



ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles		
Counsel For The State Bar Christine Souhrada Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 South Hill St. Los Angeles, CA 90015 Telephone: (213) 765-1162 Bar # 228256	Case Number (s) 06-O-11475	(for Court's use) <div style="text-align: center;">  FILED FEB 15 2007 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div>
In Pro Per Respondent James Joseph Mazzeo 6735 Edmonton Avenue San Diego, CA 92122 Telephone: (619) 913-2707 Bar # 108077	<h2 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC MATTER</h2>	
In the Matter Of: James Joseph Mazzeo Bar # 108077 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	Submitted to: Assigned Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING PUBLIC REPROVAL <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 **June 3, 1983**.
- (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 **11** 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."

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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: **two billing cycles following effective date of the Supreme Court order.**
(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.

(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. **Due to Respondent's failure to perform, including respondent's failure to appear at trial, a default judgment in the amount of \$620,193 was entered against Respondent's client, McIntyre. McIntyre had to retain another attorney to have the default judgment set aside.**
- (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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:

Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice.

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 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 reproof.
- (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 reproof.
 - No MPRE recommended. Reason: .
- (11) The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
 - Substance Abuse Conditions Law Office Management Conditions
 - Medical Conditions Financial Conditions

F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

In the Matter of
JAMES JOSEPH MAZZEO
Bar No.: 108077

Case number(s):
06-O-11475

A Member of the State Bar

Law Office Management Conditions

- a. Within **60** days/ months/ years of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must develop a law office management/organization plan, which must be approved by the Office of Probation. This plan must include procedures to (1) send periodic reports to clients; (2) document telephone messages received and sent; (3) maintain files; (4) meet deadlines; (5) withdraw as attorney, whether of record or not, when clients cannot be contacted or located; (6) train and supervise support personnel; and (7) address any subject area or deficiency that caused or contributed to Respondent's misconduct in the current proceeding.
- b. Within days/ months/**one** years of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of no less than **6** hours of Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) approved courses in law office management, ~~attorney-client relations and/or general legal ethics~~. This requirement is separate from any MCLE requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for attending these courses (Rule 3201, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.)
- c. Within 30 days of the effective date of the discipline, Respondent must join the Law Practice Management and Technology Section of the State Bar of California and pay the dues and costs of enrollment for year(s). Respondent must furnish satisfactory evidence of membership in the section to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California in the first report required.

In the Matter of
JAMES JOSEPH MAZZEO
Bar No.: 108077

Case number(s),
06-O-11475

A Member of the State Bar

NOLO CONTENDERE PLEA TO STIPULATION AS TO FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

Bus. & Prof. Code § 6085.5 Disciplinary Charges; Pleas to Allegations

There are three kinds of pleas to the allegations of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges or other pleading which initiates a disciplinary proceeding against a member:

- (a) Admission of culpability.
- (b) Denial of culpability.
- (c) **Nolo contendere, subject to the approval of the State Bar Court. The court shall ascertain whether the member completely understands that a plea of nolo contendere shall be considered the same as an admission of culpability and that, upon a plea of nolo contendere, the court shall find the member culpable. The legal effect of such a plea shall be the same as that of an admission of culpability for all purposes, except that the plea and any admission required by the court during any inquiry it makes as to the voluntariness of, or the factual basis for, the pleas, may not be used against the member as an admission in any civil suit based upon or growing out of the act upon which the disciplinary proceeding is based. (Added by Stats. 1996, ch. 1104.) (emphasis supplied)**

Rule 133, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California STIPULATION AS TO FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

(a) A proposed stipulation as to facts, conclusions of law, and disposition must set forth each of the following:

- (5) a statement that Respondent either
 - (i) admits the facts set forth in the stipulation are true and that he or she is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct or
 - (ii) **pleads nolo contendere to those facts and violations. If the Respondent pleads nolo contendere, the stipulation shall include each of the following:**
 - (a) **an acknowledgement that the Respondent completely understands that the plea of nolo contendere shall be considered the same as an admission of the stipulated facts and of his or her culpability of the statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct specified in the stipulation; and**
 - (b) **if requested by the Court, a statement by the Deputy Trial Counsel that the factual stipulations are supported by evidence obtained in the State Bar investigation of the matter (emphasis supplied)**

I, the Respondent in this matter, have read the applicable provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code § 6085.5 and rule 133(a)(5) of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California. I plead nolo contendere to the charges set forth in this stipulation and I completely understand that my plea must be considered the same as an admission of culpability except as state in Business and Professions Code section 6085.5(c).

Date 1-30-07

Signature



JAMES J. MAZZEO

Print Name

(Nolo Contendere Plea form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/22/1997. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)

Attachment to Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition
in the Matter of James J. Mazzeo
Case no. 06-O-11475

I. Facts and Conclusions of Law:

Facts:

1. On August 19, 2003, Anthony Bieggar and Rosa Bieggar (the "Bieggars") filed a civil lawsuit against, *inter alia*, Daniel McIntyre ("McIntyre"). In December 2003, McIntyre hired Respondent to represent him in Bieggar v. McIntyre, and paid him \$2,000 in advanced fees and costs.

2. On January 16, 2004, Respondent appeared on behalf of McIntyre at a Case Management Conference in Bieggar v. McIntyre and was added by the Superior Court as McIntyre's attorney of record. The Superior Court set a further case management conference for February 23, 2004.

3. On February 19, 2004, the Superior Court on its own motion continued the further case management conference in Bieggar v. McIntyre, as well as a number of other matters set for February 23, 2004, to March 8, 2004. The Superior Court gave telephonic notice to counsel, including Respondent.

4. On March 8, 2004, Respondent failed to appear for the case management conference in Bieggar v. McIntyre. The Superior Court set a further case management conference for July 15, 2004. Respondent failed to appear for the July 15, 2004 case management conference and another case management conference was set for July 28, 2004. An attorney appeared on behalf of Respondent at this July 28, 2004, case management conference. However, on August 27, 2004, Respondent failed to appear for the trial setting conference.

5. In January or February 2005, Respondent and McIntyre discussed Bieggar v. McIntyre, which was the only discussion they had about the matter. Respondent did not provide any specific information about it, its status, or future hearings.

6. Respondent also failed to appear for the Mandatory Settlement Conference, set for September 2, 2005. Prior to the MSC, the Bieggars settled their claims against a number of defendants. During the MSC, the Bieggars settled their claims against the remaining defendants, except McIntyre.

7. Respondent failed to appear for the pre-trial conference, which was set for September 15, 2005. Respondent also failed to appear for the jury trial set for September 19, 2005 and the matter proceeded as a default against McIntyre. After receiving testimony and evidence from the Bieggars, the Superior Court found McIntyre committed fraud and intentional misrepresentation in the sale of his residence and entered a judgment against McIntyre in the amount of \$620,193.

8. On October 22, 2005, counsel for the Bieggars filed and served on Respondent a "Judgment After Trial" setting forth the decision of the Superior Court that McIntyre committed fraud and intentional misrepresentation in the sale of his residence and gave the Bieggars judgment against McIntyre in the amount of \$620,193. On November 10, 2005, counsel for the Bieggars filed and served a "Notice of Entry of Judgment".

9. In late November 2005, McIntyre received a notice of judgment from the Superior Court that judgment had been entered against him in *Bieggar v. McIntyre* in the amount of \$620,193.

10. Upon receipt of the notice of judgment, McIntyre called Respondent's office and discovered that Respondent's office telephone number had been disconnected. McIntyre then contacted the building where Respondent's office had been located and was told that Respondent no longer had an office there.

11. In late November or early December 2005, McIntyre obtained Respondent's cellular telephone number from the person who referred him to Respondent, Ken Angel ("Angel"). McIntyre called the cellular telephone number for approximately one week and left approximately 20 messages on Respondent's voice message system for Respondent to call McIntyre to discuss the judgment. Angel, who was able to speak with Respondent, told McIntyre that Respondent received the messages; however, Respondent did not respond to McIntyre's messages or otherwise communicate with McIntyre.

12. McIntyre hired Thomas V. Pratt ("Pratt") to represent him in *Bieggar v. McIntyre* in early December 2005 and Pratt filed a Substitution of Attorney.

13. On February 15, 2006, Pratt filed a Motion to Set Aside Default and Judgment, which was granted by the Superior Court on or about March 16, 2006 due to "[Respondent's] abandonment."

14. Respondent did not inform McIntyre that Respondent closed or moved his office, or that he had disconnected or changed his telephone number.

15. On November 22, 2005, McIntyre filed a complaint against Respondent with the State Bar ("the McIntyre complaint"), and on November 28, 2005, the State Bar opened investigation number 06-O-11475 concerning the McIntyre complaint. On July 6, 2006 and August 24, 2006, a State Bar Investigator ("Investigator") prepared letters to Respondent regarding the McIntyre complaint. The letters requested that Respondent respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the McIntyre complaint. Respondent did not respond to the Investigator's letters or otherwise communicate with the State Bar.

Legal Conclusions:

16. By failing to perform the services for which he was hired, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

17. By failing to respond to the approximately 20 messages left by McIntyre for Respondent to call McIntyre in November and/or December 2005 to discuss the judgment, Respondent willfully failed to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(m).

18. By failing to inform McIntyre that a MSC, pre-trial conference and jury trial had been set for March 2005; the MSC, pre-trial conference and jury trial had been continued to September 2005; numerous defendants had settled with the Bieggars; default had been entered against McIntyre; judgment against McIntyre had been entered; Respondent closed or moved his office; or Respondent disconnected or changed his telephone number, Respondent failed to keep a client reasonably informed of significant developments in a matter in which Respondent had agreed to provide legal services in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(m)

19. By failing to communicate with McIntyre and take any action to defend McIntyre after July 28, 2004, Respondent willfully failed upon termination of employment to take reasonable steps to avoid reasonably foreseeable prejudice to his client in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2).

20. By failing to appear for the case management conferences on March 8, 2004 and July 15, 2004; trial setting conference on August 27, 2004; MSC on September 2, 2005; pre-trial conference on September 15, 2005; and trial on September 19, 2005, Respondent willfully disobeyed or violated an order of the court requiring him to do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of Respondent's profession which he ought in good faith to do or forbear in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6103.

21. By not providing a written response to the allegations in the McIntyre complaint or otherwise cooperating in the investigation of the McIntyre complaint, Respondent willfully failed to cooperate in a disciplinary investigation in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(i).

II. Supporting Authority:

Standard 2.4(b) of the Standards For Attorney Sanctions For Professional Misconduct states:

“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.”

Recently, the Supreme Court emphasized the importance of the Standards and held that great weight should be given to the application of the Standards in determining the appropriate level of discipline. The Court indicated that unless it has “grave doubts as to the propriety of the recommended discipline,” it will uphold the application of the Standards. *In re Silverton* (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 81, 91-92.

III. Estimate of Costs:


Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of January 17, 2007, the estimated prosecution costs in this matter are approximately \$2296.00. 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of JAMES JOSEPH MAZZEO Bar No.: 108077	Case number(s): 06-O-11475
---	-------------------------------

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.

<u>1-24-07</u> Date	 Respondent's Signature	<u>JAMES JOSEPH MAZZEO</u> Print Name
<u>2/7/07</u> Date	 Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>CHRISTINE SOUHRADA</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter Of JAMES JOSEPH MAZZEO Bar No.: 108077	Case Number(s): 06-O-11475
---	-------------------------------

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.

2-13-07
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 Los Angeles, on February 15, 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:


- [X] by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

**JAMES JOSEPH MAZZEO
6735 EDMONTON AVE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122**

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

Christine Ann Souhrada, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **February 15, 2007.**



Milagro del R. Salmeron
Case Administrator
State Bar Court