



,	State Hearing Department	Bar Court of California Los Angeles 15	3 San Francisco
RO DE 18 SA (4	neel for the State Box BERT A. HENDERSON PUTY TRIAL COUNSEL O HOMAND STREET IN PRANCISCO, CA 94105-1639 15) 538-2000	Case number(s) 05-11-00451	PUBLIC MATTER
	Counsel for Respondent in Pro Per, Respondent	·	SEP 3 0 2005 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
24 84 · (4	HRAIM MARGOLIN 0 STOCKION ST., 4th FL. N FRANCISCO, CA 94108-5318 15) 421-4347 7 32582	Submitted to III casigned judge	SAN FRANCISCO
In #	ne Matter of ROLE A. BELL	STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONC DISPOSITION AND ORDER API	CLUSIONS OF LAW AND
A N	# 122753 ismber of the State Bar of California iponalent)	ACTUAL SUSPENSION PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTI	ED
in it		forth in an altachment to this stip	mation which cannot be provide outation under specific headings, y," etc.
A.	Parties' Acknowledgments:		
(ו)	Respondent is a member of the St	ate Bar of California, admitted	JUNE 10, 1986
(2)	The parties agree to be bound by disposition are rejected or change	the factual stipulations contained to d by the Supreme Court.	1 ,
(3)	All investigations or proceedings to by this stipulation and are deemed The stipulation and order consist o	l consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/c	of this stipulation, are entirely resolved count(s) are listed under "Dismissals."
m	A distangui of note or continue or		

under "Facts."

(5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of

The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading (ó) "Supporting Authority."

No more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any (7) pending investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.

(Sipulation form approved by SSC Executive Committee 10/16/2000, Revised 12/16/2004)

ABILIE RESIDEN

022 603 275



(DX	not v	ritte a	bove this line.)					
(8)	Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code \$56086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):							
	 until costs are paid in full, Respondent will remain actually suspended from the practice of la relief is obtained per rule 264, Rules of Procedure. costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 3 for the following membership year 							
	0	(na	canip, special circumstances of orner good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure; is waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Wolver of Costs" is entirely waived					
В.	tor i	Profe	iting Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions ssional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating ances are required.					
(1)		Prior	record of discipline (see standard 1.2(f))					
	(a)	(2)	State Sar Court case # of prior case01-0-03308_(8_125494)					
	(b)		Date prior discipline effective SEPTIMBER 25, 2004					
	(0)	Œ	Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations:BUS. 6 PROF. 6068(a). 6068(1)					
			and 6125.					
	(d)	Œ	Degree of prior disciplineTHO (2) YEAR SUSPENSION STAYED; 30-DAYS ACTUAL					
	(e)	0	If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline."					
(2)	ם	Dight	onesty: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, paciment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.					
(3)	-	acc:	Violation: Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to ount to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward funds or property:					
(4)		Ham	n; Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.					



(Do	not w	rile above this line.)
-		Inditierence: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
(6)	G	Lack of Cooperation: Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of higher 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 of cumulances are involved.
Ad	dition	al aggravating circumstances:
	•	
		gating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating umstances are required.
(1)	O	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)	Æ	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)	P	Remorse: Respondent promptly look objective steps spontaneously demonstrating remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atoms for any consequences of his/her misconduct.
(5)	Ö	Restitution: Respondent paid \$on
		in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.
(6)	0	Detay: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her.
(7)	P	Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith.
(8)		Emallonal/Physical Difficulties: At the time of the slipulated 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 suffere from such difficulties or disabilities.
(S)	ם	Severe Financial Street: At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered from severe financial street which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond higher control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.

415 538 2214

Ó	P	Family Problems: At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in higher personal ille which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
1)		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 tuli extent of higher misconduct.
2)	0	Rehabilitation: Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct accurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
13)	o	No mitigating circumstances are involved.
dd	ltion	al miligating offermateness:
		•
		·
		•
		•
) .	Dis	cipline:
	Dis	scipline: Stayed Suspension:
) .	_	Stayed Suspension:
	Œ	Stayed Suspension: IX Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of
	Œ	Stayed Suspension: Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of
	Œ	Stayed Suspension: Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of
	(a)	Stayed Suspension: Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of
	(a) (b)	Stayed Suspension: Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of



				ve this line.) Suspension:
(a) [pondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a od of CME (1) YEAR
	ı	l.	0	and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present itness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(t), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct
	ı	i.		and until Respondent pays restitution as set torth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
	H	i . (and until Respondent does the following:
E. Add	Siti	01	nai	Conditions of Probation:
(1) (3	1	he	she	ondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, titness to practice, and learning and ability in allow, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Altorney Sanctions for Professional Meconduct.
(2) 🗷				the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and of Professional Conduct.
(3)		Sta of I	ite I. Info	ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the lar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes implicing for interest office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar less, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Cade.
(4) 🗷	1	Pro on the	e co	thirly (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of floo and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms profitions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with obation deputy either in-person-er by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must itly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request.
(5) (2)		Jul wh co cm cu	y 10 ndii ndii nan	ndent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state or Respondent has compiled with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all fons of probation during the preceding calendar quarter, Respondent must also state whether then by proceedings penalting against him or her in the State Bar Court and it so, the case number and it status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be ited on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.
	İ	W	Mily	illion to all quarierly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of tion.
(6) 🗆	2 1 1	Du Du	ndii ring add	ndent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and lons of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. The period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested than to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must reate fully with the probation monitor.
(7) 🕮	c		puirk Boi d	it to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any as at the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are ad to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has ted with the probation conditions.

415 538 2214

(Do 1	of W	vitte above this line.)		
(5)	13	Within one (1) year of the effective do of Probation satisfactory proof of after given at the end of that session.	te of the discly adance at a si	oline herein, Respondent must provide to the Officesion of the Ethics School, and passage of the te
		☐ No Ethics School recommended. I	Redean:	
(9)	D	Respondent must comply with all cond must so declare under penalty of peri Office of Probation.	dorq io snoille anujnoo ni yw	stion with any quarterly report to be filed with the
(10)		The following conditions are attached	hereto and in	corporated:
		Substance Abuse Conditions		Law Office Management Conditions
•		☐ Medical Conditions	a	Financial Conditions
		suspension or within one year, whi	chever period hout fuither	e of Probation during the period of actual is longer. Fatiure to pass the MPRE hearing until passage. But see rule 981(b), & (c), Rules of Procedure,
		No MPRE recommended. Recison:		
(2)	•	955, California Rules of Court, and pe	viorm the acts	must comply with the requirements of rule specified in subdivisions (a) and (a) of that rule the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order
(3)	0	90 days or more, he/she must comply	with the require one (a) and (c) o	If Respondent remains actually suspended for sments of rule 955, California Rules of Court, and of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days,
(4)	•	Credit for interim Suspension (con	viction refer	ol cases onlyj: Respondent will be credited

for the period of his/her interim suspension toward the slipulated period of actual suspension. Date

of commencement of interim suspension:

(5) D Other Conditions:



STIPULATION RE FACTS. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

CAROLE A. BELL

CASE NUMBER(S):

05-N-00451

FACTS

On August 26, 2004, the California Supreme Court filed Order No. S125494, which in part actually suspended Respondent for 30 days and until State Bar Court granted a motion to end the suspension. The Order further provided that if Respondent were suspended for 90 days or more that Respondent had to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court. Respondent was actually suspended for in excess of 90 days. Respondent was notified by the Probation Department on September 8, 2004, of the duty to comply with rule 955. Respondent did not timely file with State Bar Court the declaration of compliance required by rule 955. The declaration of compliance which was due by February 2, 2005 was finally filed on August 24, 2005. The Respondent did not have actual notice of the Supreme Court Order, the duty to comply with 955 or the commencement of the disciplinary proceedings in this matter. The reason Respondent did not have actual notice is that she had relocated without changing her official membership records address. The State Bar properly used Respondent's official membership records when mailing the probation letter and other filings related to this matter.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Respondent wilfully failed to file the rule 955 declaration of compliance with State Bar Court by February 2, 2005 as required by Supreme Court Order no. S125494. Respondent's failure to comply with rule 955, as ordered by the Supreme Court, also constitutes a wilful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6103.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A.(7), was September 1, 2005.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of September 1, 2005, the estimated prosecution costs in this matter are approximately



\$1,641. 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.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

Business and Professions Code section 6103 provides that the wilful disobedience or violation of an order of a court constitutes cause for disbarment or suspension

California Rules of Court, rule 955 provides for the suspension or disbarment of a suspended member who wilfully fails to comply with the provisions of 955.

Bercovich v. State Bar (1990) 50 Cal.3d 116, 131 - Disbarment is generally the appropriate sanction to be imposed for a wilful violation of rule 955

Shapiro v. State Bar (1990) 51 Cal.3d 251 - one year actual suspension for filing the 955 affidavit five months late.

STATE BAR ETHICS SCHOOL.

Because respondent has agreed to attend State Bar Ethics School as part of this stipulation, respondent may receive Minimum Continuing Legal Education credit upon the satisfactory completion of State Bar Ethics School.

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

(Da not write above this line.)				
In the Matter of	Case number(s):			
CAROL A. BELL	05-H-00451	•		

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, Condusions of Law and Disposition.

9/2/05 Date	Barber a Bla	CAROLE A. BELL Print name
9/13/05	Respondent's Couper's signature	EPHRATH MARCOLTS
9/15/05	Color A. John Lagure	ROBERT A. HEMORESON

Do not write above this line.) In the Matter of	Caro number(a):
	Case number(s):
CAROLE A. BELL	05-N-00451
	OPPER
	ORDER
-	he parties and that it adequately protects the public, smlssal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without
The stipulated facts and dis RECOMMENDED to the Sup	sposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE preme Court.
	sposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set PLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
All Hearing dates are vaca	ited.
odify the stipulation, filed within 15 ourt modifies or further modifies the ocedure.) The effective date o	ation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or 5 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this e approved stipulation. (See rule 135(b), Rules of this disposition is the effective date of the ormally 30 days after file date. (See rule 953(a),
•	
September 28, 2005	Par Mc Eller
oate '	PAT McFLROY

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 San Francisco, on September 30, 2005, 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 San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

EPHRAIM MARGOLIN
LAW OFFICE OF EPHRAIM MARGOLIN
240 STOCKTON STREET, 4TH FL
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108 5318

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

ROBERT HENDERSON, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on **September 30, 2005**.

Lauretta Cramer Case Administrator

State Bar Court