effective from January 17, 2001, the date on which respondent filed an affidavit pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g).

So ordered.