



ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California		
Hearing Department <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles <input type="checkbox"/> San Francisco		
Counsel for the State Bar ERIN McKEOWN JOYCE DEPUTY TRIAL COUNSEL 1149 SOUTH HILL STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015 TELEPHONE: (213) 765.1356 Bar # 149946	Case number(s) 04-O-14819-RAH	(for Court's use) <div style="text-align: center;"> FILED <i>(MDS)</i> JUN - 1 2006 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div>
<input type="checkbox"/> Counsel for Respondent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Pro Per. Respondent RIGOBERTO V. OBREGON 30141 ANTELOPE ROAD, #D-784 MENIFEE LAKES, CALIFORNIA 92584 TELEPHONE: (213) 625-3266 Bar # 130589	PUBLIC MATTER	
In the Matter of RIGOBERTO V. OBREGON Bar # 130589 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	Submitted to <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> assigned judge <input type="checkbox"/> settlement judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING STAYED SUSPENSION; NO ACTUAL SUSPENSION <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 14, 1987
(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):

- (a) ☒ costs added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline
(b) ☐ 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 282, Rules of Procedure)
(c) ☐ costs waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs"
(d) ☐ 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.
(5) ☐ Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.

250

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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.
- (8) ☒ **No aggravating circumstances are involved.**

Additional aggravating circumstances:

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) ☐ **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.

AD

(Do not write above this line.)

- (10) ☐ **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.
- (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:

D. Discipline

1. ☒ Stayed Suspension.

(a) ☒ Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of nine (9) months

- 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: _____

The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

2. ☒ Probation.

Respondent is placed on probation for a period of eighteen (18) months, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein. (See rule 953, California Rules of Court.)

RVD

(Do not write above this line.)

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

- (1) ☒ During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (2) ☒ 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.
- (3) ☒ Within 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.
- (4) ☒ 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 in each report 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.

- (5) ☐ 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.
- (6) ☒ 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.
- (7) ☒ 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 State Bar Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
- ☐ No Ethics School recommended. Reason: _____
- (8) ☐ 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.
- (9) ☐ 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 |

RVO

(Do not write above this line.)

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 within one year. 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) ☐ **Other Conditions:**

ADO

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: RIGOBERTO V. OBREGON,

CASE NUMBER: 04-O-14819

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

1. On October 13, 2004, the State Bar opened an investigation in this matter pursuant to a complaint filed against Respondent by Madhu Gupta (the "Gupta matter"). Gupta complained that money he loaned to his ex-wife was improperly applied to Obregon's attorney's fees in a bankruptcy Obregon handled for Gupta's ex-wife.

2. On January 12, 2005, State Bar Investigator Craig Von Freymann wrote to Respondent regarding the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter was placed in a sealed envelope correctly addressed to Respondent at his State Bar of California membership records address at the time, 333 S. Grand Avenue, #3015, Los Angeles, CA 90071. The letter was properly mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing for collection by the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. The United States Postal Service returned the investigator's letter stamped "returned to sender".

3. On January 27, 2005, Von Freymann wrote to Respondent again regarding the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter addressed Respondent's failure to respond to Von Freymann's letter of January 12, 2005 and requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations for misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter was placed in a sealed envelope correctly addressed to Respondent at his State Bar of California membership records address at the time, 333 S. Grand Avenue, #3015, Los Angeles, CA 90071. The letter was properly mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing for collection by the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. The United States Postal Service returned the investigator's letter stamped "returned to sender".

4. On February 7, 2005, Von Freymann faxed a copy of his January 27, 2005 letter to Respondent at his State Bar membership records fax number. Von Freymann's letter (dated January 27, 2005 and accompanied by a fax cover sheet dated February 7, 2005) addressed Respondent's failure to respond to Von Freymann's letter of January 12, 2005 and requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations for misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gupta matter. Respondent failed to respond to the February 7, 2005 fax.

5. Von Freymann visited Respondent's State Bar membership records address in January 2005 and discovered Respondent left that address without providing a forwarding address. Von Freymann then conducted a search to locate an alternative address for Respondent. As part of his search, Von Freymann called Respondent at his State Bar membership records telephone number and left a detailed message requesting a response from Respondent to the allegations made in the Gupta matter. The message also informed Respondent of his obligation to maintain a current State Bar membership records address, and that the recent mail to Respondent from the State Bar had been returned as undeliverable.

6. Respondent received the message left by Von Freymann in late January 2005. As the result of the message, Respondent updated his State Bar membership records address effective February 4, 2005.

7. On February 28, 2005, Von Freymann sent a third letter to Respondent (not including the February 7, 2005 fax of his January 27, 2005 letter) regarding the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter addressed Respondent's failure to respond to Von Freymann's letter of January 27, 2005 and requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter was placed in a sealed envelope correctly addressed to Respondent at his new State Bar of California membership records address, 833A S. Main Street, #227, Fallbrook, CA 92028-3347. The letter was properly mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing for collection by the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. The United States Postal Service did not return the investigator's letter as undeliverable or for any other reason. Von Freymann also enclosed a copy of his January 27, 2005 letter with his February 28, 2005 letter.

8. Respondent did not respond to Von Freymann's letter of February 28, 2006 or otherwise communicate with Von Freymann, despite his receipt of the letter.

9. On April 6, 2005, State Bar of California Deputy Trial Counsel Erin McKeown Joyce wrote to Respondent regarding the Gupta matter. DTC Joyce's letter requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct which were the subject of the Gupta matter. DTC Joyce's letter was placed in a sealed envelope correctly addressed to Respondent at his State Bar of California membership records address at the time, 833A S. Main Street, #227, Fallbrook, CA 92028-3347. The letter was properly mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing for collection by the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. The United States Postal Service did not return DTC Joyce's letter as undeliverable or for any other reason.

10. Respondent did not respond to DTC Joyce's letter or otherwise communicate with DTC Joyce despite his receipt of the letter.

11. Because Respondent failed to respond to DTC Joyce's letter, Von Freymann conducted an internet search for alternative addresses for Respondent. He located four other possible addresses as the result of his search.

12. On June 7, 2005, Von Freymann sent courtesy letters to Respondent regarding the Gupta matter at four different addresses obtained by Von Freymann through a database search on Respondent: 3323 Caryle Street, Los Angeles, CA 90065; Financial Solutions LTD, 445 S. Figueroa Street, #2700, Los Angeles, CA 90071; 2042 Pine Avenue, #3, Long Beach, CA 90806 and 2061 Pine Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90806. Copies of Von Freymann's previous letters of January 27, 2005, February 7, 2005 and February 28, 2005 were enclosed along with a copy of DTC Joyce's letter of April 6, 2005. Von Freymann's June 7, 2005 letters requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's June 7, 2005 letters were placed in sealed envelopes correctly addressed to Respondent at his alternative addresses. The letters were properly mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing for collection by the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. The United States Postal Service returned the letters addressed to Respondent at 2061 Pine Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90806 and 445 S. Figueroa Street, #2700, Los Angeles, CA 90071, stamped "returned to sender". The other two letters were not returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable or for any other reason.

13. Respondent did not respond to Von Freymann's letters or otherwise communicate with Von Freymann despite his receipt of at least one of the June 7, 2005 letters.

14. On July 18, 2005, Respondent sent a fax to the State Bar listing the Fallbrook address (which is his State Bar membership records address) on the letterhead, but no phone number. With his July 18, 2005 fax letter, Respondent enclosed a letter dated February 15, 2005 in which Respondent addressed some of the allegations raised in the Gupta matter. The State Bar never previously received the February 18, 2005 letter. No documentation was provided with the July 18, 2005 letter from Respondent, although documentation supporting Respondent's response was requested in all of Von Freymann's letters to Respondent. In his July 18, 2005 and February 18, 2005 letters, Respondent claimed to have earned all of the \$45,000.00 received from Gupta's wife in connection with the provision of legal services to Gupta's ex-wife. However, he failed to produce any documentation to that effect (or any proof at all) with his July 18, 2005 letter.

15. On July 20, 2005, Von Freymann wrote to Respondent again regarding the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gupta matter and to produce documents, including billing statements to substantiate Respondent's July 18, 2005 response to the State Bar that the \$45,000.00 provided to Respondent by Gupta was applied to his legal fees. Also, the State Bar sought Respondent's client trust account records accounting for the \$45,000.00 he received from Gupta in a check made payable to his client trust account. Von Freymann's letter was placed in a sealed envelope correctly addressed to Respondent at his State Bar of California membership records address at the time, 833A S. Main Street, #227, Fallbrook, CA 92028. The letter was properly mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing for collection by the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. The United States Postal Service did not return the investigator's letter as undeliverable or for any other reason.

16. Respondent did not respond to Von Freymann's letter or otherwise communicate with Von Freymann.

17. On August 12, 2005, Von Freymann sent another follow up letter to Respondent regarding the Gupta matter. Von Freymann's letter addressed Respondent's failure to respond to Von Freymann's letter of July 20, 2005 and requested Respondent to respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Gupta matter and to produce the specified documents. Von Freymann's letter was placed in a sealed envelope correctly addressed to Respondent at his State Bar of California membership records address at the time, 833A S. Main Street, #227, Fallbrook, CA 92028-3347. Enclosed with this letter was a copy of Von Freymann's July 20, 2005 letter. The letter was properly mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing for collection by the United States Postal Service in the ordinary course of business. The United States Postal Service did not return the investigator's letter as undeliverable or for any other reason. Respondent received the August 12, 2005 letter.

18. On September 14, 2005, Respondent sent a letter to Von Freymann acknowledging receipt of the letter dated August 12, 2005 and requesting an extension until September 26, 2005 to submit his response to the allegations in the Gupta matter. In his letter, Respondent claimed that he needed additional time until September 26, 2005 to gain access to his files to produce the documents sought by the State Bar.

19. However, Respondent did not submit his response or otherwise communicate with Von Freymann or DTC Joyce by September 26, 2005.

20. Respondent failed to substantively respond to the allegations in the Gupta matter despite his written promise to provide the documents and a full response to the allegations by September 26, 2005.

21. It was only after the filing of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges that Respondent provided the documentation responsive to the State Bar investigation sufficient to close the original complaint.

23. Respondent's failure to respond effectively to the State Bar investigation required unnecessary time and resources to be spent to resolve the State Bar investigation of the Gupta matter.

Legal Conclusion

22. By failing to provide a timely written response to the State Bar to the allegations in the Gupta matter, failing to produce documents which were sought from Respondent in connection with the State Bar's investigation of the Gupta matter, and failing to otherwise cooperate or participate in the investigation of the Gupta matter until after the filing of the NDC, Respondent failed to cooperate in a disciplinary investigation, in wilful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(i).

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE

Pursuant to Standard 1.3 of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct:

The primary purposes of disciplinary proceedings conducted by the State Bar of California and of sanctions imposed upon a finding or acknowledgment of a member's professional misconduct are the protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession; the maintenance of high professional standards by attorneys and the protection of public confidence in the legal profession.

Pursuant to Standard 2.6 of the Standards for Sanctions for Attorney Misconduct:

Culpability of a member of a violation of any of the following provisions of the Business and Professions Code shall result in disbarment or suspension depending on the gravity of the offense or the harm, if any, to the victim, with due regard to the purposes of imposing discipline set forth in Standard 1.3:

(a) Sections 6067 and 6068. . . .

Respondent caused no harm to any client, which is a factor in mitigation pursuant to Standard 1.2(e)(iii).

Respondent has no prior discipline, another mitigating factor pursuant to Standard 1.2(e)(i).

The stipulated discipline falls within the Standards. Accordingly, the stipulated discipline is warranted.

OTHER CONDITIONS NEGOTIATED BY THE PARTIES

Respondent shall successfully complete four (4) hours of live instruction continuing legal education courses in legal ethics above those required for his license and provide proof of completion within eighteen months of the effective date of the order approving this stipulation re facts, conclusions of law and disposition to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California. These continuing legal education course will not count towards Respondent's MCLE requirement, but are in addition to any MCLE requirement.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A.(7), was April 17, 2006.

20

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of Rigoberto V. Obregon	Case number(s): 04-0-14819
--	-------------------------------

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.

5-16-06
Date

Rigoberto V. Obregon
Respondent's signature

Rigoberto V. Obregon
Print name

Date

Respondent's Counsel's signature

Print name

5-17-06
Date

[Signature]
Deputy Trial Counsel's signature

Erin McKeown Joyce
Print name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of Rigoberto V. Obregon	Case number(s): 04-0-14819
--	-------------------------------

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.)

Date

5/26/06


RICHARD A. HONN
Judge of the State Bar Court

RVO

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 June 1, 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:


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

**RIGOBERTO V OBREGON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
30141 ANTELOPE RD #D-784
MENIFEE LAKES, CA 92584**

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

Erin Joyce, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **June 1, 2006**.


Milagro del R. Salmeron
Case Administrator
State Bar Court