

*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. 19-BG-886**

**IN RE JONATHAN K. O'NEILL**

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

FILED 12/19/2019  
District of Columbia  
Court of Appeals  
*Julio Castillo*  
Julio Castillo  
Clerk of Court

**2019 DDN 144**

**Bar Registration No. 497405**

BEFORE: Thompson and Easterly, Associate Judges, and Steadman, Senior Judge.

**ORDER**

(FILED- December 19, 2019)

On consideration of the certified order of the Court of Appeals of Maryland indefinitely suspending respondent from the practice of law in that jurisdiction by consent wherein a medical fitness requirement was imposed; this court's October 10, 2019, order suspending respondent pending resolution of this matter and directing him to show cause why this court should not impose the functionally equivalent reciprocal discipline of an indefinite suspension with the right to seek reinstatement after five years or reinstatement by the state of Maryland, whichever occurs first, and a requirement that prior to reinstatement respondent must be deemed fit to practice law by a medical provider acceptable to Disciplinary Counsel; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel; and it appearing that respondent failed to file either a response to the court's show cause order or his D.C. Bar R. XI, §14(g) affidavit, it is

ORDERED that Jonathan K. O'Neill is hereby indefinitely suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia with the right to seek reinstatement after five years or after reinstatement by the state of Maryland, whichever occurs first. Further, the right to file a petition for reinstatement is contingent on a medical provider, acceptable to Disciplinary Counsel, deeming respondent fit to practice law. It is

**No. 19-BG-886**

FURTHER ORDERED that for purposes of reinstatement, respondent's period of suspension will not begin to run until such time as he files an affidavit that fully complies with the requirements of D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14(g).

**PER CURIAM**