

***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-0721**

In re MICHAEL S. ROSIER,

Respondent.

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

**DDN: 2023-D182**

**Bar Registration No. 373449**

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 Maryland suspending respondent from the practice of law for 30 days, stayed in favor of six months' probation with conditions, by consent; this court's October 9, 2024, order directing him to show cause why reciprocal discipline should not be imposed; respondent's response in which he requests that reciprocal discipline be imposed nunc pro tunc to October 20, 2023, the date of the Maryland discipline; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel; and it appearing respondent did not notify Disciplinary Counsel of the Maryland discipline, it is

ORDERED that Michael S. Rosier is hereby suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for 30 days, stayed in favor of a six-month period of probation wherein he must comply with the conditions imposed in Maryland. *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); *see also In re Ayres-Fountain*, 955 A.2d 157, 160-61 (D.C. 2008) ("This court has established that in order for an attorney's suspension in this jurisdiction to run concurrently with any foreign discipline, the attorney must promptly notify Bar Counsel of the foreign discipline.").

**PER CURIAM**