

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS
BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY**



In the Matter of :
 :
RITU SINGH : **Disciplinary Docket No. 2020-D235**
 :
Petitioner, :
 :
Disbarred by the District of :
Columbia Court of Appeals :
Bar Number: 493198 :
Date of Admission: July 08, 2005 :
Date of Disbarment: August 24, 2011:

**DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL’S ANSWER
TO PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT**

A. Petitioner Failed to Make the Required Simple Narrative Statement

Petitioner’s Reinstatement Petition makes four conclusory claims supported by no factual statements. However, under Board Rule 9.1(c), Petitioner was obligated to make a “simple narrative statement of the alleged material facts to be established by clear and convincing evidence” demonstrating “the attorney’s moral qualifications, competency, and learning in law required for admission, as well as the material facts showing that the attorney’s resumption of the practice of law will not be detrimental to the integrity of the Bar, or to the administration of justice or subversive of the public interest.” Her petition fails to do so.

B. Disciplinary Counsel's Position

Disciplinary Counsel contests Petitioner's application to be permitted to practice law in the District of Columbia and opposes her reinstatement.

C. Answers to Petitioner's Assertions in her Petition For Reinstatement

1. Disciplinary Counsel admits Petitioner's assertions in Paragraph 1.
2. Disciplinary Counsel denies Petitioner's assertion in Paragraph 2 that "the terms of disbarment . . . ha[ve] expired," but admits that more than five years have elapsed since Petitioner's disbarment.
3. Disciplinary Counsel denies Petitioner's assertion in Paragraph 3 that she has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in law required for admission to practice in the District of Columbia, and further denies that her resumption of the practice of law within the District of Columbia will be anything other than detrimental to the integrity and standing of the Bar, the administration of justice, and will subvert the public interest.
4. Disciplinary Counsel lacks knowledge regarding the completeness of Petitioner's Reinstatement Questionnaire as set forth in Paragraph 4, despite multiple efforts by Disciplinary Counsel identifying deficiencies in the Reinstatement Petition.

D. Additional Evidence Disciplinary Counsel May Rely Upon

Under Board Rules 9.8(a) and 9.8(d), Disciplinary Counsel notifies Petitioner that it intends to rely upon the documents and other evidence obtained in its disbarment and reinstatement investigations, including all of Petitioner's submissions, and may call any witnesses who can corroborate the facts adduced through those investigations.

Conclusion

Petitioner may not be reinstated without a hearing on her fitness to have her D.C. law license restored. If Disciplinary Counsel is deemed not to have answered any assertion in the Petition for Reinstatement, Disciplinary Counsel denies each such assertion and demands strict proof. Disciplinary Counsel reserves the right to amend and supplement this Answer, as its investigation is ongoing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/
Hamilton P. Fox, III
Disciplinary Counsel

/s/
Traci M. Tait
Assistant Disciplinary Counsel

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
515 - 5th Street, N.W.
Building A, Room 117
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 638-1501

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 1, 2021, *Disciplinary Counsel's Answer to Petition For Reinstatement* was sent via electronic mail to The Board on Professional Responsibility at CaseManager@dcbpr.org, and a copy was sent via electronic mail to Ritu Singh at ritusingh0115@gmail.com.

_____/s/
Traci M. Tait