

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. 02-BG-716

IN RE JAMES S. MAXWELL, RESPONDENT

A Member of the Bar of the
District of Columbia Court of Appeals

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility
(BDN 26-00)

(Decided January 23, 2003)

Before TERRY and SCHWELB, *Associate Judges*, and NEWMAN, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: This matter is back before the court following our rejection of the sanction initially recommended by the Board on Professional Responsibility (“the Board”). In *In re Maxwell*, 798 A.2d 525 (D.C. 2002), we remanded this case to the Board, directing it to determine whether to recommend identical reciprocal discipline or to conduct further proceedings. The Board now recommends that we impose functionally identical reciprocal discipline, namely, a public censure.¹

¹ Respondent consented to a public reprimand by the Maryland Court of Appeals. The functionally equivalent sanction in the District of Columbia is a public censure. See *In re Greenberg*, 762 A.2d 42 (D.C. 2000).

Neither Bar Counsel nor respondent has offered any objection to the Board's report and recommendation. Given our limited scope of review and the presumption in favor of identical reciprocal discipline, we adopt that recommendation. *See In re Goldsborough*, 654 A.2d 1285 (D.C. 1995); *In re Zilberberg*, 612 A.2d 832, 834 (D.C. 1992); D.C. Bar Rule XI, § 11 (f). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that James S. Maxwell be, and hereby is, publicly censured.