

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

In re Joseph Lacome

No. 25-BG-0613 (D.C. May 7, 2026) · No. 25-BG-0613 · Decided May 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The District of Columbia Court of Appeals imposed reciprocal discipline on Joseph Lacome after the Arizona Supreme Court suspended him for six months by consent and required his resignation from the Arizona State Bar. The court suspended Lacome from practicing law in the District of Columbia for six months, nunc pro tunc to August 14, 2025, with reinstatement conditioned on a showing of fitness.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	District of Columbia Court of Appeals
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Beckwith; Easterly; McLeese
JURISDICTION	District of Columbia Court of Appeals
DECIDED	May 7, 2026
DOCKET	25-BG-0613
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Reciprocal-discipline proceeding based on a certified Arizona Supreme Court order suspending respondent by consent.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published

TOPICS

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

legal ethics attorney discipline reciprocal discipline

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the District of Columbia Court of Appeals should impose functionally equivalent reciprocal discipline based on the Arizona Supreme Court's consent suspension.

HOLDINGS

1. The court imposed a six-month suspension from the practice of law in the District of Columbia, nunc pro tunc to August 14, 2025, with reinstatement conditioned on a showing of fitness.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Arizona Supreme Court suspended Lacome for six months by consent and additionally required him to resign from the Arizona State Bar. In the District of Columbia proceeding, Lacome did not contest imposition of a functionally equivalent six-month suspension with a fitness requirement and filed a D.C. Bar Rule XI, § 14(g) affidavit.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Arizona Supreme Court suspended Joseph Lacome for six months by consent and conditioned the discipline on his resignation from the Arizona State Bar. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals had previously suspended him pending resolution of the reciprocal-discipline matter and directed him to show cause why functionally equivalent discipline should not be imposed. Lacome did not contest the proposed sanction and filed the required affidavit.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Sibley, 990 A.2d 483, 487-88 (D.C. 2010)

OPINION

In re Lacome

PER CURIAM.

Notice: This order 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-0613

IN RE JOSEPH LACOME,

Respondent. A Suspended Member of the Bar of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals Bar Registration No. 995071 DDN: 2025-D092 BEFORE: Beckwith, Easterly, and McLeese, Associate Judges.

ORDER

(FILED – May 7, 2026) On consideration of the certified order from the Arizona Supreme Court suspending respondent for six months by consent with the additional condition that he resign from the Arizona State Bar; this court's July 3, 2025, order suspending respondent pending this matter's resolution and directing him to show cause why the functionally equivalent discipline of a six-

month suspension with a fitness requirement should not be imposed; respondent's response, in which he states that he does not contest the proposed sanction; the statement of Disciplinary Counsel; and respondent's D.C. Bar. R. XI, § 14(g) affidavit filed August 14, 2025, it is ORDERED that Joseph Lacome is hereby suspended for six months from the practice of law in the District of Columbia, nunc pro tunc to August 14, 2025, with reinstatement conditioned upon a showing of fitness. 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).

PER CURIAM