

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. 10-BG-1396

IN RE ROBERT P. KAUFMAN, RESPONDENT.

A Member of the Bar
of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals
(Bar Registration No. 375715)

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility
(BDN-338-05)

(Submitted March 1, 2011

Decided March 10, 2011)

Before RUIZ and BLACKBURNE-RIGSBY, *Associate Judges*, and KING, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: On November 12, 2010, the Board on Professional Responsibility (“Board”) found that Robert P. Kaufman, respondent, violated District of Columbia Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1(a), 1.3(a), 1.3(b)(1) & (2), 1.4(a) and 1.16(d), in connection with his intentional neglect of a client’s personal injury lawsuit. The Board adopted the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Hearing Committee that the court publicly censure respondent for his violations, after taking into account the intentional nature of the violation, the harm suffered by the client, respondent’s disciplinary history and mitigating circumstances (respondent’s mild depressive disorder, acknowledgment of wrongdoing and remorse, cooperation with Bar Counsel and compensation to the injured client). Pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 9 (h)(2), “if no exceptions are filed to the Board’s report, the court will enter an

order imposing the discipline recommended by the Board upon the expiration of the time permitted for filing exceptions.” Neither Bar Counsel nor respondent filed an exception with the Board’s recommendation within the time allotted. *See* D.C. Bar R. XI, § 9 (e). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Robert P. Kaufman is hereby publicly censured.

So ordered.