



(Do not write above this line.)

<b>State Bar Court of California</b> Hearing Department <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles <input type="checkbox"/> San Francisco		
Counsel for the State Bar Eric H. Hsu Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 S. Hill Street Los Angeles, California 90015-2299 Tel: (213) 765-1247  Bar # 213039	Case number(s)  04-O-12291-RAH	(for Court's use)  <div style="text-align: center;"> <b>FILED</b>    <b>OCT 24 2006</b>   <b>STATE BAR COURT            CLERK'S OFFICE            LOS ANGELES</b> </div>
<input type="checkbox"/> Counsel for Respondent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Pro Per, Respondent Robert E. Riemer, Esq. 280 S. Beverly Drive, #402 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (310)274-8400  Bar # 94337	<div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">PUBLIC MATTER</div>	
In the Matter of  <b>ROBERT E. RIEMER</b>  Bar # 94337  A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	Submitted to <input type="checkbox"/> assigned judge <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> settlement judge  <b>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND            DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</b>  <b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	

Note: All information required by this form and any additional information which cannot be provided in the space provided, must be set forth in an attachment to this stipulation under specific headings, e.g., "Facts," "Dismissals," "Conclusions of Law," "Supporting Authority," etc.

#### A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted December 16, 1980  
(date)
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation, are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation and order consist of 13 pages.
- (4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law."
- (6) The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading "Supporting Authority."
- (7) No more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any pending investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.

(Do not write above this line.)

(8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):

- until costs are paid in full, Respondent will remain actually suspended from the practice of law unless relief is obtained per rule 284, Rules of Procedure.
- costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years:
- (hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure)
- costs waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs"
- costs entirely waived

**B. Aggravating Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.**

(1)  Prior record of discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]

(a)  State Bar Court case # of prior case \_\_\_\_\_

(b)  Date prior discipline effective \_\_\_\_\_

(c)  Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(d)  Degree of prior discipline \_\_\_\_\_

(e)  If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline."

(2)  **Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.

(3)  **Trust Violation:** Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.

(4)  **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.

SEE ATTACHMENT.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (5)  **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (6)  **Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.
- (7)  **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. **SEE ATTACHMENT.**
- (8)  **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances: **NONE.**

**C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating circumstances are required.**

- (1)  **No Prior Discipline:** Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not deemed serious.
- (2)  **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.
- (3)  **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings.
- (4)  **Remorse:** Respondent promptly took objective steps spontaneously demonstrating remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of his/her misconduct.
- (5)  **Restitution:** Respondent paid \$ \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ in restitution to \_\_\_\_\_ without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.
- (6)  **Delay:** These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her.
- (7)  **Good Faith:** Respondent acted in good faith.
- (8)  **Emotional/Physical Difficulties:** At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical disabilities which expert testimony would establish was directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the product of any illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities.
- (9)  **Severe Financial Stress:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered from severe financial stress which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (10)  **Family Problems:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
- (11)  **Good Character:** Respondent's good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of his/her misconduct.
- (12)  **Rehabilitation:** Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13)  **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances: **SEE ATTACHMENT.**

**D. Discipline:**

(1)  **Stayed Suspension:**

- (a)  Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of one (1) year
- i.  and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
- ii.  and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
- iii.  and until Respondent does the following: \_\_\_\_\_

(b)  The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2)  **Probation:**

Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of two (2) years,  
which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter.  
(See rule 953, Calif. Rules of Ct.)

(Do not write above this line.)

(3)  **Actual Suspension:**

(a)  Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of ninety (90) days

- i.  and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct
- ii.  and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
- iii.  and until Respondent does the following: \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Additional Conditions of Probation:**

- (1)  If Respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until he/she proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in general law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
- (2)  During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3)  Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (4)  Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and conditions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must promptly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request.
- (5)  Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.

In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.

- (6)  Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.
- (7)  Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (8)  Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
- No Ethics School recommended. Reason: \_\_\_\_\_
- (9)  Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.
- (10)  The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Law Office Management Conditions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Conditions         | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Conditions             |

#### F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

- (1)  **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination:** Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. **Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 951(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 321(a)(1) & (c), Rules of Procedure.**
- No MPRE recommended. Reason: \_\_\_\_\_
- (2)  **Rule 955, California Rules of Court:** Respondent must comply with the requirements of rule 955, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
- (3)  **Conditional Rule 955, California Rules of Court:** If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 days or more, he/she must comply with the requirements of rule 955, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
- (4)  **Credit for Interim Suspension [conviction referral cases only]:** Respondent will be credited for the period of his/her interim suspension toward the stipulated period of actual suspension. Date of commencement of interim suspension: \_\_\_\_\_
- (5)  **Other Conditions:**

**ATTACHMENT TO**  
**STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION**

IN THE MATTER OF:        ROBERT E. RIEMER

CASE NUMBER:            04-O-12291-RAH

**FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.**

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violating the specified statute.

**I. Facts.**

1.     On July 4, 2003, Raquel Hall, Steve Hall, Jessica Session, Ashleh Hall, and La Shawna Lewis (collectively "the Halls") were injured in an automobile accident ("the Hall matter").
2.     On July 8, 2003, the Halls employed Mark S. Greenberg ("Greenberg") to represent them in the Hall matter.
3.     On November 14, 2003, the Halls employed Respondent to represent them in the Hall matter.
4.     On November 14, 2003, Respondent sent a letter to Greenberg stating that Greenberg's services had been terminated by the Halls in the Hall matter.
5.     On February 12, 2004, Respondent sent a letter to Greenberg stating that he had settled the Hall matter.
6.     On February 16, 2004, State Farm Automobile Insurance Company Insurance ("State Farm") issued five checks ("settlement check(s)"), totaling \$29,755, in settlement of the Hall matter. Each of those settlement checks were made payable to "Law Offices of Robert E. Riemer & Mark Greenberg," in addition to the respective name of the Halls.
7.     On February 16, 2004, Respondent received the settlement checks from State Farm.
8.     On February 17, 2004, Respondent deposited the settlement checks into his client trust account at Union Bank of California, account number 0720054604 ("CTA").

9. On February 17, 2004 when Respondent deposited the settlement checks into his CTA, he was grossly negligent in not knowing that Greenberg neither signed nor authorized his signature to be affixed to any of the settlement checks.
10. On February 17, 2004, Greenberg asserted a lien in the aggregate amount of \$3,904.64 for his fees and costs in the Hall matter.
11. On February 19, 2004, Respondent issued eight CTA checks relating to the Hall matter: check number 2021, in the amount of \$157.23, was made payable to Greenberg for costs; check numbers 2022, 2024, 2025, 2026, and 2028, in the aggregate amount of \$3,833.50, were made payable to Respondent's law firm for attorney fees and costs; check numbers 2023 and 2027, each in the amount of \$179, were made payable to Freeman Emergency Physicians Medical Group.
12. On March 15, 2004, the State Bar commenced its investigation case number 04-O-12291, concerning a State Bar complaint filed by Greenberg against Respondent (the "Greenberg matter").
13. On March 22, 2004, Greenberg filed a lawsuit against Respondent and his law firm, in an action titled *Mark S. Greenberg v. Law Offices of Robert E. Riemer*, Los Angeles County Superior Court case number 04C00468, to recover for Greenberg's lien asserted in the Hall matter ("*Greenberg v. Riemer*"). On May 3, 2005, a judgment was entered against Respondent and in favor of Greenberg for \$2,374.64. By October 25, 2005, Respondent paid \$2,374.64 to Greenberg, in satisfaction of the judgment.
14. On March 10, 2005, a State Bar investigator ("the investigator") sent a letter to Respondent requesting that he "list all the individuals who had possession of [the settlement checks] from the initial time of receipt to the time of deposit."
15. On March 16, 2005, in response to the investigator's letter of March 10, 2005, Respondent wrote the State Bar and stated in his letter that:

On or about February 18, 2004, Steve Hall picked up the envelope containing the five unsigned settlement drafts. On or about February 27, 2004, someone on behalf of all clients, dropped off the settlement drafts which were fully signed except for [Respondent's] signature. Immediately upon receiving the signed drafts, [Respondent] stamped and deposited (but did not sign) the settlement drafts to [his] Client Trust Account.

However, Respondent deposited the settlement checks on February 17, 2004, and issued eight CTA checks relating to the Hall matter on February 19, 2004.

16. At the time Respondent sent his March 16, 2005 letter to the State Bar, he knew that his statement that the settlement checks were picked on or about February 18, 2004, and that those checks were returned on or about February 27, 2004, was false, because he knew that he had deposited the settlement checks into his CTA on February 17, 2004, and that he had issued CTA checks against the settlement funds on February 19, 2004.

**II. Conclusions of Law.**

- A. By depositing the settlement checks into Respondent's client trust account when Respondent was grossly negligent in not knowing that Greenberg neither signed nor authorized his signature to be affixed to any of the settlement checks, Respondent wilfully committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, or corruption, in willful violation of California Business and Professions Code section 6106.
- B. By informing the State Bar that the settlement checks were picked up on or about February 18, 2004, and that those checks were returned to Respondent on or about February 27, 2004, when Respondent knew that his statement was false, Respondent wilfully committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, or corruption, in willful violation of California Business and Professions Code section 6106.

**DISMISSAL.**

The parties respectfully request this court to dismiss the following alleged violation, in the interest of justice:

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Alleged Violation</u>
04-O-12291	Two	Business and Professions Code section 6106.

**PENDING PROCEEDINGS.**

The disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A(7), was October 18, 2006.

**AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.**

The presumptively appropriate level of discipline for attorney misconduct is as set forth in the Standards. (*Morgan v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 598, 607.) In this case, standard 2.3 provides, in pertinent parts, that the culpability of a member of an act of moral turpitude, fraud,

or intentional dishonesty toward a court, client, or another person shall result in actual suspension or disbarment, depending on the gravity of harm.

The California Supreme Court views misrepresentation to the State Bar as an offense greater than other types of misconduct.<sup>1</sup> In *Olguin v. State Bar* (1980) 28 Cal.3d 195, the attorney was charged with presenting the State Bar with false statements that he had forwarded to subsequent counsel a substitution of attorneys and had given or mailed a notice of suspension to the client and opposing counsel, and with documents fabricated to deceive the State Bar in its investigation, with the intent to avoid culpability in the client-abandonment charge. The Court imposed 18 months of stayed suspension with probation for that period, conditioned upon actual suspension for the first six months.

Following the established jurisprudence, the review department has held that a deliberate attempt to mislead a State Bar investigation constitutes moral turpitude in violation of section 6106. (*In the Matter of Gillis* (Review Dept. 2002) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 387, 398-399.) In *Gillis*, the attorney lied to the State Bar by stating that, in the underlying sale of real property to his client, the client had assumed a note and mortgage as part of their contract of sale and that she was billed for the payments after the sale, when no such assumption took place and that the client was never billed for the payment on the property. The recommended discipline was three years of stayed suspension with probation for three years, conditioned upon actual suspension for the first six months.

#### **AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**

Respondent's misconduct is surrounded by the following aggravating circumstances: Respondent's misconduct evinces multiple acts of wrongdoing. (Std. 1.2(b)(ii).) His misconduct also harmed Greenberg, in that Greenberg had to sue Respondent to recover for fees and costs owed. (Std. 1.2(b)(iv).)

#### **MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**

Respondent has been admitted to practice law in California since December 16, 1980, and has no prior record of discipline in California.

#### **COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.**

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of October 18, 2006, the estimated prosecution costs in this matter are

---

<sup>1</sup>See, e.g., *Worth v. State Bar* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 707, 711: "Perhaps petitioner's greater offense is his fraudulent and contrived misrepresentations to the State Bar. [Citation.]"

approximately \$2,449.00. Respondent acknowledges that this figure is an estimate only. Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from the stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the cost of further proceedings.

#### **WAIVER OF VARIANCE BETWEEN NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES AND STIPULATED FACTS AND CULPABILITY**

The parties hereby waive any variance between the Notice of Disciplinary Charges filed on June 23, 2006, and the facts and conclusions of law contained in this stipulation. The parties also waive the issuance of an amended Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The parties further waive the right to a formal hearing and to the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges on any charge not included in the pending Notice of Disciplinary Charges.

#### **RESTRICTIONS WHILE ON ACTUAL SUSPENSION.**

During the period of actual suspension, Respondent shall not do any of the following: 1) render legal consultation or advice to a client; 2) appear on behalf of a client in any hearing or proceeding or before any judicial officer, arbitrator, mediator, court, public agency, referee, magistrate, commissioner, or hearing officer; 3) appear as a representative of a client at a deposition or other discovery matter; 4) negotiate or transact any matter for or on behalf of a client with third parties; 5) receive, disburse, or otherwise handle a client's funds; or 6) engage in activities which constitute the practice of law.

Respondent shall declare under penalty of perjury that he has complied with this provision in all quarterly reports required to be filed with the Office of Probation, pertaining to periods in which Respondent was actually suspended from the practice of law.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of ROBERT E. RIEMER Member #: 94337	Case number(s): 04-O-12291-RAH
---	-----------------------------------

### SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES

By their signatures below, the parties and their counsel, as applicable, signify their agreement with each of the recitations and each of the terms and conditions of this Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

ER      19RER  
10/18/06      Robert E. Riemer      ROBERT E. RIEMER  
Date      Respondent's signature      Print name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date      Respondent's Counsel's signature      Print name  
Oct. 19, 2006      [Signature]      ERIC H. HSU  
Date      Deputy Trial Counsel's signature      Print name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of ROBERT E. RIEMER Member #: 94337	Case number(s): 04-O-12291-RAH
---	-----------------------------------


### ORDER

Finding the stipulation to be fair to the parties and that it adequately protects the public, IT IS ORDERED that the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without prejudice, and:

- The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- All Hearing dates are vacated.

The parties are bound by the stipulation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed within 15 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved stipulation. (See rule 135(b), Rules of Procedure.) The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after file date. (See rule 953(a), California Rules of Court.)

10-00-06  
Date

  
Judge of the State Bar Court

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
**[Rule 62(b), Rules Proc.; Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]**

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on October 24, 2006, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

**STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION  
AND ORDER APPROVING**

in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:


- by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

**ROBERT E. RIEMER  
LAW OFC ROBERT E RIEMER  
280 S BEVERLY DR #402  
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212**

- by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

**Eric Hsu, Enforcement, Los Angeles**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **October 24, 2006.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Milagro del R. Salmeron**  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court