

**IN RE: RAYMOND C. STEBBINS****NO. BD-2013-033****S.J.C. Judgment of Disbarment entered by Justice Lenk on July 10, 2015.¹****SUMMARY²**

On January 30, 2013, the respondent, Raymond C. Stebbins, pleaded guilty in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to two counts of conspiracy to impede, obstruct, or defeat tax in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371; five counts of evasion of assessment of tax in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7201; two counts of false statements in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001; and one count of theft of public money in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 641. The circumstances supporting the conviction were as follows.

The two conspiracy counts involved separate but similar schemes to divert funds and conceal income from the IRS. The first scheme involved a business by which the respondent was employed in a “sales position.” He also owned a number of private companies. The respondent sent false invoices from his companies to the business for work that had not been provided. At least \$490,000 was improperly obtained over a nine-year period. From these funds, the respondent paid 90% to the general manager of the business and kept 10% for himself. The second scheme involved a construction company the owner of which was the co-conspirator. The respondent sent false bills to the company amounting to \$3.3 million, of which the respondent kept 10% and returned 90% to the owner. The conspiracy charged in each scheme was to evade federal income taxes. The tax evasion charges were for false tax returns filed by the respondent between January 2005 and July 2010, in which he failed to report income from the two schemes.

The convictions for making false statements and theft of public money arose from the respondent’s application for and receipt of Section 8 benefits from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Section 8 is a program that provides subsidies to renters whose income is insufficient to pay market rates for housing. In 2006 and 2007, the respondent made false representations on Section 8 applications to HUD to qualify for Section 8 benefits. In all, he received more than \$45,000 in benefits to which he was not entitled.

On June 11, 2013, the respondent was sentenced to three years’ imprisonment on each count to be served concurrently and two years of supervised release to run concurrently. The respondent was also required to pay the balance of restitution as set by probation or determined by the court after hearing.

¹ The complete Order of the Court is available by contacting the Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County.

² Compiled by the Board of Bar Overseers based on the record filed with the Supreme Judicial Court.

On May 17, 2013, the respondent was temporarily suspended from the bar of the Commonwealth. On July 12, 2013, bar counsel filed with the Board of Bar Overseers a petition for discipline. The respondent did not file an answer to the petition and was defaulted. On October 28, 2013, the board unanimously voted to recommend that the Supreme Judicial Court enter an order of disbarment effective on May 17, 2013, the date of the respondent's temporary suspension. After a hearing at which bar counsel appeared and the respondent participated via telephone, on July 10, 2015, the Court (Lenk, J.) entered a judgment of disbarment retroactive to May 17, 2013.