

The Court, in its decision, found that the respondent's conduct was a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. The Court noted that the respondent's actions were a clear breach of the duty of loyalty and confidentiality owed to his client. The Court further stated that the respondent's conduct was a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, specifically Rule 1.7, which prohibits a lawyer from representing conflicting interests. The Court concluded that the respondent's actions were a clear violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and that the respondent should be disciplined.

In reaching its decision, the Court considered the respondent's arguments that the disciplinary action was arbitrary and capricious. The Court found that the respondent's arguments were unavailing. The Court noted that the respondent's conduct was a clear violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and that the disciplinary action was a necessary and appropriate response to the respondent's conduct. The Court further stated that the respondent's actions were a clear violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and that the disciplinary action was a necessary and appropriate response to the respondent's conduct.

The Court also considered the respondent's argument that the disciplinary action was a violation of the respondent's constitutional rights. The Court found that the respondent's argument was unavailing. The Court noted that the respondent's conduct was a clear violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and that the disciplinary action was a necessary and appropriate response to the respondent's conduct. The Court further stated that the respondent's actions were a clear violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and that the disciplinary action was a necessary and appropriate response to the respondent's conduct.

## Disbarment

The following persons have been disbarred by the California Supreme Court, effective on the dates indicated. They are ineligible to practice law, and their names have been stricken from the roster of California attorneys.

- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).
- Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990).

The Court, in its decision, found that the respondent's conduct was a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. The Court noted that the respondent's actions were a clear breach of the duty of loyalty and confidentiality owed to his client. The Court further stated that the respondent's conduct was a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, specifically Rule 1.7, which prohibits a lawyer from representing conflicting interests. The Court concluded that the respondent's actions were a clear violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and that the respondent should be disciplined.

**Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990). Aquino was convicted in federal court of conspiracy and multiple violations of the immigration and naturalization laws. Aquino had engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving sham marriages which was aimed at obtaining permanent resident status for Philippine citizens. The Supreme Court held that Aquino's serious misconduct in the course of his law practice, which included advising clients to commit perjury, warranted disbarment despite the presence of mitigating circumstances such as Aquino's record of community service and evidence of his rehabilitation.

**Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990). Aquino was convicted in federal court of conspiracy and multiple violations of the immigration and naturalization laws. Aquino had engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving sham marriages which was aimed at obtaining permanent resident status for Philippine citizens. The Supreme Court held that Aquino's serious misconduct in the course of his law practice, which included advising clients to commit perjury, warranted disbarment despite the presence of mitigating circumstances such as Aquino's record of community service and evidence of his rehabilitation.

**Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990). Aquino was convicted in federal court of conspiracy and multiple violations of the immigration and naturalization laws. Aquino had engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving sham marriages which was aimed at obtaining permanent resident status for Philippine citizens. The Supreme Court held that Aquino's serious misconduct in the course of his law practice, which included advising clients to commit perjury, warranted disbarment despite the presence of mitigating circumstances such as Aquino's record of community service and evidence of his rehabilitation.

The Court, in its decision, found that the respondent's conduct was a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. The Court noted that the respondent's actions were a clear breach of the duty of loyalty and confidentiality owed to his client. The Court further stated that the respondent's conduct was a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, specifically Rule 1.7, which prohibits a lawyer from representing conflicting interests. The Court concluded that the respondent's actions were a clear violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and that the respondent should be disciplined.

**Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990). Aquino was convicted in federal court of conspiracy and multiple violations of the immigration and naturalization laws. Aquino had engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving sham marriages which was aimed at obtaining permanent resident status for Philippine citizens. The Supreme Court held that Aquino's serious misconduct in the course of his law practice, which included advising clients to commit perjury, warranted disbarment despite the presence of mitigating circumstances such as Aquino's record of community service and evidence of his rehabilitation.

**Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990). Aquino was convicted in federal court of conspiracy and multiple violations of the immigration and naturalization laws. Aquino had engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving sham marriages which was aimed at obtaining permanent resident status for Philippine citizens. The Supreme Court held that Aquino's serious misconduct in the course of his law practice, which included advising clients to commit perjury, warranted disbarment despite the presence of mitigating circumstances such as Aquino's record of community service and evidence of his rehabilitation.

**Paulo Almando Aquino** (485859), 48, San Gabriel (January 17, 1990). Aquino was convicted in federal court of conspiracy and multiple violations of the immigration and naturalization laws. Aquino had engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving sham marriages which was aimed at obtaining permanent resident status for Philippine citizens. The Supreme Court held that Aquino's serious misconduct in the course of his law practice, which included advising clients to commit perjury, warranted disbarment despite the presence of mitigating circumstances such as Aquino's record of community service and evidence of his rehabilitation.