

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court**

In the Matter of Robert W. Mance, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2013-000916

Opinion No. 27312
Submitted August 13, 2013 – Filed September 4, 2013

DEFINITE SUSPENSION

Lesley M. Coggiola, Disciplinary Counsel, of Columbia,
for Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

Robert W. Mance, of the District of Columbia, *pro se*.

PER CURIAM: By way of the attached opinion of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, respondent was suspended from the practice of law for six months following misconduct in three client matters. *In re Mance*, 35 A.3d 1125 (D.C. 2012). The Maryland Court of Appeals subsequently imposed an indefinite suspension as reciprocal discipline against respondent.¹ *Attorney Grievance Comm'n of Md. v. Mance*, 61 A.3d 59 (Md. 2013). By letter dated February 6, 2013, respondent notified the Clerk of this Court of his suspensions in both jurisdictions.

The Clerk of this Court sent a letter via certified mail to respondent notifying him that, pursuant to Rule 29(b), RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR, he had thirty (30) days in which to inform the Court of any claim he might have that identical discipline in this state is not warranted and reasons for such claim. Though respondent signed

¹ As noted by the Maryland Court of Appeals in its opinion suspending respondent from the practice of law, Maryland does not have an express equivalent sanction in its attorney discipline regulatory scheme. However, an indefinite suspension in Maryland is the functionally equivalent sanction because respondent must satisfy a fitness requirement in order to be reinstated in the District of Columbia.

the certified mail receipt, he did not respond to the Clerk's notice. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel filed a response stating it had no information that would indicate the imposition of identical discipline in this state is not warranted.

We find a six-month suspension is the appropriate sanction to impose as reciprocal discipline in this matter. *See In re Cooper*, 397 S.C. 339, 725 S.E.2d 491 (2012); *In re Strait*, 343 S.C. 312, 540 S.E.2d 460 (2000); *In re Acker*, 308 S.C. 338, 417 S.E.2d 862 (1992). We also find a sufficient attempt has been made to serve notice on respondent, and find none of the factors in Rule 29(d), RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR, present in this matter. We therefore suspend respondent from the practice of law for six months for the misconduct set forth in the opinion of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Within fifteen (15) days of the date of this opinion, respondent shall file an affidavit with the Clerk of Court showing that he has complied with Rule 30, RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR.

DEFINITE SUSPENSION.

**TOAL, C.J., PLEICONES, BEATTY, KITTREDGE and HEARN, JJ.,
concur.**