

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. 23-BG-0542

IN RE ROBERT P. WALDECK, RESPONDENT.

A Suspended Member of the Bar
of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals
(Bar Registration No. 494643)

On Report and Recommendation
of the Board on Professional Responsibility

(BDN No. 21-BD-038; DDN Nos. 2016-D066, 2017-D195, 2020-D041,
2020-D042, 2020-D057, 2020-D058, 2020-D124)

(Decided August 24, 2023)

Before MCLEESE and DEAHL, *Associate Judges*, and WASHINGTON, *Senior Judge*.

PER CURIAM: The Board on Professional Responsibility recommends that Robert P. Waldeck be disbarred from the practice of law for reckless misappropriation and violations of Rules 1.3(a), 1.3(b)(1), 1.3(b)(2), 1.3(c), 1.4(a), 1.15(a) 1.15(b), 1.15(e), 1.16(d), 8.4(c), and 8.4(d).¹ This court has previously

¹ The Board's report erroneously states that respondent also violated Rule 1.5(b), but the Hearing Committee concluded that respondent did not commit this

concluded that disbarment is the appropriate sanction for reckless misappropriation.² Respondent has not filed any exceptions to the Board’s Report and Recommendation. Nor has he filed the required D.C. Bar R. XI, § 14(g) affidavit after the court suspended him pursuant to D.C. Bar Rule XI, § 3(c) on October 5, 2021,³ or after the court suspended him pursuant to D.C. Bar Rule XI, § 9(g) on August 10, 2023.

Under D.C. Bar R. XI, § 9(h)(2), “if no exceptions are filed to the Board’s report, the [c]ourt will enter an order imposing the discipline recommended by the Board upon the expiration of the time permitted for filing exceptions.” *See also In re Viehe*, 762 A.2d 542, 543 (D.C. 2000) (“When . . . there are no exceptions to the Board’s report and recommendation, our deferential standard of review becomes even more deferential.”). Because no exceptions have been filed and disbarment is the appropriate sanction for reckless misappropriation—particularly when coupled with respondent’s numerous other violations arising from his abandonment of multiple clients—we accept the recommendation that respondent be disbarred.

violation after Disciplinary Counsel ultimately declined to pursue the charge. However, this error has no bearing on the recommended sanction.

² *See In re Anderson*, 778 A.2d 330, 338 (D.C. 2001).

³ No. 21-BS-657.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that respondent Robert P. Waldeck is hereby disbarred from the practice of law in this jurisdiction. Respondent's attention is directed to the requirements of D.C. Bar. R. XI, § 14 and their effect on eligibility for reinstatement. *See* D.C. Bar. R. XI, § 16(c).

So ordered.