

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-0722

In re CARL H. FRANKLIN,

Respondent.

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

DDN: 2023-D185

Bar Registration No. 438829

BEFORE: Beckwith and Howard, Associate Judges, and Thompson, Senior Judge.

ORDER

(FILED— November 21, 2024)

On consideration of the certified order from the state of Louisiana suspending respondent from the practice of law for six months, stayed in favor of one year of supervised probation with conditions, by consent; this court's October 9, 2024, order directing him to show cause why reciprocal discipline should not be imposed; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel; and it appearing that respondent has not filed a response, it is

ORDERED that Carl H. Franklin is hereby suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for six months, stayed in favor of a one-year period of probation wherein he must comply with the conditions imposed by Louisiana. *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).

PER CURIAM