

On July 13, 2023, Disciplinary Counsel filed an accurate copy of the May 17, 2023 Judgment in a Criminal Case with the Court of Appeals, which suspended Respondent pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 10(c), and directed the Board to institute a formal proceeding to determine whether any of Respondent's offenses involve moral turpitude within the meaning of D.C. Code § 11-2503(a) (2001). Order, *In re O'Neill*, No. 23-BG-504 (D.C. June 23, 2023).

On July 13, 2023, Disciplinary Counsel filed a statement with the Board recommending Respondent's disbarment because Respondent had been found guilty of crimes involving moral turpitude *per se*. Respondent did not file a response to Disciplinary Counsel's statement, the time for doing so having expired.

ANALYSIS

D.C. Code § 11-2503(a) requires the disbarment of a member of the District of Columbia Bar convicted of a crime of moral turpitude. Once the Court has determined that a particular crime involves moral turpitude *per se*, disbarment must be imposed. See *In re Colson*, 412 A.2d 1160, 1165 (D.C. 1979) (en banc).

Respondent pled guilty to wire fraud, which the Court has already decided is a crime of moral turpitude *per se*. See *In re Bryant*, 46 A.3d 402, 402 (D.C. 2012) (per curiam) (“[B]oth mail fraud and wire fraud are crimes of

moral turpitude *per se.*” (quoting *In re Evans*, 793 A.2d 468, 469 (D.C. 2002) (per curiam))).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Board recommends that the Court disbar Respondent pursuant to D.C. Code § 11-2503(a) based on his conviction of crimes involving moral turpitude *per se.*

BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

By: 

Sara K. Blumenthal

All members of the Board concur in this Report and Recommendation, except Ms. Cassidy and Ms. Rice-Hicks, who did not participate.