

*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. 18-BG-572**

IN RE JOSEPH R. LAUMANN

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

DDN: 160-18

Bar Registration No. 471952

BEFORE: Glickman, Thompson, and Beckwith, Associate Judges.

**ORDER**

(FILED – August 2, 2018)

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; this court's June 4, 2018, order directing respondent to show cause why the functionally-equivalent discipline of an indefinite suspension with a fitness requirement, with the right to file for reinstatement after five years or after reinstatement by the state of Maryland, whichever occurs first, should not be imposed; and 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 filed his D.C. Bar R. XI, §14 (g) affidavit on June 29, 2018, it is

ORDERED that Joseph R. Laumann is hereby indefinitely suspended with a fitness requirement *nunc pro tunc* to June 29, 2018. He may file for reinstatement after five years or after reinstatement by the state of Maryland, whichever occurs first. *See In re Sibley*, 990 A.2d 483 (D.C. 2010); *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**