

# FILED

## STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

### **REVIEW DEPARTMENT**

#### **IN BANK**

)

)

)

In the Matter of RICHARD ALAN WOLF, A Member of the State Bar, 216598.

Case No. 17-C-01527

RECOMMENDATION OF SUMMARY DISBARMENT

On May 5, 2017, the Office of Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar (OCTC) transmitted the records of conviction of Richard Alan Wolf showing that he was convicted of violating title 18 United States Code section 2252(a)(2) (receipt of images of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct) on April 11, 2012, and that the conviction is final because no party filed a notice of appeal within the statutory time period after the entry of judgment. (Fed. Rules App. Proc., rule 4(b), 28 U.S.C.) On May 26, 2017, we ordered Wolf placed on interim suspension from the practice of law effective June 19, 2017, pending final disposition of this proceeding.

Also on May 5, 2017, OCTC filed a motion for summary disbarment based on Wolf's conviction. Wolf did not respond. We grant the motion and recommend that Wolf be summarily disbarred.

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, Wolf's offense is a felony. (18 U.S.C. §§ 3559(a) [classifying offenses based on sentencing ranges], 2252(a)(2) [punishable with imprisonment up to 20 years].)

Second, Wolf's conviction necessarily involves moral turpitude. (*In re Grant* (2014) 58 Cal.4th 469 [felonious possession of child pornography is moral turpitude per se because the crime involves exploitation of children and shows flagrant disrespect for the law and for societal norms].) Accordingly, Wolf's conviction qualifies him for summary disbarment.

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 Richard Alan Wolf, State Bar number 216598, 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.

**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 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 June 2, 2017, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

#### **RECOMMENDATION OF SUMMARY DISBARMENT FILED JUNE 2, 2017**

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:

RICHARD A. WOLF 16953 NEW ROCHELLE WAY UNIT 63 SAN DIEGO, CA 92127 - 6890

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

Murray B. Greenberg, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on June 2, 2017.

Julieta E. Gonzales

Julieta E. Gonzales Case Administrator State Bar Court