

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. 12-BG-1890

IN RE: GEORGE G. STROTT, JR.,
Respondent.

Bar Registration No. 222653

BDN: 352-12

BEFORE: Thompson, Associate Judge, and Terry and Reid, Senior Judges.

ORDER

(FILED - March 28, 2013)

On consideration of the certified order of the Court of Appeals of Maryland indefinitely suspending respondent from the practice of law in that jurisdiction with the right to petition for reinstatement in thirty days, this court's December 17, 2012, order suspending respondent pending further action of the court and directing him to show cause why the reciprocal discipline of an indefinite suspension with a fitness requirement and the right to seek reinstatement after reinstatement by the state of Maryland, or after thirty days, whichever occurs first, should not be imposed, and the statement of Bar Counsel regarding reciprocal discipline, and it appearing that respondent has failed to file a response to this court's order to show cause but did file an affidavit as required by D.C. Bar R. XI, §14 (g) on January 8, 2013, it is

ORDERED that George G. Strott, Jr. is hereby indefinitely suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia *nunc pro tunc* to January 8, 2013. Although respondent is now eligible to file a petition for reinstatement, reinstatement is subject to a showing of fitness. *See In re Sibley*, 990 A.2d 483 (D.C. 2010), and *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