

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SUPREME COURT

ORDER

LD-2016-0016, In the Matter of John A. James, Jr., Esquire

By letter dated September 8, 2016, the Attorney Discipline Office (ADO) notified the court that Attorney John A. James, Jr., has been disbarred by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County for numerous violations of the Massachusetts Rules of Professional Conduct. The ADO requests that Attorney James be immediately suspended from the practice of law on an interim basis pending a final decision by this court about the imposition of reciprocal discipline.

The court has reviewed the order of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and the summary of the case prepared by the Massachusetts Board of Bar Overseers. Based on this information, the court finds that Attorney James's immediate suspension from the practice of law is necessary to protect the public and to preserve the integrity of the legal profession. See Rule 37(16)(d) and (f). Accordingly, it is hereby ordered:

- (1) In accordance with Rule 37(16)(d) and (f), Attorney John A. James, Jr., is immediately suspended from the practice of law in New Hampshire pending a decision about the imposition of reciprocal discipline in accordance with Rule 37(12) and further order of this court. Attorney James is enjoined from transferring, assigning, hypothecating, or in any manner disposing of or conveying any assets of New Hampshire clients, whether real, personal, beneficial, or mixed.
- (2) A copy of the order of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and of this order shall be served upon Attorney James by first-class and certified mail at the latest address he has provided to the New Hampshire Bar Association.
- (3) Within 15 days from the date of this order, Attorney James may request a hearing on the issue of whether the interim suspension should be lifted, which will be promptly scheduled. See Reiner's Case, 152 N.H. 163 (2005).
- (4) Rule 37(12) governs reciprocal discipline. Paragraph (d) of this section authorizes the court to impose final discipline identical or

similar to the discipline imposed by another jurisdiction unless the disciplined attorney or the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) demonstrates, or the court finds, based upon one of the grounds as set forth in Rule 37(12)(d), that the imposition of identical or substantially similar discipline would be unwarranted.

- (5) Within 30 days of service of this order, Attorney James and the PCC shall inform the court if they contend that the imposition of discipline substantially similar to that imposed by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court would be unwarranted, and if they so contend, of the reasons for their contention.

Hicks, Conboy, Lynn, and Bassett, JJ., concurred.

DATE: September 13, 2016

ATTEST:


Eileen Fox, Clerk

Distribution:

Brian R. Moushegian, Esquire
David M. Rothstein, Esquire
John A. James, Jr., Esquire
File