

These opinions are made available as a joint effort by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the District of Columbia Bar.

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-341

IN RE MARK J. ROCHON, RESPONDENT.

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

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility

(Decided March 2 , 2000)

Before FARRELL and RUIZ, *Associate Judges*, and GALLAGHER, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: On January 14, 1999, respondent Mark J. Rochon was publicly reprimanded by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit after repeatedly ignoring briefing deadlines in several cases and filing a motion to withdraw as counsel one week before the extended deadline for filing a brief in one of the cases. In two of the cases, the Circuit Court issued orders to show cause why the appeals should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. After respondent answered the orders, the Court entered new briefing schedules. Again, respondent failed to file the briefs within the time specified in the new briefing orders. Even the Circuit Court's explicit expression of its displeasure did not motivate respondent to correct his conduct.

Bar Counsel filed with this court a certified copy of the Circuit Court's disciplinary order. This court referred the matter to the Board on Professional Responsibility ("Board"), and the Board has now filed its report and recommendation. The Board recommends reciprocal discipline in the form of a public censure, the functional equivalent of the Circuit Court's public reprimand. *See In re Macaulay*, 737 A.2d 552, 553 (D.C. 1999). Bar Counsel has informed the court that she takes no exception to the Board's report and recommendation. Respondent has not filed any opposition to the Board's report and

recommendation. Given our limited scope of review and the presumption in favor of identical reciprocal discipline, we adopt the Board's recommendation. *See* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (f)(1); *In re Goldsborough*, 654 A.2d 1285 (D.C. 1995); *In re Zilberberg*, 612 A.2d 832, 834 (D.C. 1992). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Mark J. Rochon be, and hereby is, publicly censured.

So ordered.