


(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles DISBARMENT			PUBLIC MATTER
<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Mia R. Ellis Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 South Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015 213-765-1380</p> <p>Bar # 228235</p>	<p>Case Number(s): 06-C-15477 - RAP 07-O-10099 10-N-11171</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <div style="text-align: center; padding: 10px;"> <p>FILED</p> <p>AUG 31 2012</p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"> <p>kwiktag® 152 141 646</p>  </div>	
<p>Counsel For Respondent</p> <p>Burke W. Willsey 9741 Wheatland Avenue #2 Shadow Hills, CA 91040 818-273-9449</p> <p>Bar # 68510</p>	<p>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING; ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT</p>		
<p>In the Matter of: Daniel Patrick Willsey</p> <p>Bar # 143772</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>	<p>DISBARMENT</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 11, 1989.
- (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 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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 to be awarded to the State Bar.
 - Costs are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs".
 - Costs are entirely waived.
- (9) ORDER OF INACTIVE ENROLLMENT:
The parties are aware that if this stipulation is approved, the judge will issue an order of inactive enrollment under Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), and Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, rule 5.111(D)(1).

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**
- (a) State Bar Court case # of prior case 99-H-10199
 - (b) Date prior discipline effective September 24, 1999
 - (c) Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: Business and Professions Code Section 6103 and Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 1-110.
 - (d) Degree of prior discipline Nine (9) months suspension, stayed, two (2) years probation
 - (e) If respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below:

State Bar Case numbers 97-C-12009 and 98-O-01477, effective date: June 10, 1998, for violations of Business and Professions Code Section 6068(l), arising from Respondent's failure to comply with conditions of his Agreement in Lieu of Discipline and 6068(a), arising from Respondent's conviction for violating Vehicle Code sections 16028(a) (proof of financial responsibility) and 23103 (reckless driving) in relation to an alcohol related motor vehicle stop. Degree of discipline was one (1) year private reproof.
- (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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. See Stipulation Attachment at page 10.
- (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. See Stipulation Attachment at page 11.
- (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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:

See Stipulation Attachment at page 11.

D. Discipline: Disbarment.

E. Additional Requirements:

- (1) **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.
- (2) **Restitution:** Respondent must make restitution to _____ in the amount of \$ _____ plus 10 percent interest per year from _____. If the Client Security Fund has reimbursed _____ for all or any portion of the principal amount, respondent must pay restitution to CSF of the amount paid plus applicable interest and costs in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5. Respondent must pay the above restitution and furnish satisfactory proof of payment to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles no later than _____ days from the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this case.
- (3) **Other:**

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: Daniel P. Willsey
CASE NUMBER(S): 06-C-15477, 07-O-10099, 10-N-11171

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.

Case No. 06-C-15477 (Conviction Proceedings)

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND IN CONVICTION PROCEEDING:

1. This is a proceeding pursuant to sections 6101 and 6102 of the Business and Professions Code and rule 9.10 of the California Rules of Court.
2. On December 23, 2009, Respondent was convicted of violating California Penal Code Section 191.5(a) [gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated], a felony.
3. On June 11, 2010, the Review Department of the State Bar Court issued an order pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6102 that Respondent be suspended from the practice of law effective June 25, 2010, pending final disposition of this disciplinary matter. The Review Department further ordered that Respondent comply with rule 9.20 of the California Rules of Court. Respondent has remained on interim suspension since June 25, 2010.
4. On or about April 6, 2011, the Review Department of the State Bar Court issued an order referring the matter to the Hearing Department pursuant to rule 9.10(a) of the California Rules of Court, for a hearing and decision recommending discipline to be imposed in the event that the Hearing Department finds that the facts and circumstances surrounding Respondent's felony conviction involved moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline.

FACTS:

5. On November 14, 2006, Sheriff's Deputy William J. Hudnall (Deputy Hudnall) was driving west-bound on Highway 178 in Kern County, California, along with a passenger, Grace Brown ("Brown"). Respondent was driving east bound on Highway 178.
6. Respondent's vehicle crossed into the oncoming traffic lane.
7. Deputy Hudnall's 2003 Ford Explorer was hit head-on by the eastbound vehicle driven by Respondent.

8. Deputy Hudnall's vehicle went over an embankment and he died at the scene.
9. Brown was injured.
10. During the course of the investigation it was determined that Respondent was under the influence of a controlled substance, amphetamine/cocaine. In an inventory search of the Respondent's vehicle, a small bundle of methamphetamine was located in Respondent's day planner. A loaded and cocked 12 gage shotgun was also found in Respondent's vehicle.
11. On June 14, 2007, Kern County District Attorney's office filed an Information alleging that the Respondent, on November 14, 2006, committed the following crimes:
 - a. Count one: unlawfully killing Deputy Hudnall without malice aforethought in violation of Vehicle Code Section 23152 or 23153, a felony, and the killing was the proximate result of an or act of passing in the opposite lane in an unsafe manner in violation of Penal Code section 191.5(A), a felony, and with the enhancement that Respondent caused bodily injury to Brown, in violation of California Vehicle Code section 23558;
 - b. Count two: willfully and unlawfully and while under the influence of alcohol or drug drive a vehicle and in so driving did an act forbidden by law or neglect in violation of Vehicle Code section 21751, passing in the opposite land in an unsafe manner, which proximately caused bodily injury to Deputy Hudnall, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23153(a), a felony and with the enhancements that Respondent caused bodily injury to Brown, in violation of California Vehicle Code section 23558 and great bodily injury to Deputy Hudnall within the meaning of Penal Code section 12022.7 and also causing the above offense to be a serious felony within the meaning of Penal Code section 1192.7(C)(8);
 - c. Count three: willfully and unlawfully transport, import into the State of California, sell, furnish, administer, or give away, or offer to transport, import into the State of California, sell, furnish, administer, or give away, or attempt to import into the State of California a controlled substance: methamphetamine in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11379(a), a felony, with the enhancement that he was personally armed with a firearm during the commission of the offense, within the meaning of Penal Code Section 12022(C);
 - d. County four: willfully and unlawfully possess a substance containing methamphetamine while armed with a loaded, operable firearm in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11370.1(a), a felony;
 - e. Count five: willfully and unlawfully have in his immediate possession an operable, loaded firearm, short-barreled shotgun while unlawfully under the influence of methamphetamine in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11550(E), a felony.

- f. Count six: willfully and unlawfully manufacture or cause to be manufactured, import into the State of California, keep for sale, or offer or expose for sale, or give, lend or possess an instrument or weapon of the kind commonly known as a short-barreled shotgun in violation of Penal Code section 12020(A)(1), a felony;
 - g. Count seven: willfully and unlawfully possess a loaded firearm which was capable of being concealed upon his person while not being listed with the Department of Justice as the registered owner of that firearm, in violation of Penal Code section 12025(B)(6), a felony.
- 8. On December 23, 2009, Respondent pled nolo contendere to Count One, a violation Penal Code section 191.5, gross vehicular manslaughter while intoxicated, a felony. All other charges were dismissed.
 - 9. Respondent was sentenced to six years in state prison. He was further ordered to make restitution to Carrie Hudnall, Deputy Hudnall's wife, Brown, and Kern County Sheriff's Department for their losses incurred.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

- 10. The facts and circumstances surrounding the above-described violation(s) involved moral turpitude.

Case No. 07-O-10099 (State Bar Investigation)

FACTS:

- 11. From July 1, 2006 to December 29, 2006, Respondent was the authorized signatory on his client trust account (CTA) at City National Bank, identified as account number xxxxx3746.¹
- 12. During the aforementioned period, Respondent held in his CTA funds for his clients, including advances for fees, costs, and expenses.
- 13. On September 4, 2006, Respondent issued check number 2114, in the amount of \$300, which was drawn against funds in the CTA, to Dewey Davido for body work concerning an automobile described as "2000 Sebring."
- 14. On September 11, 2006, Respondent deposited check number 097, a check for advance fees from client Glen F. Casaburi, into his CTA. The check was returned for insufficient funds. After September 29, 2006, Respondent did not maintain client trust account ledgers for his clients, maintain a written account journal for his CTA, or reconcile his CTA. From October 2, 2006 to October 13, 2006, Respondent issued five (5) checks that were returned and unpaid, due to insufficient funds in the CTA.
- 15. On September 22, 2006, Respondent issued check number 2117, in the amount of \$150, which was drawn against funds in the CTA, to the My Way Lounge, a sports bar.

¹ The complete account number has been omitted due to privacy concerns.

16. From September 23, 2006 to September 28, 2006, Respondent issued five checks, drawn against funds in the CTA, to Vons, a grocery store.
17. On October 2, 2006, Respondent issued check number 2127 in the amount of \$130.21, which was drawn against funds in the CTA, to Rosemont Pet Hospital.
18. On October 5, 2006, Respondent issued check number 2131 in the amount of \$31.44, which was drawn against funds in the CTA, to Ralphs, a grocery store.
19. None of the aforementioned checks were issued on behalf of a client or in connection with a client matter. Rather, they were issued for Respondent's personal expenses.
20. On January 11, 2007, the State Bar opened an investigation, case number 07-O-10099.
21. On February 13, 2007 and March 6, 2007, a State Bar investigator wrote to Respondent regarding the subject CTA checks. The letters were sent to Respondent's State Bar membership records address at the time. The letters were not returned by the United States Postal Service for any reason. Respondent received the letters but did not respond.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

22. By issuing checks drawn against funds in the CTA for personal expenses, Respondent commingled funds in a trust account, in wilful violation of rule 4-100(A) of the California Rules of Professional Conduct.
23. By failing to maintain client trust account ledgers for his clients after September 29, 2006, by failing to maintain a written account journal for his CTA at any time after September 29, 2006, and by failing to maintain monthly reconciliations of his CTA after September 29, 2006, Respondent failed to maintain, and to preserve for five years from final appropriate disposition, complete records of all client funds coming into Respondent's possession, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(3).
24. By failing to provide a written response to the State Bar as requested, Respondent willfully failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent in violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(i).

Case No. 10-N-11171 (State Bar Investigation)

FACTS:

25. On June 11, 2010, the Review Department of the State Bar Court of the State of California filed a suspension order in case No. 06-C-15477, effective June 25, 2010 (hereinafter "June 11, 2010, 9.20 Order"). The June 11, 2010, 9.20 Order included a requirement that Respondent comply with rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, by performing the acts specified in subdivisions(a) and (c) within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of Respondent's suspension order. The Review

Department properly served upon Respondent a copy of the June 11, 2010, 9.20 Order. Respondent received the Order.

26. On August 5, 2010, Respondent filed a motion to continue time for compliance with the Order. On August 6, 2010, the State Bar filed a non-opposition.
27. On August 23, 2010, the Review Department granted Respondent's motion. Respondent was ordered to comply with rule 9.20 by performing the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of the August 23, 2010 Order. The Review Department properly served upon Respondent a copy of the August 23, 2010, Order.
28. On September 23, 2010, Respondent filed a motion for further order to continue time for compliance with the 9.20 Order. The State Bar did not oppose the motion.
29. On October 12, 2010, the Review Department granted Respondent's motion. Respondent was ordered to comply with rule 9.20, by performing the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) within 30 days after the effective date of the October 12, 2010, 9.20 Order. Respondent received the Order.
30. The Review Department's October 12, 2010, 9.20 Order became effective on November 11, 2010, thirty days after the order was filed.
31. On January 3, 2011, Respondent's Counsel, Burke Willsey, filed a declaration with the Court that Respondent mailed him an executed copy of the 9.20 compliance declaration but Burke Willsey delayed filing it with the Court until certified mail receipts were returned indicating that the parties had received the notices.
32. On January 3, 2011, the 9.20 compliance declaration was filed with the Court.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

33. By failing to file a declaration of compliance with rule 9.20 in conformity with the requirements of rule 9.20(c), Respondent failed to timely comply with the provisions of the Review Department's October 12, 2010 9.20 Order, requiring compliance with Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court.

AGGRAVATION AND MITIGATION

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Prior Record of Discipline: This is discussed on page two of the Stipulation. Prior discipline is an aggravating factor. (Standard 1.2(b)(i).)

Harm: Standard 1.2(b)(iv) applies as Respondent's misconduct resulted in the death of Deputy Hudnall and injury to Brown, as well as at the irreparable damage to the lives of the victims' family and friends.

Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: The misconduct stipulated herein constitutes multiple acts as there are three matters with multiple acts of misconduct. However, this misconduct does not constitute a pattern. Standard 1.2(b)(ii) (See *Bledsoe v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1074 [defining pattern of misconduct].)

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Pre-trial Stipulation: Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into a full stipulation with the Office of Chief Trial Counsel prior to the trial, thereby saving State Bar Court time and resources. (*In re Downey* (2009) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 151, 156; *In the Matter of Van Sickle* (Rev. Dept. 2006) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 980, 993-994). However, the facts in the matters could have been proven by documentary evidence. Also, Respondent's cooperation is tempered by the fact that he did not provide a written response to the State Bar during the investigation of case number 07-O-10099. Thus, Respondent's cooperation is entitled to some, but not great, weight in mitigation.

DISMISSALS

In case number 07-O-10099, the parties respectfully request the Court to dismiss Count Two, Business and Professions Code Section 6106.

DISCUSSION OF AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

The Court looks first to the Standards when setting discipline; the Standards are to be given great weight and followed whenever possible. (*In re Silvertown* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 81, 91-92; *In the Matter of Sullivan* (Rev. Dept. 2010) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 189, 195.) Where there are two or more acts of misconduct in a single proceeding, and different sanctions apply, the sanction imposed shall be the more or most severe of the different applicable sanctions. (Standard 1.6(a).)

A number of the Standards apply to the misconduct in these matters, all of which call for disbarment: 1.7(b), 2.6, 3.2, and California Rule 9.20. Respondent has two prior records of discipline, at least one involving alcohol (State Bar case number 99-H-10199 and 98-O-01477), and a history of violating probation conditions (State Bar case number 99-H-10199 and 97-C-12009). There is no evidence of compelling mitigation to justify deviating from the Standards. While Respondent's cooperation is entitled to some weight in mitigation, in balancing the misconduct and factors in aggravation, the parties submit that disbarment is the appropriate to the nature and extent of the misconduct committed by Respondent and is adequate to protect the public, courts and the legal profession.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(7), was August 22, 2012.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.




Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of August 22, 2012, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$6,988.40. 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Daniel Patrick Willsey	Case number(s): 06-C-15477; 07-O-10099; and 10-N-11171
---	---

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.

<u>8/24/2012</u> Date	<u></u> Respondent's Signature	<u>Daniel P. Willsey</u> Print Name
<u>8/24/2012</u> Date	<u></u> Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u>Burke Willsey</u> Print Name
<u>8/24/12</u> Date	<u></u> Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Mia R. Ellis</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Daniel Patrick Willsey	Case Number(s): 06-C-15477; 07-O-10099; 10-N-11171
---	---

DISBARMENT 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 ~~with~~ ^{DFM} 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 5.58(E) & (F), 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.)**

Respondent _____ is ordered transferred to involuntary inactive status pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4). Respondent's inactive enrollment will be effective three (3) calendar days after this order is served by mail and will terminate upon the effective date of the Supreme Court's order imposing discipline herein, or as provided for by rule 5.111(D)(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, or as otherwise ordered by the Supreme Court pursuant to its plenary jurisdiction.

Date

8/29/12

Judge of the State Bar Court

DONALD F. MILES

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); 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 August 31, 2012, 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 Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

BURKE W. WILLSEY
9741 WHEATLAND AVE # 2
SHADOW HILLS, CA 91040

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

Mia R. Ellis, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on August 31, 2012.



Johnnie Lee Smith
Case Administrator
State Bar Court