

REVIEW DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE BAR COURT
IN BANK

In the Matter of)	Case No. 05-C-02759
)	
JONATHAN REGENT TYRELL)	RECOMMENDATION OF
)	SUMMARY DISBARMENT
A Member of the State Bar)	
_____)	

The State Bar's request for recommendation of summary disbarment, filed on November 27, 2006, is granted. On December 8, 2006, we filed an order to show cause (OSC) on or before January 15, 2007, directing respondent, Jonathan Regent Tyrell, State Bar No. 206398, to show why we should not recommend his summary disbarment to the Supreme Court. On January 26, 2007, respondent filed a request for an extension of time to respond to the OSC, which we granted on February 14, 2007. Respondent was allowed until March 16, 2007, to respond. On March 16, 2007, respondent moved for a second continuance. Respondent's request is denied.

In August 2005, respondent was convicted of one count of forgery. (Pen. Code, § 470, subd. (c).)¹ As a result of respondent's conviction we placed him on interim

¹Respondent was also convicted of possession of a controlled substance under Health and Safety Code section 11377, subdivision (a), and of battery with serious injury under Penal Code section 243, subdivision (d). We rely only on respondent's conviction under Penal Code section 470, subdivision (c), in recommending his summary disbarment.

suspension effective October 10, 2005, and he has remained on interim suspension since that time. Respondent's conviction is now final.

The record of conviction establishes that respondent's conviction meets the criteria for summary disbarment under Business and Professions Code section 6102, subdivision (c), as amended effective January 1, 1997, and his conviction is conclusive proof that he committed the crime. (*In re Crooks* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 1090, 1097.) First, respondent's offense is a felony. (Pen. Code, §§ 17, subd. (a), 473.) Second, it is a crime that involves moral turpitude. (*In re Prantil* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 227, 234.) When an attorney's conviction meets the requirements of Business and Professions Code, section 6102, subdivision (c), "the attorney is not entitled to a State Bar Court hearing to determine whether lesser discipline is called for." (*In re Paguirigan* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 1, 4-7.) Disbarment is mandatory. (*Id.* at p. 9; see also *In re Lesansky* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 11.)

We therefore recommend that respondent, Jonathan Regent Tyrell, State Bar No. 206398, be summarily disbarred from the practice of law in this state. We also recommend that respondent be ordered to comply with rule 9.20 of the California Rules of Court and to perform the acts specified in paragraphs (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 45 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's order. Finally, we recommend that costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code, section 6086.10, such costs being enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code, section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

Presiding Judge