

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO

## **STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

## **HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO**

))

)

)

)

In the Matter of	
FRANK EPSTEIN,	
Member No. 97325,	
A Member of the State Bar.	

Case Nos.: 04-O-14278-LMA (07-O-14039)

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO TAKE AND PASS PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY EXAMINATION AND DENYING REQUEST FOR A HEARING

On October 3, 2012, respondent Frank Epstein requested the court to extend the time within which he must comply with a condition attached to his public reproval, effective October 4, 2011. Specifically, he asked for an extension of time within which he must take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination (MPRE). Respondent also requested a hearing on his motion.

On October 16, 2012, Supervising Attorney Terrie Goldade of the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California opposed respondent's request to modify his reproval condition to allow more time in which to take and pass the MPRE.<sup>1</sup>

The court is seriously troubled by an apparent failure on respondent's part to comprehend that complying with court-ordered reproval conditions must be given the highest priority. The court cautions that an attorney's failure to comply with conditions attached to a public reproval may be cause for a separate disciplinary proceeding. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.19; Rules Prof. Conduct, rule 1-110.) Thus, it would behoove respondent to immediately attempt to remedy



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> According to the Declaration of Terrie Goldade, which was submitted with the Office of Probation's opposition to respondent's motion, respondent has not been compliant with his quarterly and LAP reporting conditions.

The court finds respondent's request to take and provide proof of passage of the MPRE is consistent with protecting the public; the member's successful rehabilitation; and maintaining the integrity of the legal profession. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.300(B).)

Good cause having been shown, respondent's motion to extend the time within which to take and pass the MPRE is **GRANTED** and respondent is hereby **ORDERED** to provide proof of passage of the MPRE to the Office of Probation on or before May 21, 2013.

Pursuant to rule 5.45(D) of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, written motions in the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court are submitted without hearing, unless otherwise ordered. Having reviewed the pleadings and finding that holding a hearing will not materially contribute to court's consideration of respondent's motion, the court **DENIES** respondent's request for a hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November \_\_\_\_, 2012

LUCY ARMENDARIZ Judge of the State Bar Court

any failure on his part to comply with his reproval conditions as expeditiously and as best he can.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); 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 San Francisco, on November 1, 2012, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO TAKE AND PASS PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY EXAMINATION AND DENYING REQUEST FOR A HEARING

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 San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

FRANK EPSTEIN 1519 TENNESSEE ST VALLEJO, CA 94590

FRANK EPSTEIN 1517 TENNESSEE ST VALLEJO, CA 94590

 $\boxtimes$ 

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

TERRIE GOLDADE, Probation, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on November 1, 2012.

Mazie Yip Case Administrator State Bar Court