

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. 23-BG-0337

IN RE GRANT GRIFFITH SARBINOFF

DDN: 2023-D015

An Administratively Suspended Member of the
Bar of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals

Bar Registration No. 1005561

BEFORE: Blackburne-Rigsby, Chief Judge, Beckwith, Associate Judge, and Ruiz,
Senior Judge.

ORDER

(FILED— June 29, 2023)

On consideration of the certified order from the state of Florida suspending respondent from the practice of law for three years by consent; this court's May 3, 2023, order suspending respondent pending disposition of this matter and directing him to show cause why reciprocal discipline should not be imposed with his reinstatement conditioned upon a showing of fitness; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel requesting the additional condition that respondent be reinstated by the state of Florida prior to seeking reinstatement in this jurisdiction; and it appearing that respondent has not filed a response or his D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14(g) affidavit, it is

ORDERED that Grant Griffith Sarbinoff is hereby suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for three years with reinstatement conditioned on a showing of fitness. Prior to filing a petition for reinstatement respondent must first be reinstated to the practice of law in the state of Florida. *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 discipline and exceptions to this presumption should be rare); *In re Fuller*, 930 A.2d 194, 198 (D.C. 2007) (stating that the rebuttable presumption of identical reciprocal discipline applies to all cases in which the respondent does not participate); *see also In re Bennett*, 292 A.3d 211

No. 23-BG-0337

(D.C. 2022) (conditioning eligibility to seek reinstatement on readmission in original disciplining jurisdiction). It is

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

PER CURIAM