

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. 25-BG-0106

IN RE JIN-HO CYNN,

Respondent.

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

Bar Registration No. 395450

DDN: 2024-D219

BEFORE: Beckwith and Shanker, Associate Judges, and Ruiz, Senior Judge.

O R D E R

(FILED – June 5, 2025)

On consideration of the order from the Circuit Court for the County of Fairfax, Virginia, revoking respondent's license to practice law in Virginia; this court's February 24, 2025, order maintaining respondent's preexisting suspension in the District pending this matter's resolution and directing him to show cause why identical reciprocal discipline should not be imposed; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel recommending that identical reciprocal discipline be imposed and that reinstatement in the District be conditioned upon respondent's reinstatement in Virginia; and it appearing that respondent has not filed a response to the show cause order or his D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14(g) affidavit and has not opposed Disciplinary Counsel's proposed reinstatement condition, it is

ORDERED that Jin-Ho Cynn is hereby disbarred from the practice of law in the District of Columbia with reinstatement conditioned upon reinstatement in Virginia. *See In re Sibley*, 990 A.2d 483, 487-88 (D.C. 2010) (explaining that exceptions to the rebuttable presumption in favor of identical reciprocal discipline should be rare); *In re Fuller*, 930 A.2d 194, 198 (D.C. 2007) (per curiam) (explaining that the rebuttable presumption applies to all cases in which the respondent does not participate); *see also In re Corry*, 290 A.3d 20 (D.C. 2023) (per curiam) (where the respondent did not object, conditioning his reinstatement upon reinstatement in the

originating jurisdiction); *In re Laibstain*, 841 A.2d 1259, 1263 (D.C. 2004) (per curiam) (explaining that the equivalent sanction for revocation is disbarment). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that for purposes of reinstatement, respondent's disbarment 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