


FILED

FEB 01 2016 

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

**STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES**

REVIEW DEPARTMENT

IN BANK

In the Matter of)	Case No. 06-C-14843
)	
JAGDIP SINGH SEKHON,)	RECOMMENDATION OF
)	SUMMARY DISBARMENT
A Member of the State Bar, No. 170324.)	
_____)	

On September 30, 2015, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar (OCTC) filed a Request for Summary Disbarment based on Jagdip Singh Sekhon's felony conviction. Sekhon did not respond. We granted the request on November 2, 2015. However, on December 4, 2015, we vacated our November 2, 2015 order due to service issues. Sekhon was thereafter properly served, and we ordered him to respond to the summary disbarment request by January 26, 2016. Sekhon did not file a response. We grant OCTC's request and recommend that Sekhon be summarily disbarred.

In June 2009, Sekhon was convicted of violating title 18 United States Code section 371 (conspiracy to commit immigration fraud). Effective August 31, 2009, Sekhon was placed on interim suspension from the practice of law. With its request for summary disbarment, OCTC submitted evidence that the conviction had become final. Specifically, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed Sekhon's conspiracy conviction and sentence; the conviction is now final.



After the judgment of conviction becomes final, "the Supreme Court shall summarily disbar the attorney if the offense is a felony . . . and an element of the offense is the specific intent to deceive, defraud, steal, or make or suborn a false statement, or involved moral turpitude." (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6102, subd. (c).) The record of conviction establishes both criteria for summary disbarment.

First, Sekhon's offense is a felony. (18 U.S.C. § 3559(a) [classifying offenses based on sentencing ranges]; see 18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1546 [conspiracy punishable with imprisonment up to 5 years].)

Second, his conviction involves moral turpitude because it necessarily involves intent to defraud. (*In re Fahey* (1973) 8 Cal.3d 842, 849.) The conspiracy statute makes it a crime to "conspire . . . to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof." (18 U.S.C. § 371.) Sekhon was convicted of conspiring to defraud the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services in the submission of asylum applications. The moral turpitude classification of the crime of conspiracy depends upon the object of the conspiracy. (*In re McAllister* (1939) 14 Cal.2d 602, 603 [if the commission of an offense involves moral turpitude, then a conspiracy to commit the offense would also involve moral turpitude].) The object of Sekhon's conspiracy conviction was immigration fraud in violation of title 18 United States Code section 1546. Section 1546 provides in pertinent part: "Whoever knowingly makes under oath, or as permitted under penalty of perjury . . . knowingly subscribes as true, any false statement with respect to a material fact in any application, affidavit, or other document required by the immigration laws or regulations prescribed thereunder, or knowingly presents any such application, affidavit, or other document which contains any such false statement or which fails to contain any reasonable basis in law or

fact [shall be guilty of a crime against the United States].” Accordingly, Sekhon’s conviction qualifies him for summary disbarment under the statute.

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, 7.) Disbarment is mandatory. (*Id.* at p. 9.)

We therefore recommend that Jagdip Singh Sekhon, State Bar number 170324, be disbarred from the practice of law in this state. We also recommend that he be ordered to comply with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20 and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court’s order. Finally, we recommend that the costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with section 6086.10 of the Business and Professions Code and that such costs be enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

PURCELL

Presiding Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); 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 February 1, 2016, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

RECOMMENDATION OF SUMMARY DISBARMENT FILED FEBRUARY 1, 2016

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

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


**JAGDIP S. SEKHON
5517 PLEASANT GROVE CT
SALIDA, CA 95368**

**FCI LOMPOC
FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
ATTN: JAGDIP S. SEKHON
REGISTRATION NO. 16732-097
3600 GUARD ROAD
LOMPOC, CA 93436**

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

ALLEN BLUMENTHAL, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on February 1, 2016.



Jasmine Guladzyan
Case Administrator
State Bar Court