

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. 01-BG-1578

IN RE JOEL CHASNOFF, RESPONDENT.

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

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility

(BDN 409-01)

(Submitted May 28, 2003

Decided June 12, 2003)

Before FARRELL and REID, *Associate Judges*, and KERN, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: On October 15, 2001, the Court of Appeals of Maryland indefinitely suspended respondent, Joel Chasnoff, for misconduct in his representation of three clients. *Attorney Grievance Comm'n of Md. v. Chasnoff*, 783 A.2d 224 (Md. 2001). Respondent's misconduct included failing to act with competence, failing to act with diligence, failing to communicate with his clients, charging an excessive fee, and failing to respond to disciplinary authorities.

Respondent reported his suspension to Bar Counsel as required by D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (b). This court temporarily suspended respondent on January 14, 2002, pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (d),¹ and referred the matter to the Board on Professional Responsibility ("Board"). The Board recommends that we impose reciprocal discipline in the form of a ninety-day suspension with a fitness requirement. Bar Counsel has informed the court that

¹ Respondent has also been suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia since 1989 for nonpayment of dues. *See* D.C. Bar R. II, § 6.

she takes no exception to the Board's report and recommendation. Respondent has not filed any opposition to the Board's report and recommendation.

We have previously imposed a fixed period of suspension as reciprocal discipline when the original disciplining court imposed an indefinite suspension. *See In re Freed*, 773 A.2d 436 (D.C. 2001); *In re Berg*, 694 A.2d 876, 877 n.2 (D.C. 1997). Given our limited scope of review in this uncontested case, we adopt the Board's recommendation. *See In re Goldsborough*, 654 A.2d 1285 (D.C. 1995); D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (f). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Joel Chasnoff be suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for the period of ninety days. Reinstatement in the District of Columbia shall be conditioned on respondent's proof of his fitness to practice law. We again direct respondent's attention to the requirements of D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g) and their effect on his eligibility for reinstatement. *See* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 16 (c).

So ordered.