

**FILED**

OCT 12 2007

STATE BAR COURT  
CLERK'S OFFICE  
LOS ANGELES

**REVIEW DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE BAR COURT  
IN BANK**

In the Matter of

**GEORGE HENRY JARAMILLO**

A Member of the State Bar.

) **05-C-03650**

) **RECOMMENDATION OF**  
) **SUMMARY DISBARMENT**

The State Bar's request for recommendation of summary disbarment, filed on May 10, 2007, is granted. On May 24, 2007, we filed an order to show cause directing respondent George Henry Jaramillo to show why summary disbarment should not be recommended to the Supreme Court. Jaramillo did not file a response, but submitted his resignation with charges pending on June 20, 2007. To date, the Supreme Court has not accepted his resignation. (See Rules Proc. of State Bar, interim rule 657, subd. (b).)

On January 29, 2007, Jaramillo entered a plea of nolo contendere to one count of perjury (Pen. Code, § 118) and one count of misappropriation of public funds (Pen. Code, § 424). The plea was accepted and Jaramillo did not appeal the conviction. As a result of his conviction, we placed Jaramillo on interim suspension effective May 11, 2007, and he has remained on interim suspension since that time. His conviction is now final.


Jaramillo's conviction provides conclusive evidence that he is guilty, and he is conclusively presumed to have committed all of the acts necessary to constitute the offenses. (*In re Duggan* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 416, 423.) Respondent committed these offenses at a time



when summary disbarment was a consequence of his criminal conviction, and his conviction of perjury meets the requirements of summary disbarment under Business and Professions Code, section 6102, subdivision (c).

First, respondent was convicted of a felony. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6102, subd. (b).) Second, perjury is crime that necessarily involves moral turpitude. (*In re Kristovich* (1976) 18 Cal.3d 468, 472.) When an attorney's conviction meets the above requirements, "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 George Henry Jaramillo, State Bar member number 169891, 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

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
**[Rule 62(b), Rules Proc.; Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]**

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on October 12, 2007, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

**RECOMMENDATION OF SUMMARY DISBARMENT FILED OCTOBER 12, 2007**

in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:


- by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

**GEORGE H. JARAMILLO**  
**79 BELL CANYON DR**  
**DOVE CANYON, CA 92679 - 3807**

- by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

**DANE C. DAUPHINE, Enforcement, Los Angeles**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **October 12, 2007**.

  
**Rosalie Ruiz**  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court