

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. 04-BG-1240

IN RE ALBERT S. WATKINS,
RESPONDENT.

A Member of the Bar
of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals
(Bar Registration No. 399625)

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility
(BDN074-01)

(Decided August 25, 2005)

Before SCHWELB and RUIZ, *Associate Judges*, and KERN, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: Respondent Albert S. Watkins was publicly reprimanded by the Supreme Court of Missouri for improperly disclosing confidential information and representing two clients with conflicting interests. The Board on Professional Responsibility (“Board”) determined that respondent’s conduct violated Rules 1.6 and 1.7 of the District of Columbia Rules of Professional Conduct, and recommends that we impose reciprocal discipline in the form of a public censure.

A public censure is functionally equivalent to the public reprimand imposed in Missouri. *See In re Bailey*, 759 A.2d 1076, 1076 (D.C. 2000). In light of this, and the presumption in favor of identical reciprocal discipline, *see In re Zilberberg*, 612 A.2d 832, 834 (D.C. 1992), as well as our heightened deference to the Board’s recommendation when, as here, it is unopposed, *see* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (f); *In re Anya*, 871 A.2d 1181, 1182 (D.C. 2005), it is

ORDERED that Albert S. Watkins be, and he is, hereby publicly censured.

So ordered.