

*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-239**

IN RE PETER R. ESTES

Respondent.

FILED 05/18/2017  
District of Columbia  
Court of Appeals  
*Julio Castillo*  
Julio Castillo  
Clerk of Court

**Bar Registration No. 358466**

**DDN 235-16**

BEFORE: Blackburne-Rigsby, Chief Judge, McLeese, Associate Judge, and Farrell, Senior Judge.

**ORDER**

(FILED – May 18, 2017)

On consideration of the certified order of the Supreme Court of California disbaring respondent from the practice of law in California; this court’s March 13, 2017, order 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; it appearing that respondent did not file a response to this court’s show cause order or file the required D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g) affidavit; and it further appearing that respondent was previously suspended from the practice of law, *see In re Estes*, 144 A.3d 40 (D.C. 2016), and failed to file the required affidavit, it is

ORDERED that Peter R. Estes is hereby disbarred from the practice of law in the District of Columbia. *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”). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that for the purposes of reinstatement the time for reinstatement will not begin to run until such time as respondent files a D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g) affidavit.

**PER CURIAM**