

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. 24-BG-0353

IN RE JOSHUA N. DEBOLD,

DDN: 2024-D032

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

Bar Registration No. 989159

BEFORE: Beckwith and Easterly, Associate Judges, and Washington, Senior Judge.

ORDER

(FILED— June 20, 2024)

On consideration of the certified order from the Commonwealth of Virginia revoking respondent's license to practice law; this court's May 3, 2024, order suspending respondent pending final disposition of this proceeding and directing him to show cause why disbarment should not be imposed as reciprocal discipline; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel; and it appearing that respondent has not filed a response or his D.C. Bar R. XI § 14(g) affidavit, it is

ORDERED that Joshua N. Debold is hereby disbarred from the practice of law in the District of Columbia. *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 Laibstain*, 841 A.2d 1259, 1263 (D.C. 2004) (explaining that the equivalent sanction for revocation in the District is disbarment). It is

No. 24-BG-0354

FURTHER ORDERED that, for purposes of reinstatement, respondent's disbarment 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