

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. 16-BG-470

IN RE: LAURA HAWKINS STRACHAN,
Respondent.

Bar Registration No. 416662

DDN: 50-16

FILED 8/4/16
District of Columbia
Court of Appeals

Julio Castillo
Clerk of Court

BEFORE: Glickman, Associate Judge, and Nebeker and Farrell, Senior Judges.

ORDER

(FILED - August 4, 2016)

On consideration of the certified order of the Court of Appeals of Maryland indefinitely suspending respondent from the practice of law in that jurisdiction, *see Attorney Grievance Com'n of Maryland v. Strachan*, 132 A.3d 291 (Md. 2016), this court's June 3, 2016, order directing respondent to show cause why the functionally-equivalent discipline of an indefinite suspension should not be imposed with reinstatement subject to a showing of fitness and with the right to seek reinstatement after five years or reinstatement by the state of Maryland, the statement of Disciplinary Counsel regarding reciprocal discipline, and it appearing that respondent failed to file a response to the court's show cause order but did file her affidavit as required by D.C. Bar R. XI, §14 (g) on July 5, 2016, it is

ORDERED that Laura Hawkins Strachan is hereby indefinitely suspended with reinstatement conditioned on a showing of fitness, *nunc pro tunc* to July 5, 2016. Respondent may file for reinstatement after five years or after she is reinstated to practice law in the state of Maryland, whichever occurs first. *See In re Sibley*, 990 A.2d 483 (D.C. 2010), and *In re Fuller*, 930 A.2d 194, 198 (D.C. 2007) (rebuttable presumption of identical reciprocal discipline applies to all cases in which the respondent does not participate).

PER CURIAM