



(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California
Hearing Department
San Francisco

<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Susan I. Kagan Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2037</p> <p>Bar # 214209</p>	<p>Case Number (s) 06-C-14515</p>	<p>(for Court's use)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PUBLIC MATTER</p> <p style="text-align: center;">FILED <i>R</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">AUG 03 2007</p> <p style="text-align: center;">STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</p>
<p>Counsel For Respondent</p> <p>Jerome Fishkin Fishkin & Slatter, LLP 1111 Civic Drive, Suite 215 Walnut Creek, CA 94596</p> <p>Bar # 47798</p>	<p>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</p>	
<p>In the Matter Of: Michael T. Meehan</p> <p>Bar # 178402</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>	<p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p>PUBLIC REPROVAL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p>	

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 3, 1995**.
- (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 **8** 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):
- costs added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline (public reproof)
 - case ineligible for costs (private reproof)
 - costs to be paid in equal amounts 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
- (9) The parties understand that:
- (a) A private reproof imposed on a respondent as a result of a stipulation approved by the Court prior to initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, but is not disclosed in response to public inquiries and is not reported on the State Bar's web page. The record of the proceeding in which such a private reproof was imposed is not available to the public except as part of the record of any subsequent proceeding in which it is introduced as evidence of a prior record of discipline under the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.
 - (b) A private reproof imposed on a respondent after initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.
 - (c) A public reproof imposed on a respondent is publicly available as part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.

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.
- (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) **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.

- (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) **Private reproof (check applicable conditions, if any, below)**
- (a) Approved by the Court prior to initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (no public disclosure).
- (b) Approved by the Court after initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (public disclosure).

or

- (2) **Public reproof (Check applicable conditions, if any, below)**

E. Conditions Attached to Reproval:

- (1) Respondent must comply with the conditions attached to the reproof for a period of **one (1) year**.
- (2) During the condition period attached to the reproof, 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 condition period attached to the reproof. 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 the reproof 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 (thirty) days, that report must be submitted on the next following 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 condition period and no later than the last day of the condition period.

- (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 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 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 conditions attached to the reprobation.
- (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) 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 of the effective date of the reprobation.

No MPRE recommended. Reason: **The protection of the public and the interests of the respondent do not require passage of the MPRE in this case.**

- (11) 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 |

F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

Attachment language (if any):

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Facts

In 2005, respondent became licensed to practice law in the State of Tennessee. Respondent resided in Tennessee from 2005 through 2006.

Prior to March 2006, respondent was appointed as defense counsel to represent Tammy Jarrett in the criminal matter *State of Tennessee v. Tammy Jarrett*, Washington County Criminal Court Case No. 31930. The *Jarrett* matter was scheduled for a hearing re: plea deadline on April 4, 2006, before the Honorable Lynn W. Brown. Respondent was aware of the April 4, 2006 hearing.

Prior to April 4, 2006, respondent moved from Tennessee to Arizona. Respondent notified the judges and clerks in Washington County and provided them his new Arizona address. He began making motions to withdraw in his cases.

On April 4, 2006, respondent failed to appear at the hearing on behalf of Ms. Jarrett. At the hearing, Ms. Jarrett advised the Court that she had heard respondent moved to Arizona, but had no communication with respondent.

On April 6, 2006, Judge Brown sent a letter to respondent requesting respondent to explain in writing his "apparent neglect of [his] client." The letter was sent to respondent's Washington County address.

On April 21, 2006, having received no response to his April 6, 2006 letter, Judge Brown cited respondent for contempt of court in relation to respondent's failure to appear on behalf of Ms. Jarrett at the hearing on April 4, 2006, *State of Tennessee v. Meehan*, Washington County Criminal Court Case No. 32446. On the same date, the Court issued a capias/bench warrant against respondent.

On April 25, 2006, respondent sent a letter of apology to Judge Brown.

On May 3, 2006, the Court recalled the capias/bench warrant and issued a criminal summons against respondent. Respondent was ordered to appear in court on June 20, 2006. On June 20, 2006, respondent failed to appear in court. Although respondent's counsel appeared at the June 20, 2006 hearing, respondent was unable to appear due to childcare problems. On the same date, the Court issued another capias/bench warrant against respondent.

On July 7, 2006, respondent appeared before the Court and the Court recalled the capias/bench warrant. On the same date, respondent pled guilty to a violation of Tennessee Code Annotated section 29-9-102 [contempt of court], a misdemeanor, due to the initial failure to appear on April 4, 2006.

On December 11, 2006, respondent was sentenced to ten days of probation and assessed a \$50 fine.

Conclusions of Law

By failing to appear on behalf of his client at the April 4, 2006 hearing, respondent violated Tennessee Code Annotated section 29-9-102. By violating T.C.A. 29-9-102, respondent failed to support the law in willful violation of section 6068(a) of the Business and Professions Code.

By failing to appear at the June 20, 2006 hearing after being ordered to do so by the Court, respondent violated an order of the court requiring him to do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of his profession, which he ought in good faith to do or forbear, in willful violation of section 6103 Business and Professions Code.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS

The disclosure date referred to on page two, paragraph A (7) was July 11, 2007.

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.

SUPPORTING AUTHORITY

Standard 3.4 provides that the final conviction of a member of a crime which does not involve moral turpitude inherently or in the facts and circumstances surrounding the crime's commission but which does involve other misconduct warranting discipline shall result in a sanction as prescribed under part B of these standards appropriate to the nature and extent of the misconduct found to have been committed by the member.

Standard 2.6(a) requires violations of Business and Professions Code sections 6068 and 6103 shall result in disbarment or suspension depending on the gravity of the offense or harm, if any, to the victim, with due regard to the purpose of imposing discipline set forth in standard 1.3.

Based on the mitigation in this matter and the lack of aggravating circumstances, a public reproof is the appropriate level of discipline. (See *In the Matter of Respondent X* (Review Dept. 1997) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 592.)

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

Standard 1.2(e)(i). Respondent has been in practice since December 3, 1995, and has no prior record of discipline.

Standard 1.2(e)(iii). Based on respondent's relocation to Arizona, the Court discharged respondent from the *Jarrett* matter on April 4, 2006. There was no harm to the client.

Standard 1.2(e)(iv). Respondent was required to move hastily from Tennessee due to increased hostility towards him and his family based on his sexual orientation.

Standard 1.2(e)(v). Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation to the State Bar during the proceedings.

Standard 1.2(e)(vii). Respondent displayed remorse for his misconduct.

The Court imposed a \$50 fine on respondent. The lenient sentence is entitled to some mitigation weight. (See *In the Matter of Meza* (Review Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 608, 613.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of Michael T. Meehan	Case number(s): 06-C-14515
--	--------------------------------------

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.

7/27/07

Date



Respondent's Signature

Michael T. Meehan

Print Name

7/30/07

Date



Respondent's Counsel Signature

Jerome Fishkin

Print Name

8/1/07

Date



Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

Susan I. Kagan

Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter Of Michael T. Meehan	Case Number(s): 06-C-14515
--	--------------------------------------

ORDER

Finding that the stipulation protects the public and that the interests of Respondent will be served by any conditions attached to the reproval, 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 REPROVAL IMPOSED.
- The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the REPROVAL IMPOSED.
- All court dates in the Hearing Department 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 125(b), Rules of Procedure.) **Otherwise the stipulation shall be effective 15 days after service of this order.**

Failure to comply with any conditions attached to this reproval may constitute cause for a separate proceeding for willful breach of rule 1-110, Rules of Professional Conduct.

August 3, 2007
Date

Pat McElroy
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 August 3, 2007, 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:

**JEROME FISHKIN
FISHKIN & SLATTER LLP
1111 CIVIC DR STE 215
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596**

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

SUSAN I. KAGAN, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on **August 3, 2007**.



Bernadette C. O. Molina
Case Administrator
State Bar Court