THIS REPORT IS NOT A FINAL ORDER OF DISCIPLINE*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY



Feb 28 2022 3:14pm

Board on Professional Responsibility Corrected March 2, 2022 1:04pm

In the Matter of

SAM BABBS, III

Respondent.

A Member of the Bar of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (Bar Registration No. 989170) Board Docket No. 22-BD-009 Disciplinary Docket Nos. 2021-D142, 2021-D143, 2021-D144, 2021-D161, 2021-D185, and 2022-D018

CORRECTED REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

This matter is before the Board on Professional Responsibility (the "Board") on the motion of Disciplinary Counsel to accept Respondent's consent to disbarment pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12(a) and Board Rule 16.1. Respondent's affidavit declaring consent to disbarment, executed on February 24, 2022, is attached to Disciplinary Counsel's motion.

The Board, acting through its Chair, and pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12(b) and Board Rule 16.2, has reviewed Respondent's affidavit declaring his consent to disbarment and recommends that the Court enter an order disbarring Respondent on consent pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 12(b). Disciplinary Counsel's motion asserts that Respondent has requested that his disbarment not take effect until April 11, 2022, to allow time for Respondent to wind down his practice. Disciplinary Counsel consents to disbarment effective on April 11, 2022. The Court has previously ordered disbarment to be effective on a future date. *See In re Vidal*, D.C. App. No. 17-BS-1081 (Oct. 26, 2017) (disbarment effective October 31, 2017); *In re Allen*, D.C. App. No. 12-BG-1148 (Aug. 23, 2012) (disbarment effective October 1, 2012). Because a disbarment order issued prior to the effective date protects the public by providing notice of Respondent's pending disbarment, the Board further recommends that the effective date of disbarment be April 11, 2022.

^{*} Consult the 'Disciplinary Decisions' tab on the Board on Professional Responsibility's website (www.dcattorneydiscipline.org) to view any subsequent decisions in this case.

Respondent's attention should be drawn to the requirement to demonstrate compliance with the provisions of D.C. Bar R. XI, §§ 14 and 16, including the filing of the affidavit pursuant to D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14(g) (which must be served on Disciplinary Counsel and the Board), and to the fact that the period of disbarment will not be deemed to run for purposes of reinstatement until a compliant affidavit is filed. *See In re Slosberg*, 650 A.2d 1329, 1331-33 (D.C. 1994).

BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

By: Mathew G. Kaiser

Matthew G. Kaise Chair