

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. 09-BG-401

IN RE: CHANDRA MAHINDA BOGOLLAGAMA,
Respondent.

Bar Registration No. 418491

BDN: 313-08

BEFORE: Fisher and Oberly, Associate Judges, and Kern, Senior Judge.

O R D E R
(FILED - August 20, 2009)

On further consideration of the certified copy of the Circuit Court of Virginia's order revoking respondent's license to practice law, this court's May 18, 2009, order directing respondent to show cause why identical discipline should not be imposed, his responses thereto, and the Statement of Bar Counsel regarding reciprocal discipline, and it appearing that respondent has not filed the affidavit required by D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g), it is

ORDERED that Chandra Mahinda Bogollagama is hereby disbarred. Respondent has failed to establish the existence of any exceptions under D.C. Bar. R. XI, § 11 (c) and may not re-litigate the factual basis for his discipline in another jurisdiction. *In re Fuchs*, 905 A.2d 160 (D.C. 2006). Finally, respondent's misappropriation in Virginia would also constitute misconduct in this jurisdiction, *see* D.C. R. Prof. Cond. 1.15 (a), disbarment here is the functional equivalent of revocation in Virginia, *In re Laibstain*, 841 A.2d 1259, 1264 (D.C. 2004), and disbarment is within the range of sanctions we impose for misappropriation. *In re Addams*, 579 A.2d 190, 191 (D.C. 1990) (en banc). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that for purposes of reinstatement respondent's disbarment will not begin to run until he files an affidavit that fully complies with the requirements of D.C. Bar. R. XI, § 14 (g).

PER CURIAM