IN RE: TIMOTHY A. RAMOS

NO. BD-2013-084

S.J.C. Order of Term Suspension entered by Justice Lenk on November 12, 2013.[1]
(S.J.C. Order of Reinstatement entered by Justice Lenk on June 23, 2014.)

SUMMARY[2]

The respondent was admitted to practice in Massachusetts in 2002, and was not licensed to practice law in any other state. From about April 2009 through December 2009, the respondent engaged in business in Ohio under the name of the Ramos Law Group, Inc. He used letterhead and other documents in communications with clients using the name Ramos Law Group, Inc. and referring to himself as a lawyer. The respondent was the sole principal of Ramos Law Group, which had no employees and was not associated with a lawyer licensed to practice in Ohio.

From about April 2009 through December 2009, approximately 137 clients engaged and paid fees to Ramos Law Group, Inc. to assist with obtaining relief in connection with their residential mortgage loans. The respondent did not inform the clients that he was not permitted to practice law in Ohio. After the matter came to the attention of the Ohio Attorney General, the respondent refunded the fees paid by clients to Ramos Law Group, Inc. to all clients who requested refunds.

By holding himself out as practicing law in Ohio when he was not licensed to practice law there, the respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in violation of Mass. R. Prof. C. 5.5(a). By using the firm name and letterhead of "Ramos Law Group, Inc." with an Ohio address, the respondent made false or misleading communications about himself or his services, in violation of Mass. R. Prof. C. 7.1, and used a firm name, letterhead or other professional designation that violated Rule 7.1, in violation of Mass. R. Prof. C. 7.5(a).

Between 2002 and 2011, the respondent was convicted in Ohio of four misdemeanors involving reckless operation of vehicles and possession of marijuana. The respondent did not report the convictions to bar counsel. The respondent's criminal conduct violated Mass. R. Prof. C. 8.4(b) and (h). The respondent's failure to report the convictions to bar counsel violated S.J.C. Rule 4:01, § 12(8), and Mass. R. Prof. C. 8.4(d). In mitigation, the respondent's criminal conduct was not related to his representation of a client, and he entered a rehabilitation program for substance abuse in 2011.

---

[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 August 20, 2013, bar counsel filed a petition for discipline alleging that the respondent's conduct violated the rules set forth above. That same day, the respondent filed an answer admitting to the facts and rule violations alleged, and the parties filed a stipulation asking that the board recommend a suspension of six months, with the respondent's automatic reinstatement to the practice of law pursuant to S.J.C. Rule 4:01, § 18(1)(a), conditioned upon his submission of evidence satisfactory to bar counsel that he continued to abstain from the use of illegal drugs and alcohol.

On September 23, 2013, the board voted to accept the parties' stipulation. The board filed an information with the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County. On November 12, 2013, the Court (Lenk, J.) entered an order suspending the respondent for six months effective immediately, subject to the conditions stated in the stipulation.