

*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. 19-BG-58**

IN RE RACHEL L. YOSHA

**2018 DDN 305**

An Administratively Suspended Member  
of the Bar of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals

**Bar Registration No. 423700**

BEFORE: Beckwith and McLeese, Associate Judges, and Nebeker, Senior Judge.

**ORDER**

(FILED – May 2, 2019)

On consideration of the certified order of the Supreme Court of Arizona suspending respondent from the practice of law in that jurisdiction for a period of 90 days, followed by a two-year probationary period with conditions upon her reinstatement, and it appearing that respondent has previously rejected the terms of probation, this court's February 12, 2019, order suspending respondent and directing her to show cause why the functionally equivalent reciprocal discipline of a 90-day suspension with a fitness requirement should not be imposed and the response thereto; and the statement of Disciplinary Counsel regarding reciprocal discipline and the reply thereto; and it appearing that respondent filed her D.C. Bar R. XI, §14(g) affidavit on February 12, 2019, it is

ORDERED that Rachel L. Yosha is hereby suspended from the practice of law in the District of Columbia for a period of 90 days *nunc pro tunc* to February 12, 2019, followed by a two-year period of probation. Reinstatement is conditioned upon a showing of fitness to practice law in the District of Columbia and compliance with all conditions imposed by the state of Arizona. *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).

**PER CURIAM**