

## STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

## REVIEW DEPARTMENT

## IN BANK

In the Matter of	)	Case No. 15-C-15769
JAMES JUNKUL PAK,	)	RECOMMENDATION OF SUMMARY
A Member of the State Bar, No. 178278.	)	DISBARMENT
	)	

On June 24, 2016, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar (OCTC) filed a motion for summary disbarment based on James Junkul Pak's felony conviction. Pak did not respond. We grant the motion and recommend that Pak be summarily disbarred.

On February 18, 2016, Pak pled guilty to violating Penal Code section 487, subdivision (b)(3) (grand theft by employee), with an enhancement under Penal Code section 186.11, subdivision (a)(1) and (2) (aggravated white collar crime over \$500,000). Effective May 31, 2016, Pak was placed on interim suspension from the practice of law. With its motion for summary disbarment, OCTC submitted evidence that the conviction had become final. Specifically, no party filed an appeal within 60 days after pronouncement of judgment. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.308.) Therefore, the conviction is 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, Pak's offense is a felony. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6102, subd. (b); Pen. Code, §§ 17, subd. (a); 186.11, subds. (a)(1), (2); 489, subd. (c); 1170, subd. (h).) Second, the crime of grand theft of personal property involves moral turpitude. (*In re Basinger* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1348, 1358 [grand theft necessarily involves moral turpitude]; see also *In re Paguirigan* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 1, 5 [crimes of robbery, embezzlement, and other forms of theft necessarily involve moral turpitude].)

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*, supra, 25 Cal.4th at p. 7.) Disbarment is mandatory. (*Id.* at p. 9.)

We therefore recommend that James Junkul Pak, State Bar number 178278, 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 costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10, and that such costs be enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

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 of California. 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 August 1, 2016, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

RECOMMENDATION OF SUMMARY DISBARMENT FILED AUGUST 1, 2016

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:

JAMES J. PAK LAW OFFICES OF JAMES PAK & ASSOCIATES 2201 TERRAZA PL FULLERTON, CA 92835 - 3311

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

CHARLES A. MURRAY, Enforcement, Los Angeles

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

Rosalie Ruiz

Case Administrator

State Bar Court