

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. 05-BG-128

IN RE RANDY M. MOTT, RESPONDENT.

A Member of the Bar
of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals
(Bar Registration No. 211037)

On Report and Recommendation and Supplemental Report
and Recommendation of the Board on Professional Responsibility.
(BDN 246-01)

(Decided October 27, 2005)

Before WASHINGTON, *Chief Judge*, REID, *Associate Judge*, and NEBEKER, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: Disagreeing with the findings of its Hearing Committee,¹ the Board on Professional Responsibility (“Board”) has concluded that respondent, Randy M. Mott, violated rules 1.15 (a) and 1.17 (a) of the D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct and D.C. Bar R. XI, § 19 (f), by failing to deposit client funds in a designated escrow or trust account, failing to adequately safeguard the funds, and failing to keep appropriate records.

The violations at issue are clear-cut and conceded, and the Board has issued a report and recommendation and supplemental report and recommendation suggesting that we publicly censure Mr. Mott. Neither he nor Bar Counsel has taken any exception to the Board’s report or its supplemental report, thus our deference to its recommendations are heightened. *See* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 9 (g)(2); *In re Delaney*, 697 A.2d 1212, 1214 (D.C. 1997). We will adopt the recommended sanction “unless to do so would foster a tendency

¹ Which found that respondent had commingled funds.

toward inconsistent dispositions for comparable conduct or would otherwise be unwarranted.” D.C. Bar R. XI, § 9 (g)(1). We find nothing in the record before us to conclude that this sanction is unwarranted or inconsistent. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the respondent Randy M. Mott be and is hereby publicly censured.

So ordered.