

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. 17-BG-568

IN RE SCOTT B. GILLY,
Respondent.
A Suspended Member of the Bar of the
District of Columbia Court of Appeals

DDN: 355-16

11/02/2017
FILED
District of Columbia
Court of Appeals
Julio Castillo
Julio Castillo
Clerk of Court

Bar Registration No. 442356

BEFORE: Thompson, Associate Judge, and Washington and Farrell, Senior
Judges.

ORDER

(FILED – November 2, 2017)

On consideration of the certified order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York suspending respondent from the practice of law with leave to petition for reinstatement after one year; this court’s June 9, 2017, order temporarily suspending respondent in this case and directing him to show cause why identical reciprocal discipline should not be imposed; the statement of Disciplinary Counsel regarding reciprocal discipline; and respondent’s response to the show cause order in which he does not oppose identical reciprocal discipline but requests the reciprocal suspension run *nunc pro tunc* from September 12, 2016, when he was suspended by the District Court; and it appearing that respondent filed the required D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14 (g) affidavit in this case on July 7, 2017, but has not practiced law in the District of Columbia since the filing of the affidavit for his prior suspension in this jurisdiction, it is

ORDERED that Scott B. Gilly is hereby suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for one year *nunc pro tunc* to September 12, 2016, with reinstatement subject to a fitness requirement. *See In re Sibley*, 990 A.2d 483, 487-88 (D.C. 2010) (explaining that the presumption of identical discipline in D.C. Bar R. XI, § 11 (c) will prevail except in “rare” cases); *In re Cole*, 809 A.2d 1226, 1227 n.3 (D.C. 2002) (explaining that in unopposed reciprocal matters the “imposition of identical discipline should be close to automatic”).

PER CURIAM