

[Cite as *Disciplinary Counsel v. Meenen*, 88 Ohio St.3d 268, 2000-Ohio-333.]

OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL *v.* MEENEN.

[Cite as *Disciplinary Counsel v. Meenen* (2000), 88 Ohio St.3d 268.]

*Attorneys at law — Misconduct — Permanent disbarment — Reciprocal discipline.*

(No. 99-1399 — Submitted December 15, 1999 — Decided March 22, 2000.)

ON CERTIFIED ORDER of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, No. D-22-98.

This case is pending before the court in accordance with the reciprocal discipline provisions of Gov.Bar R. V(11)(F).

On November 4, 1998, respondent, Robert D. Meenen, last known address in Willard, Ohio, Attorney Registration No. 0050218, was disbarred from the practice of law in New Jersey. A certified notice of the disbarment issued by the Supreme Court of New Jersey was received by the relator, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, which then advised the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio of the disbarment on July 27, 1999.

On August 9, 1999, we issued an Order to Show Cause to respondent requiring that within twenty days he notify this court of the reasons why the imposition of comparable or identical discipline in Ohio under Gov.Bar R. V(11)(F)(4) would be unwarranted. The Clerk attempted service of the order upon the respondent by certified mail on August 9, 1999, at his last known address, “c/o

Mr. Garry Buurma, Route # 2, Willard, Ohio.” Linda Buurma received and signed for the order. Respondent failed to file a responsive pleading.

---

*Jonathan E. Coughlan*, Disciplinary Counsel, and *Kevin L. Williams*, Assistant Disciplinary Counsel, for relator.

---

*Per Curiam*. When an attorney has been disciplined in another state, Gov. Bar R. V(11)(F)(4)(a)(ii) requires us to impose an identical or comparable discipline unless the disciplined attorney shows by clear and convincing evidence that “the misconduct established warrants substantially different discipline in Ohio.” *Disciplinary Counsel v. Hine* (1997), 80 Ohio St.3d 448, 449, 687 N.E.2d 420, 421. Respondent has not done so. “New Jersey disbarment is final.” *In the Matter of Valentin* (1997), 147 N.J. 499, 505, 688 A.2d 602, 605. Therefore, respondent is disbarred from the practice of law in Ohio. Costs taxed to respondent.

*Judgment accordingly.*

MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER, COOK and LUNDBERG STRATTON, JJ., concur.