




(Do not write above this line.)

**State Bar Court of California**  
**Hearing Department**  
**San Francisco**

Counsel For The State Bar  <b>Manuel Jimenez</b> <b>Office of the Chief Trial Counsel</b> <b>State Bar of California</b> <b>180 Howard Street</b> <b>San Francisco, CA 94105</b>	Case Number (s) <b>05-O-01072; 05-O-02293;</b> <b>05-O-03143; 06-O-10627</b>	(for Court's use)  <div align="center"><b>PUBLIC MATTER</b></div>  <div align="center"><b>FILED</b> </div> <div align="center">APR 09 2008</div> <div align="center">STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</div>
Bar # <b>218234</b> Counsel For Respondent  <b>Vicki H. Young</b> <b>Law Offices of Ephraim Margolin</b> <b>240 Stockton Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor</b> <b>San Francisco, CA 94108</b>	<div align="center"><b>RECEIVED</b></div> <div align="center">MAR 21 2008</div> <div align="center">STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</div>	
Bar # <b>73261</b>	Submitted to: <b>Settlement Judge</b>	
In the Matter Of: <b>Richter Wong Kong</b>  Bar # <b>96937</b>  A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING  <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**.
- (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 consists of **12** pages, not including the order.
- (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.
- (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.
- (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. **Respondent's conduct resulted in his client, Marlyn Toy's case being dismissed for failure to file a complaint within the period of limitations.**
- (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.
- (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. **Respondent has a history of suffering from depression, including during the times of the misconduct. Respondent has entered the L.A.P. program, and will continue to seek therapy with a California Licensed Psychologist, as directed by L.A.P.**
- (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. **See attached, paragraph IV.**
- (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**

## D. Discipline:

(1) ☒ **Stayed Suspension:**

- (a) ☒ Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of **two years**.
- 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 years**, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 9.18, California Rules of Court)

(3) ☒ **Actual Suspension:**

- (a) ☒ Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of **sixty (60) 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.
- (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 checked="" 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 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 321(a)(1) & (c), Rules of Procedure.**
- ☐ No MPRE recommended. Reason: .
- (2) ☐ **Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court:** Respondent must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, 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 9.20, California Rules of Court:** If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 days or more, he/she must comply with the requirements of rule **9.20**, 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 language begins here (if any):

I. Misconduct

*Marlyn Toy Matter (05-O-01072)*

On April 23, 1998, fourteen days before the statute of limitations would run out, complainant Marlyn Toy employed respondent to handle a personal injury matter. Subsequent to getting the file from her previous attorney, respondent failed to file a complaint before the statute of limitations. In and between April 1998 through March 2001, complainant wrote and telephoned respondent numerous times. Respondent failed to respond.

By recklessly failing to perform legal services with competence, respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A). By failing to keep his client reasonably informed of significant developments in a matter in which he had agreed to provide legal services, respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6068(m).

*Villa Randolph Matter (05-O-02293)*

On May 27, 1996, complainant Villa Randolph hired respondent to represent her daughter, Maxine Preston, in a personal injury matter. Mr. Kong had successfully settled the claim of Mitchell Preston, who was also injured in the accident. In and between November 11, 1996 and September, 2000, representatives from the National American Insurance Companies of California ("NAICC") contacted respondent via phone and letter, offering to settle the matter for \$15,000, which represented the policy limits of the policy of the insured. In response to the first offer to settle, respondent informed the representative of NAICC that he wanted to do a background check on the driver/insured to determine his assets. In August 1998, respondent called NAICC and asked if he would need to get a minor's compromise to settle the case. Subsequently, respondent failed to respond to repeated requests to settle the case. Respondent failed to respond to numerous inquiries by the complainant. Respondent ceased working on the case after August 22, 1998, until the complainant contacted the State Bar of California.

By recklessly failing to perform legal services with competence, respondent violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A). By failing, upon termination of employment, to take reasonable steps to avoid foreseeable prejudice to his client, respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2). By failing to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client, in a matter in which respondent agreed to provide legal services, respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

*Beth Hopwood Matter (05-O-03143)*

Respondent represented Peno Nguyen in a personal injury matter. Peno Nguyen filed a worker's compensation claim on his own behalf. In June 2001, respondent settled the personal injury matter for \$5000. In July, 2001 respondent signed a lien with Ward North America ("Ward"), a worker's compensation carrier, and agreed to set aside \$1,380, pending conclusion of Nguyen's worker's compensation case. Ward reduced its lien to \$1,000. In February 2003, the worker's compensation matter concluded. On March 24, 2003, Beth Hopwood, counsel for Ward, sent respondent a copy of the Worker's Compensation Appeals Board judge's order, and requested payment of the lien. Respondent paid Nguyen \$380.38, representing the difference between the amount respondent held and the compromised lien. On April 30, May 13, June 3 and October 1, 2003, Hopwood called respondent and left messages requesting

return telephone calls. Respondent failed to respond. On February 10, July 2 and July 19, 2004, and March 17 and April 14, 2005, Hopwood sent letters to respondent requesting payment of the lien. Respondent did not respond, or pay the lien. On May 16, 2006, Hopwood filed a complaint with the State Bar. On July 14, 2006, respondent sent a check for \$1,000 to Hopwood.

During the period in and between November 2004 and June 2005, respondent failed to transfer earned funds from the CTA, and issued checks drawn upon his CTA to pay personal expenses, and also made three cash withdrawals. By failing to pay promptly, as requested by a client, any funds in Respondent's possession which the client is entitled to receive, respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(4). By depositing or commingling funds belonging to respondent in a bank account labelled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or words of similar import, respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).

## II. Pending Proceedings

The disclosure date referred to on page 1, paragraph A(7), is March 19, 2008. As of this date, there are no other pending proceedings.

## III. Costs of Disciplinary Proceedings

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent (with this stipulation) that as of March 19, 2008, the estimated prosecution costs in this matter or approximately \$5,511.00. Respondent acknowledges that this figure is an estimate only and that it does not include State Bar Court costs which will be included in a final cost assessment. 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.

IV. Financial Difficulties: Respondent has provided documentation that he suffered severe financial difficulties in the years 1997 and 1998, during the time that he committed misconduct in the *Toy* and *Randolph* matters.

## V. Authorities in Support of Discipline

### A. *The Standards*

Standard 1.3 provides that the primary purposes of attorney discipline are, "the protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession, the maintenance of high legal professional standards by attorneys and the preservation of public confidence in the legal profession."

Standard 2.2(b) provides that culpability of a member of the commingling of entrusted funds or property or the commission of another violation of 4-100, Rules of Professional Conduct, none of which offenses result in willful misappropriation of entrusted funds or property shall result in at least a three month actual suspension from the practice of law, irrespective of mitigating circumstances.

Standard 2.4(b) provides, that culpability of a member of willfully failing to perform services in an individual matter or matters not demonstrating a pattern of misconduct or culpability of a member of



willfully failing to communicate with a client shall result in reproof or suspension depending upon the extent of the misconduct and the degree of harm to the client.

Standard 2.6 provides that culpability of a member of a violation of...[Business and Professions Code section 6068]...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.

#### B. Case Law

The Court should also look at case authority in determining the appropriate level of discipline to determine whether the discipline is consistent or disproportional to prior decisions on the same set of facts. *Snyder v. State Bar* (1990) 49 Cal.3d 1302.

In determining the appropriate level of discipline, the court should look to the Standards for Professional Misconduct. In *In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 206, the California Supreme Court stated;

"To determine the appropriate level of discipline ... we... must first look to the standards for guidance. 'These guidelines are not binding on us, but they promote the consistent and uniform application of disciplinary measures. Hence we have said that 'we will not reject a recommendation arising from application of the standards unless we have grave doubts as to the propriety of the recommended discipline.'"

Despite the need to examine cases on an individual basis, it is a goal of disciplinary proceedings that there be consistent recommendations as to discipline, a goal that has been largely achieved through the application of the Standards of Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. (*In the Matter of Marsh* (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 291.)

The standards provide guidance and deserve "great weight." (*In re Morse*, supra, 11 Cal.4th at p. 205; *In re Naney* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 186, 190; *Van Sloten v. State Bar* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 921, 933, fn. 5.) "[A]dherence to the standards in the great majority of cases serves the valuable purpose of eliminating disparity and assuring consistency, that is, the imposition of similar attorney discipline for instances of similar attorney misconduct." (*In re Naney*, supra, 51 Cal.3d at p. 190; see also *In re Brown* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 205, 220.) The California Supreme Court accepts a disciplinary recommendation resulting from application of the standards unless it has "grave doubts" about the recommendation's propriety. (*In re Morse*, supra, 11 Cal.4th at p. 206; *In re Lamb* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 239, 245.)

*Matter of Sullivan* (Review Dept. 1997) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 608. Respondent, with no prior disciplinary record, was suspended for one year, stayed, sixty days actual, and three years probation for failing to communicate with clients in two matters, and of recklessly or repeatedly failing to provide competent legal services in four matters.

In the Matter of  
Richter Kong Wong

Case number(s):  
05-O-01072; 05-O-02293; 05-O-03143; 06-O-10627

## Medical Conditions

- a. ☒ Unless Respondent has been terminated from the Lawyer Assistance Program ("LAP") prior to respondent's successful completion of the LAP, respondent must comply with all provisions and conditions of respondent's Participation Agreement with the LAP and must provide an appropriate waiver authorizing the LAP to provide the Office of Probation and this court with information regarding the terms and conditions of respondent's participation in the LAP and respondent's compliance or non-compliance with LAP requirements. Revocation of the written waiver for release of LAP information is a violation of this condition. However, if respondent has successfully completed the LAP, respondent need not comply with this condition.

- b. ☐ Respondent must obtain psychiatric or psychological help/treatment from a duly licensed psychiatrist, psychologist, or clinical social worker at respondent's own expense a minimum of        times per month and must furnish evidence to the Office of Probation that respondent is so complying with each quarterly report. Help/treatment should commence immediately, and in any event, no later than thirty (30) days after the effective date of the discipline in this matter. Treatment must continue for        d days or months or        years or, the period of probation or until a motion to modify this condition is granted and that ruling becomes final.

If the treating psychiatrist, psychologist, or clinical social worker determines that there has been a substantial change in respondent's condition, respondent or Office of the Chief Trial Counsel may file a motion for modification of this condition with the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court, pursuant to rule 550 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar. The motion must be supported by a written statement from the psychiatrist, psychologist, or clinical social worker, by affidavit or under penalty of perjury, in support of the proposed modification.

- c. ☐ Upon the request of the Office of Probation, respondent must provide the Office of Probation with medical waivers and access to all of respondent's medical records. Revocation of any medical waiver is a violation of this condition. Any medical records obtained by the Office of Probation are confidential and no information concerning them or their contents will be given to anyone except members of the Office of Probation, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel, and the State Bar Court, who are directly involved with maintaining, enforcing or adjudicating this condition.


Other:

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of <b>Richter Wong Kong</b>	Case number(s): <b>05-O-01072; 05-O-02293; 05-O-03143; 06-O-10627</b>
--	--

### 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 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

_____ Date	_____ Respondent's Signature	<u>Richter Wong Kong</u> Print Name
_____ Date	_____ Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u>Vicki H. Young</u> Print Name
<u>3-21-08</u> Date	 Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Manuel Jimenez</u> Print Name

In the Matter of <b>Richter Wong Kong</b>	Case number(s): <b>05-O-01072; 05-O-02293; 05-O-03143; 06-O-10627</b>
--	--

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 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

Richter Wong Kong  
Print Name

Respondent's Counsel Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

(Do not write above this line.)

**In the Matter of  
Richter Wong Kong****Case number(s):  
05-O-01072; 05-O-02293; 05-O-03143; 06-O-10627****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 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.


3-21-08

Date


3/21/08

Date

Date



Respondent's Signature



Respondent's Counsel Signature

Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

Richter Wong Kong

Print Name

Vicki H. Young

Print Name

Manuel Jimenez

Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter Of  <b>Richter Wong Kong</b>	Case Number(s):  <b>05-0-01072; 05-0-02293; 05-0-03143; 06-0-10627</b>
--	--

**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 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)**

4-7-08  
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 San Francisco, on April 9, 2008, 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 San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

**VICKI HUI-WEN YOUNG  
240 STOCKTON ST #400  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108 - 5306**

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

**MANUEL JIMENEZ, Enforcement, San Francisco**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on **April 9, 2008**.



---

**Bernadette C. O. Molina**  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court