

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. 25-BG-1013

IN RE NURY A. TURKEL, RESPONDENT.

A Member of the Bar of the
District of Columbia Court of Appeals
(Bar Registration No. 978639)

On Report and Recommendation of the Board on
Professional Responsibility Ad Hoc Hearing Committee
Approving Amended Petition for Negotiated Discipline
(BDN: 24-ND-0004; DDN: 2019-D148)

(Decided: August 20, 2026)

Before MCLEESE and SHANKER, *Associate Judges*, and GLICKMAN,* *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: This decision is nonprecedential. Please refer to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12.1(d), governing the appropriate citation of this opinion.

In this disciplinary matter, the Hearing Committee recommends approval of the parties' amended petition for negotiated discipline. Respondent Nury A. Turkel has acknowledged that, in connection with his representation of a client seeking

* Judge Glickman dissents and would reject the proposed negotiated discipline as being unduly lenient under the circumstances.

asylum, he failed to (1) provide competent representation; (2) serve his client with the skill and care commensurate with that generally afforded to clients by other lawyers in similar matters; (3) represent his client diligently; (4) act with reasonable promptness in representing his client; (5) keep his client reasonably informed about the status of the matter; (6) promptly comply with reasonable requests for information and explain the matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit his client to make informed decisions regarding the representation; (7) maintain complete financial records; and (8) take timely steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect his client's interests by refunding any advance fee or expense that had not been earned or incurred. Respondent admits that, as a result, he violated D.C. R. Pro. Conduct 1.1(a)-(b), 1.3(a) & (c), 1.4(a)-(b), 1.15(a), and 1.16(d), or committed parallel violations under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102. The proposed discipline consists of a thirty-day suspension stayed in favor of one year of probation with conditions.

Having reviewed the Committee's recommendation¹ in accordance with our procedures in these cases, *see* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12.1(d), we agree that this case is appropriate for negotiated discipline and "the agreed-upon sanction is justified," *In re Mensah*, 262 A.3d 1100, 1104 (D.C. 2021) (per curiam) (internal quotation marks

¹ We grant the consent motion to file under seal the lodged confidential appendix to the Committee's report and recommendation.

omitted), in light of reasonably analogous precedents. *See, e.g., In re Cole*, 967 A.2d 1264 (D.C. 2009); *In re Banks*, 577 A.2d 316 (D.C. 1990) (per curiam); *see also In re Teitelbaum*, 303 A.3d 52, 56 (D.C. 2023) (providing that a negotiated discipline petition “may generally omit to charge a violation if, after reasonable factual investigation, there is a substantial risk that [Disciplinary Counsel] would not be able to establish the violation by clear and convincing evidence”). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that respondent Nury A. Turkel is hereby suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for thirty days, fully stayed, and placed on one year of probation with the following conditions:

(a) he shall take three hours of preapproved continuing legal education related to the maintenance of trust accounts, record keeping, and/or safekeeping of client property and three hours of preapproved continuing legal education in immigration law, and he must certify and provide documentary proof that he has met this requirement to Disciplinary Counsel no later than six months after the date of this opinion; and

(b) from the date he signed the amended negotiated discipline agreement through the conclusion of his term of probation he shall not engage in any misconduct in this or any other jurisdiction.

If Disciplinary Counsel has probable cause to believe that respondent has violated any of these conditions, then Disciplinary Counsel may move to revoke his probation and ask that he serve the thirty-day suspension stayed herein.

So ordered.