

*Notice: This order 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. 24-BG-0195**

IN RE SARI KARSON KURLAND,

Respondent.

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

**Bar Registration No. 424297**

**DDN: 2024-D043**

BEFORE: Howard and Shanker, Associate Judges, and Glickman, Senior Judge.

**O R D E R**

(FILED – November 26, 2025)

On consideration of the order from the Supreme Court of Maryland disbarring respondent from the practice of law by consent; this court's March 18, 2024, order suspending respondent pending resolution of her disciplinary matter in Maryland; this court's August 7, 2025, order directing respondent to show cause why identical reciprocal discipline should not be imposed; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel requesting that respondent be disbarred and that reinstatement be conditioned upon respondent's reinstatement in Maryland; and it appearing that respondent has not filed a response to this court's show cause order or to Disciplinary Counsel's statement, or her D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14(g) affidavit, it is

ORDERED that Sari Karson Kurland is hereby disbarred from the practice of law in the District of Columbia and that prior to filing a petition for reinstatement she must first be reinstated to practice law in the state of Maryland. *See In re Sibley*, 990 A.2d 483, 487-88 (D.C. 2010) (explaining that there is a rebuttable presumption in favor of imposition of identical reciprocal discipline and exceptions to this presumption should be rare); *In re Fuller*, 930 A.2d 194, 198 (D.C. 2007) (explaining that a rebuttable presumption of identical reciprocal discipline applies unless one of the exceptions is established); *see also In re Hoffman*, 267 A.3d 1016, 1016 (D.C. 2022) (where attorney did not object, conditioning his eligibility to seek reinstatement on readmission in the original disciplining jurisdiction). It is

**No. 24-BG-0195**

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

**PER CURIAM**