

PUBLIC MATTER

FILED

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

JUN 30 2009 *loc*

HEARING DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES

STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES

In the Matter of)

Case No.: 05-O-00935-RAP

JAMES FRIEND JORDAN)

ORDER RE STATE BAR'S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION/MODIFICATION

Member No. 74606)

A Member of the State Bar.)

On June 3, 2009, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California (State Bar), by and through Deputy Trial Counsel Christine Souhrada, filed a motion for reconsideration/modification of the court's May 18, 2009 Decision. On June 17, 2009, attorney James R. DiFrank, on behalf of respondent James Friend Jordan, filed an opposition to the State Bar's motion for reconsideration.

In its motion for reconsideration/modification, the State Bar requested that the court's May 18, 2009 Decision be modified to require, among other things, that respondent be actually suspended for 90 days *and until* he pays the sanctions ordered on September 10, 2004 and October 12, 2005. Having considered the parties' moving papers, the State Bar's motion for reconsideration/modification is **DENIED**. There is an insufficient showing of errors of law or fact based on the evidence already before the court, and there are no new or different facts, circumstances or law. (Rule 224, Rules Proc. of State Bar.)

However, upon further reflection, the decision filed on May 18, 2009, is hereby MODIFIED, sua sponte, to include the following modification:



1

1. On page 17 of the decision, numbered paragraph two, "Respondent must provide satisfactory proof of such sanctions payments to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles within the period of probation" is deleted, and in its place is inserted "Respondent must provide satisfactory proof of such sanctions payments to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles within one year after the effective date of the Supreme Court's disciplinary order." The remainder of this paragraph remains the same.

The amendment ordered is not a clerical correction. Accordingly, the time for filing a motion to reopen the record, for a new trial and/or for reconsideration of the court's May 18, 2009 decision, under rules 222, 223 and/or 224, respectively, of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California (Rules of Procedure) and the time for filing a request for review of said decision under rule 301 of the Rules of Procedure will be calculated from the date this order is served on the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 30, 2009


RICHARD A. PLATEL
Judge of the State Bar Court

