BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION
OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF A SUSPENDED MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA, **JESSE PAUL SUPLIZO, Bar No. 022720** RESPONDENT.	Nos. 07-2079, 08-0236, 08-0408, 08-0409, 08-0449, 08-0618 **DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION REPORT**

This matter came before the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Arizona on January 10, 2009, pursuant to Rule 58, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., for consideration of the Hearing Officer's Report filed November 3, 2008, recommending disbarment, two years of probation upon reinstatement with terms and conditions to be determined upon reinstatement, restitution and costs.

Decision

Having found no facts clearly erroneous, the nine members of the Disciplinary Commission unanimously recommend accepting and incorporating the Hearing Officer's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation for disbarment, two years of probation with terms and conditions to be determined upon reinstatement, restitution and costs.[1] The amounts of restitution are as follows:

Restitution

Jeff Freundlich	$ 8,835.00
Art Roth	$ 5,157.50
The ThinkHer LLC;	$16,076.00
Wendy Schade;	$ 395.00

[1] The Hearing Officer's Report is attached as Exhibit A.

Patricia Camacho	$ 1,255.00
TOTAL	**$31,718.50**

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of January 2009.

Daisy Flores

Daisy Flores, Chair
Disciplinary Commission

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk
this 30th day of January, 2009.

Copy of the foregoing mailed
this 2nd day of February, 2009, to:

Robert J. Stephan, Jr.
Hearing Officer 9R
P.O. Box 500
Tempe, AZ 85280-0500

Jesse Paul Suplizo
Respondent
3420 East Shea Boulevard, Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85028

and

Jesse Paul Suplizo
Respondent
320 Ocean Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

and

Jesse Paul Suplizo
Respondent
1728 Ocean Avenue, Suite 217
San Francisco, CA 94112

Jason B. Easterday
Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85016-6288

by: Evelyn Loza

/mps

EXHIBIT
A

BEFORE A HEARING OFFICER OF

THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,

JESSE PAUL SUPLIZIO, Bar No. 022720

Respondent.

No. 07-2079, 08-0236, 08-0408, 08-0409, 08-0449, 08-0618

HEARING OFFICER'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

(Assigned to Hearing Officer 9R Robert J. Stephan, Jr.)

Pursuant to Rule 57(j), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., the undersigned Hearing Officer recommends Mr. Jesse Paul Suplizio ("Respondent") be disbarred from the practice of law, pay restitution, and payment of all costs and expenses in these disciplinary proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The State Bar filed its complaint in this matter on May 6, 2008. The complaint was served on Respondent by certified restricted mail/delivery and regular first class mail pursuant to Rule 47(c), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. A Notice of Default was issued on June 3, 2008, pursuant to Rule 57(d), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. Respondent failed to file an answer or otherwise defend against the allegations contained in the State Bar's complaint. A default was entered against Respondent in this matter on June 24, 2008. On June 26, 2008, the State Bar requested an Aggravation/Mitigation Hearing, which was held on September 16, 2008.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The undersigned Hearing Officer finds the following facts have been proven beyond the clear and convincing evidence standard:

1. At all times relevant, Respondent was a lawyer licensed to practice law in the state of Arizona having been first admitted to practice in Arizona on March 4, 2004.

COUNT ONE (File no. 07-2079 (Freundlich))

2. In June 2007, Mr. Jeff Freundlich ("Mr. Freundlich") hired Respondent for legal representation regarding trademark preparation for Whirled Music Publishing, Inc. and Trifecta Holdings, LLC.

3. Mr. Freundlich paid Respondent a total of $8,835.00 for Respondent's legal representation.

4. Between August 2007 to November 2007, Mr. Freundlich attempted to contact Respondent numerous times regarding the legal representation.

5. Respondent failed to respond to Mr. Freundlich or to otherwise communicate with him regarding his legal matters.

6. On October 31, 2007, Mr. Freundlich mailed a certified letter to Respondent, at Respondent's listed address, requesting a status report on his legal matter and an accounting of the money he had entrusted to Respondent as an advance payment for the completion of his legal work.

7. On November 2, 2007, Mr. Freundlich's certified letter was accepted and signed for by an individual named "Julie."

8. Mr. Freundlich's certified letter requested a response from Respondent within five days.

9. Respondent failed to respond to Mr. Freundlich.

10. Respondent failed to fully perform the legal services for which Mr. Freundlich paid.

11. On December 6, 2007, Mr. Freundlich brought Respondent's conduct to the attention of the State Bar of Arizona ("State Bar").

12. By letter dated January 29, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the State Bar made Respondent aware of the allegations against him.

13. The letter requested Respondent respond, in writing, to Complainant's charge within twenty days of the date of the letter.

14. Respondent failed to respond.

15. By letter dated February 27, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the State Bar again requested that Respondent provide a response in writing to Mr. Freundlich's allegations. Respondent's response was requested within ten days of the date of the letter.

16. Respondent failed to respond.

COUNT TWO (File no. 08-0236 (Trust Account))

17. On February 4, 2008, a debit in the amount of $38.19 attempted to pay against Respondent's JP Morgan Chase Bank client trust account.

18. JP Morgan Chase Bank paid the debit and charged a $25 overdraft fee leaving a negative balance of $63.19.

19. By letter dated February 12, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, State Bar Records Examiner ("Records Examiner") notified Respondent of the receipt of the overdraft notice and requested an explanation regarding the overdraft.

20. The February 12, 2008, letter requested that Respondent provide a written response explaining the overdraft within thirty days of the date of the letter.

21. On March 4, 2008, a debit in the amount of $5.95 attempted to pay against Respondent's JP Morgan Chase Bank client trust account.

22. JP Morgan Chase Bank paid the debit and charged a $32 overdraft fee leaving a negative balance of $126.14.

23. By letter dated March 7, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, State Bar Staff Examiner notified Respondent of receipt of the March 4, 2008 overdraft notice, and requested that Respondent respond and explain both overdrafts by March 10, 2008.

24. Respondent failed to respond.

25. On March 11, 2008, a debit in the amount of $32.00 attempted to pay against Respondent's JP Morgan Chase Bank client trust account when there were insufficient funds in the account, leaving a negative balance. JP Morgan Chase Bank paid the debit and charged a $32 overdraft fee.

26. By letter dated March 13, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the Records Examiner requested that Respondent provide an explanation of Respondent's February 4, 2008 overdraft and March 4, 2008 overdraft, within ten days of the date of the letter.

27. By letter dated March 14, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the Records Examiner requested that Respondent provide, by March 24, 2008, a written explanation of Respondent's overdrafts of February 12, 2008, March 6, 2008, and March 11, 2008.

28. On March 13, 2008, a debit in the amount of $32 attempted to pay against Respondent's JP Morgan Chase Bank client trust account when there were insufficient funds in the account.

29. JP Morgan Chase Bank paid the debit and charged a $35 overdraft fee leaving a negative balance of $225.14 in Respondent's client trust account.

30. On March 18, 2008, a debit in the amount of $35 attempted to pay against Respondent's JP Morgan Chase Bank client trust account when there were insufficient funds in the account.

31. JP Morgan Chase Bank paid the debit and charged a $35 overdraft fee resulting in a negative balance of $260.14 in Respondent's client trust account.

32. On March 20, 2008, a debit in the amount of $35 attempted to pay against Respondent's JP Morgan Chase Bank client trust account when there were insufficient funds in the account.

33. JP Morgan Chase Bank paid the debit and charged a $35 overdraft fee leaving a negative balance of $295.14, in Respondent's client trust account.

34. On March 24, 2008, a debit in the amount of $35 attempted to pay against Respondent's JP Morgan Chase Bank client trust account when there were insufficient funds in the account.

35. JP Morgan Chase Bank paid the debit, and charged a $35 overdraft fee leaving a negative balance of $330.14, in Respondent's client trust account.

36. Respondent failed to respond to the Record Examiner's March 13, 2008 letter.

37. Respondent failed to respond to the Record Examiner's March 14, 2008 letter.

COUNT THREE (File no. 08-0408(Camacho))

38. In February 2007, Patricia Camacho ("Ms. Camacho") hired Respondent for legal representation and assistance in registering a trademark.

39. Ms. Camacho paid Respondent $1,255.00 for his representation.

40. In December 2007, Ms. Camacho called Respondent's office concerning the representation and left a message with Respondent's secretary.

41. Respondent did not return Ms. Camacho's December 2007 phone call.

42. In January 2008, Ms. Camacho called Respondent's office concerning the representation and received a message saying that Respondent's phone number had been temporarily disconnected.

43. On January 9, 2008, Ms. Camacho sent Respondent an email concerning the representation, but received no response from Respondent.

44. On February 17, 2008, Ms. Camacho mailed a letter to Respondent at his office address requesting he contact her within ten days. (Compl. ¶ 52.)

45. Respondent never responded to Ms. Camacho's letter.

46. Respondent failed to fully complete his representation of Ms. Camacho.

47. By submission dated March 4, 2008, Ms Camacho informed the State Bar of Respondent's conduct.

48. By letter dated March 19, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the State Bar notified Respondent of Ms. Camacho's allegations and requested a written response within twenty days of the date of the letter.

49. Respondent failed to respond.

COUNT FOUR (File no. 08-0409(Roth))

50. On August 24, 2007, Art Roth ("Mr. Roth") hired Respondent for legal representation and assistance in forming a business.

51. Mr. Roth paid Respondent a flat fee of $5,157.50 for Respondent's legal representation.

52. On September 13, 2007, Respondent sent Mr. Roth an email regarding the legal representation.

53. The September 13, 2007, email from Respondent to Mr. Roth was the last contact Mr. Roth had with Respondent.

54. On November 1, 2007, Mr. Roth sent Respondent an email requesting a status update concerning his legal matter.

55. Respondent did not respond.

56. On January 16, 2008, Mr. Roth sent Respondent an email requesting a status update.

57. Respondent did not respond.

58. On January 25, 2008, Mr. Roth sent Respondent an email requesting information on how to contact Respondent.

59. Responded did not respond.

60. Mr. Roth called Respondent but discovered that Respondent's phone number had been disconnected.

61. Respondent did not fully complete his representation of Mr. Roth.

62. By letter dated March 6, 2008, Mr. Roth advised the State Bar of Respondent's conduct.

63. By letter dated March 19, 2008, the State Bar of Arizona mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the State Bar advised Respondent of Mr. Roth's allegations and requested a response in writing within 20 days of the date of the letter.

64. Respondent failed to respond.

COUNT FIVE (File no. 08-0409(Dater))

65. In March 26, 2007, Christie Dater ("Ms. Dater") and Dawn Hayashi ("Ms. Hayashi") hired Respondent for legal representation and assistance in securing a trade name and copyright for a new product for their business The ThinkHer, LLC.

66. All amounts Ms. Dater and Ms. Hayashi paid to Respondent were for work on behalf of their business, The ThinkHer, LLC.

67. The ThinkHer, LLC paid Respondent a total of $16,076.00 over the course of Respondent's representation.

68. In January 2008, Ms. Dater called Respondent and found that Respondent's phone had been disconnected.

69. In January 2008, Ms. Dater attempted to email Respondent. The emails were undeliverable.

70. Ms. Dater had no contact with Respondent beginning in January 2008, despite her attempts at communication with him.

71. Respondent did not fully complete the work he was hired to perform for The ThinkHer, LLC.

72. By submission dated March 12, 2008, Ms. Dater notified the State Bar of Arizona of Respondent's conduct.

73. By letter dated March 19, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the State Bar notified Respondent of Ms. Dater's allegations and requested a written response within 20 days of the date of the letter.

74. Respondent failed to respond.

COUNT SIX (File no. 08-0618(Schade))

75. On October 23, 2006, Wendy Schade ("Ms. Schade") hired Respondent to conduct a comprehensive trademark search.

76. Ms. Schade entered into a fee agreement with Respondent for the legal services and paid Respondent $395 to conduct the comprehensive trademark search.

77. In June 2007, Ms. Schade called Respondent requesting a status update regarding the representation, was unable to reach him by telephone, and left voicemail messages.

78. Respondent did not return Ms. Shade's phone calls.

79. On July 14, 2007, Ms. Schade mailed a letter to Respondent at his office address requesting a status update regarding her representation.

80. On September 27, 2007, Ms. Schade called Respondent and left a voicemail message requesting that Respondent return her phone call and provide a status update.

81. Respondent failed to respond. Respondent did not otherwise communicate with her.

82. By submission dated April 6, 2008, Ms. Schade notified the State Bar of Respondent's conduct.

83. By letter dated April 17, 2008, mailed to Respondent at his address of record, the State Bar notified Respondent of Ms. Schade's allegations and requested a response in writing within ten days of the date of the letter.

84. Respondent failed to respond.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Respondent failed to appear, file an answer, or otherwise defend against the allegations in the State Bar's complaint, therefore a default was properly entered. Consequently, the allegations in the complaint were deemed admitted pursuant to Rule 57(d), Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. This Hearing Officer took testimony at an Aggravation/Mitigation hearing in which the Respondent failed to appear. The Hearing Officer finds that there is clear and convincing evidence of the following:

COUNT ONE

Respondent's conduct violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs. 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.15, 1.16(d), and 8.1(b).

COUNT TWO

Respondent's conduct violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs. 1.15 and 8.1(b), and Rules 43, 44, and 53, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

COUNT THREE

Respondent's conduct violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.16(d), and 8.1(b) and Rule 53, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

COUNT FOUR

Respondent's conduct violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.16(d), and 8.1(b) and Rule 53, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

COUNT FIVE

Respondent's conduct violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs. 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.16(d), and 8.1(b) and Rule 53, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

COUNT SIX

Respondent's violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.16(d), and 8.1(b) and Rule 53, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

ABA STANDARDS

The American Bar Association's *Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions ("Standards")* are a "useful tool in determining the proper sanction." *In re Cardenas,* 164 Ariz. 149, 152, 791 P.2d 1032, 1035 (1990). In determining an appropriate sanction, the Hearing Officer and the Disciplinary Commission consider the duty violated, the lawyer's mental state, the presence or absence of actual or potential injury, and the existence of aggravating and mitigating factors. *In re Tarletz*, 163 Ariz. 548, 789 P.2d 1049 (1990); *see also Standard* 3.0.

In this case, Respondent violated his duties to his clients and the legal profession. Respondent acted knowingly by agreeing to perform work for his clients, taking the clients' money, and then abandoning the client and his practice before completing the work. Respondent caused serious injury or serious potential injury to his clients. Respondent converted a total of $31,718.50, in client funds when he did not fully complete the work in which they hired him to perform, while keeping the funds. Further, Respondent's conduct caused serious injury to the public and profession. Respondent's misconduct reflects poorly on the profession as a whole, as a self-regulated profession and may have the effect of causing the public to doubt the integrity of other members of the profession.

Standard 4.0 (Violations of Duties Owed to Clients) is applicable in determining the appropriate sanction warranted by Respondent's conduct. *Standard* 4.41 (Lack of Diligence) states, "Disbarment is generally appropriate when:

(a) a lawyer abandons the practice and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or

(b) a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client; or

(c) a lawyer engaged in a pattern of neglect with respect to client matters and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client."

Standard 7.0 (Violations of Other Duties Owed as a Professional) also applies. *Standard* 7.1 states, "Disbarment is generally appropriate when a layer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional with the intent to obtain a benefit for the lawyer or another, and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client, the public, or the legal system."

"The *Standards* do not account for multiple charges of misconduct. The ultimate sanction imposed should at least be consistent with the sanction for the most serious instance of misconduct among a number of violations; it might well be and generally should be greater than the sanction for the most serious misconduct." *Standards* at 7. The presumptive sanction in this case is disbarment. The following are factors that should be considered in aggravation of the presumptive sanction:

Standard 9.22(a) Prior disciplinary offense: On July 23, 2008, in State Bar File No. 08-0727, the Probable Cause Panelist issued an Order of Restitution against Respondent for violation of Rule 42, specifically E.R.s 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.16(d), 8.1(b), and Rule 53, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. Respondent was ordered to pay $915.00 to the Complainant.

Standard 9.22(b) Dishonest or selfish motive: Respondent took $31,718.50 of the clients' money, failed to complete the work for which he was retained, and abandoned his clients and his practice.

Standard 9.22(c) Pattern of misconduct. Respondent was hired by five clients in this case. In each count in which a client was involved, Respondent's conduct formed a pattern. Respondent was hired, was paid, and then abandoned the client without fully completing the work and without refunding all or part of the funds entrusted to him for payment.

Standard 9.22(d) Multiple offenses: Respondent violated multiple ethical rules, duties, and *Standards*.

Standard 9.22(e) Bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of the disciplinary agency: Respondent failed to comply with his ethical obligation to respond to the State Bar's screening investigation in each of the six counts. Further, Respondent did not file an answer to the formal complaint and did not participate in the formal proceedings

Standard 9.22(g) Refusal to acknowledge wrongful nature of conduct: Respondent has never acknowledged the wrongful nature of his conduct.

Standard 9.22(j) Indifference to making restitution: Respondent has not made any efforts to make restitution to the clients that he harmed.

No evidence was presented that would warrant a finding of a mitigating factor.

PROPORTIONALITY REVIEW

In the imposition of lawyer sanctions, the Court is guided by the principle that an effective system of professional sanctions must have internal consistency. *In re Pappas,* 159 Ariz. 516, 768 P.2d 1161 (1988). Therefore, a review of cases that involve conduct of a similar nature is warranted. To achieve internal consistency, it is appropriate to examine sanctions imposed in cases that are factually similar. *In re Shannon*, 179 Ariz. 52, 876 P.2d 548 (1994). However, the discipline in each situation must be tailored for the individual case as neither perfection or absolute uniformity can be achieved. *In re Riley*, 142 Ariz. 604 (1984).

In *In re Beskind*, SB-07-0155-D (2007), Beskind was disbarred from the practice of law and ordered to pay restitution. Beskind took retainers from clients and then failed to adequately or fully perform the legal services as promised. Beskind failed to attend hearings, trials, failed to communicate with clients, and failed to provide a written fee agreement. Beskind further failed to respond or cooperate with the State Bar's investigation. Beskind's mental state was found to be intentional or knowing and he was found to have caused actual injury. There were eight aggravating factors: *Standard* 9.22(b) Dishonest or selfish motive, *Standard* 9.22(c) Pattern of misconduct, *Standard* 9.22(d) Multiple offenses, *Standard* 9.22(e) Bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with the rules or orders of the disciplinary agency, *Standard* 9.22(f) Submission of false Evidence, false statements, or other deceptive practices during the disciplinary process, *Standard* 9.22(g) Refusal to acknowledge wrongful nature of conduct, *Standard* 9.22(i) Substantial experience in the practice of law, and *Standard* 9.22(j) Indifference to making restitution. There was one mitigating factor: *Standard* 9.32(a) Absence of a prior disciplinary record. Beskind's conduct was found to have violated Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.4(c), 8.4(d), and Rules 53(d), 53(e), and 53(f) Ariz.R.Sup.Ct

In *In re Hoover,* SB-06-0027-D (2006), Hoover was disbarred from the practice of law and ordered to pay restitution. Hoover engaged in a pattern of neglect of clients by failing to diligently represent and communicate with clients. Hoover abandoned the practice of law after charging fees for services that were not performed or were of little or no value to the clients. Hoover also failed to cooperate with the State Bar's investigation. Hoover's mental state was found to be knowing and he was found to have caused serious injury. There were five aggravating factors: *Standard* 9.22(a) Prior disciplinary offenses, *Standard* 9.22(c) Pattern of misconduct, *Standard* 9.22(d) Multiple offenses, *Standard* 9.22(h) Vulnerability of victim, and *Standard* 9.22(i) Substantial experience in the practice of law. There were no mitigating factors. Hoover was sanctioned for violation of Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5(c), 1.15, 1.16, 3.2, 3.2(c)(3), 8.1(b), 8.4(d), and Rules 53(d) and 53(f) Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

In *In re Son,* SB-05-0173-D (2006), Son was disbarred from the practice of law and ordered to pay restitution. Son abandoned his law practice and engaged in a pattern of neglect with respect to client matters. Son failed to perform any contracted services for clients after accepting fees, and a conservator was appointed to handle Son's client files and trust account. Son also failed to cooperate with the State Bar's investigation. Son's mental state was found to be knowing and he was found to have caused actual injury. There were three aggravating factors: *Standard* 9.22(c) Pattern of misconduct, *Standard* 9.22(d) Multiple offenses, and *Standard* 9.22(e) Bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with the rules or orders of the disciplinary agency. There was one mitigating factor: *Standard* 9.32(a) Absence of a prior disciplinary record. Son was sanctioned for violation of Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct., specifically ERs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.15, 1.16, 3.2, 8.1(b), and Rules 53(d) and 53(f) Ariz.R.Sup.Ct.

RECOMMENDATION

The Supreme Court "has long held that 'the objective of disciplinary proceedings is to protect the public, the profession and the administration of justice and not to punish the offender.'" *In re Alcorn*, 202 Ariz. 62, 74, 41 P.3d 600, 612 (2002) (quoting *In re Kastensmith*, 101 Ariz. 291, 294, 419 P.2d 75, 78 (1966)). It is also the purpose of lawyer discipline to deter future misconduct. *In Re Fioramonti*, 176 Ariz. 182, 859 P.2d 1315 (1993). It is also a goal of lawyer regulation to protect and instill public confidence in the integrity of individual members of the State Bar. *Matter of Horwitz*, 180 Ariz. 20, 881 P.2d 352 (1994).

Upon consideration of the facts, the ethical rules violated, the applicable *Standards*, the aggravating and mitigating factors, and an analysis of proportional cases, this Hearing Officer recommends the following sanction:

1. Respondent shall be disbarred from the practice of law.

2. Respondent shall, within thirty days of the date of the final judgment and order, pay restitution to:

   a. Mr. Jeff Freundlich in the amount of $8,835.00;

   b. Mr. Art Roth in the amount of $5,157.50;

   c. The ThinkHer LLC in the amount of $16,076.00;

   d. Ms. Wendy Schade in the amount of $395;

   e. Ms. Patricia Camacho in the amount of $1,255.

3. Respondent shall pay all costs and expenses incurred by the State Bar in brining this disciplinary proceeding. In addition, Respondent shall pay all costs and expenses incurred in this matter by the Disciplinary Commission, the Supreme Court, and the Disciplinary Clerk's Office.

4. Should Respondent be reinstated to the practice of law, Respondent shall be placed on probation for two years, with the terms and conditions of probation to be determined at the time of reinstatement.

DATED this 3rd day of November, 2008.

Robert J. Stephan, Jr. /RNM

Robert J. Stephan, Jr.
Hearing Officer 9R

Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk of the Supreme Court this 3rd day of November, 2008:

Copies mailed this 4th day of November, 2008, to:

Jesse Paul Suplizio
Respondent
3420 East Shea Boulevard, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85028

Jesse Paul Suplizio
Respondent
320 Ocean Avenue
San Francisco, California 94112

Jesse Paul Suplizio
Respondent
1728 Ocean Avenue, Suite 217
San Francisco, California 94112

Jason B. Easterday
Bar Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6288

by: Claire Hen