

*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. 99-BG-267

IN RE BRIAN P. HANCHEY,  
RESPONDENT.

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

On Report and Recommendation of the  
Board on Professional Responsibility

(Submitted October 10, 2000                      Decided November 2, 2000)

Before STEADMAN and REID, *Associate Judges*, and PRYOR, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: Before us is a reciprocal discipline case. The Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board accepted respondent's resignation and revoked his license to practice law in that state.<sup>1</sup> Subsequently, this court entered an order temporarily suspending respondent and directing the Board on Professional Responsibility to recommend whether reciprocal discipline should be imposed.

The Board has submitted a report and recommendation that respondent be

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the Virginia rules, information underlying this proceeding is confidential and was transmitted to Bar Counsel subject to that condition. *Cf.* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12(c) (Disbarment by Consent).

disbarred in the District of Columbia, pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11(c)(4).<sup>2</sup> We have previously noted the distinction between revocation of a license, analogous to an indefinite suspension but permitting a petition for reinstatement at any time, and disbarment, with its mandatory five-year minimum term. *In re Brickle*, 521 A.2d 271, 273 (D.C. 1987). Our usual deferential standard to Board recommendations “becomes even more deferential where, as here, the attorney [and Bar Counsel] ha[ve both] failed to contest the proposed sanction.” *In re Hitselberger*, No. 99-BG-57, slip op. at 2 (D.C. October 26, 2000) (citations omitted). We have examined the entire record, *see In re Sheridan*, 680 A.2d 439, 440 (D.C. 1996), and adopt the Board’s recommendation. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that respondent is disbarred from the practice of law in the District of Columbia effective forthwith. Respondent’s attention is drawn to the provisions of D.C. Bar R. XI, §§ 14 and 16(c) dealing with the requirements imposed upon disbarred attorneys and their effect on the time period for a petition of reinstatement.

---

<sup>2</sup> That subsection permits a departure from the norm of identical reciprocal discipline where the foreign conduct “warrants substantially different discipline in the District of Columbia.”