State Bar Court of California **Hearing Department** PUBLIC MATTER Los Angeles Counsel For The State Bar (for Court's use) Case Number (s) 06-O-12280 William F. Stralka **Deputy Trial Counsel** State Bar of California 1149 South Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299 (213) 765 1091 APR 30 2008 Bar # 56147 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE In Pro Per Respondent LOS ANGELES Paul Robert Markley 2790 Skypark Drive #106 Torrance, CA 90505 (310) 325 4004 Submitted to: Assigned Judge Bar # 102784 STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND In the Matter Of: DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING Paul Robert Markley **ACTUAL SUSPENSION** Bar # 102784 ☐ PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED A Member of the State Bar of California

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:

(Respondent)

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted June 10, 1982.
- (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."

kwiktag* 035 119 512

(Lib not write above this line.)				
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.				
(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:				

	pating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating umstances 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. Respondent has been a member of the State Bar since June 10, 1982, and has no prior record of discipline.			
(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 or 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.			
Addition	al mitigating circumstances			

(Do not write above this line.)					
D.	D. Discipline:				
(1)	1) 🔀 Stayed Suspension:				
(a) Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of one year.			Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of one year.		
		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)	⊠ 1	he above-referenced suspension is stayed.		
(2)	\boxtimes	Proba	tion:		
	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)	\boxtimes	Actua	Suspension:		
	(a) Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a pe of 30 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.	Addi	tional	Conditions of Probation:		
(1)		he/she	condent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in all law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.		
(2)		_	the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of sional Conduct.		
(3)	\boxtimes	State 6	ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of ation, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar ees, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.		
(4)		and so	thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation hedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and ons of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the		

(Do not write above this line.)					
			ation deputy either in-person or by telepho ptly meet with the probation deputy as dir		ring the period of probation, Respondent must nd 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.			
					ining the same information, is due no earlier than obation 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	on:	•
(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:			
			Substance Abuse Conditions		Law Office Management Conditions
			Medical Conditions		Financial Conditions
F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:					
(1)	\boxtimes	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)		Cali	ifornia Rules of Court, and perform the ac	ts spec	must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20 , ified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 e date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.

(Do not write above this line.)			
(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:	

In the	Matter of	of	
PAUL F	ROBERT	MARKLEY,	#102784

Case number(5): 06-O-12280

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 noto contendere to those facts and violations. If the Respondent pleads noto 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 noto 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).
one option of the first of the

Date

4-23-08

يركب 2008

PAUL ROBERT MARKLEY

ے Print Name

PAUL Robert MARK/4

(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:

PAUL ROBERT MARKLEY

CASE NUMBER(S):

06-O-12280

PENDING PROCEEDINGS:

The disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A.(7), was April 17, 2008.

PARTIES ARE BOUND BY THE STIPULATIONS FACTS:

The Parties intend to be and are here by bound by the stipulation to facts contained in this stipulation. This stipulation as to facts, and the facts so stipulated shall independently survive, even if the conclusions of law and/or stipulated disposition set forth herein are rejected, or changed in any manner whatsoever, by the Hearing Department or the Review Department of the State Bar Court, or by the California Supreme Court.

STIPULATION AS TO 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, or has otherwise committed acts of misconduct warranting discipline.

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Respondent hereby pleads noto contendere to the following facts and conclusions of law.

FACTS: CASE NO. 06-O-12280

1. On November 15, 2004, Membership Billing Services billed Respondent for State Bar membership fees due for 2005 ("fee statement") to his Membership Records address 222 N. Sepulveda Blvd. #1775, El Segundo, CA 90245. On February 28, 2005, Respondent became delinquent in his payment of his 2005 State Bar membership fees. On February 28, 2005, Membership Billing Services sent a notice of fees due - fee statement - to Respondent at his Membership Records address. In 2005 Respondent moved his office address to a new floor and suite number in the same office building, but failed to notify Membership Records of the new address as required by the Business and Professions Code. Respondent received both fee statements.

- 2. On May 20, 2005, Membership Billing Services sent Respondent a Final Delinquent Notice to his Membership Records address. His delinquency was referred to the California Supreme Court by Membership Billing Services for appropriate action.
- 3. On August 24, 2005, the California Supreme Court filed Order no. S136220 ("Suspension Order") suspending Respondent from the practice of law in California. The Suspension Order became effective on September 16, 2005. A copy of the Suspension Order was sent to Membership Billing Services by the Supreme Court.
- 4. On August 26, 2005, Membership Billing Services properly served a copy of the Suspension Order upon Respondent at his Membership Records address. Respondent received the Suspension Order.
- 5. On September 9, 2005, Respondent spoke with Membership Billing Services and stated that he would send out his membership fees "this week."
- 6. On October 14, 2005, Respondent was employed in California by Marie Takahashi ("Takahashi") on a contingent fee basis to represent her in a personal injury matter arising out of an automobile collision that occurred on September 30, 2005.
- 7. On October 17, 2005, Respondent sent Takahashi a letter on his legal stationery thanking her for retaining his law office and instructing her in how to correctly proceed with her case. Also included with the letter were copies of Takahashi's retainer agreement signed October 14, 2005; a copy of a letter of representation on Respondent's letterhead dated October 14, 2005 signed by Takahashi; and a Limited Authorization to Obtain Information and Records dated October 14, 2005, and signed by Takahashi.
- 8. On October 18, 2005, Respondent's State Bar membership fees payment was sent by Respondent to Membership Billing Services paid by check drawn on Respondent's general account. The payment was rejected by Membership Billing Services on October 21, 2005, because it was not made by "certified funds/credit card." On October 21, 2005, Respondent's general account check was returned with correspondence notifying Respondent of the requirement of payment by certified funds/credit card.
- 9. On October 18, 2005, Takahashi provided Respondent with a Consent for Release of Confidential Information from Lisa Pedersen regarding Takahashi's injuries.
- 10. On October 27, 2005, Respondent telephoned Lora Tellefsen of Vista Claims Services, Vista, California and identified himself as Takahashi's attorney, and discussed Tellefsen's communications with Takahashi.
- 11. On October 31, 2005, State Bar Membership Billing Services received payment of Respondent's State Bar dues by cashier's check, Respondent's suspension was terminated, and he was fully restored to active membership in the California State Bar.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

- 1. By agreeing to be retained by Takahashi and by continuing to correspond with Takahashi and Vista Claims Services, while he was suspended from the practice of law in California, Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(a), by holding himself out as practicing or entitled to practice law or otherwise practicing law when he was not an active member of the State Bar, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, sections 6125 and 6126.
- 2. By failing to inform his client of his suspension for not paying his Bar dues, Respondent failed to keep his client reasonably informed of significant developments in matters with regard to which the attorney has agreed to provide legal services, in wilful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE:

STANDARDS FOR ATTORNEY SANCTIONS

To determine the appropriate level of discipline, the standards provide guidance. *Drociak v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1085, 1090; *In the Matter of Sampson* (Review Dept. 1994) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 119, 134. A disciplinary recommendation must be consistent with the discipline in similar proceedings. See *Snyder v. State Bar* (1990) 49 Cal.3d 1302, 1310-1311. Also, the recommended discipline must rest upon a balanced consideration of relevant factors. *In the Matter of Sampson, supra*, 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 119, 135.

Pursuant to Standard 1.3 of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct: The primary purposes of disciplinary proceedings conducted by the State Bar of California and of sanctions imposed upon a finding or acknowledgment of a member's professional misconduct are the protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession; the maintenance of high professional standards by attorneys and the protection of public confidence in the legal profession.

Standard 1.6(a) provides that "[T]he appropriate sanction for an act of professional misconduct shall be the sanction set forth in the standards for the particular misconduct found or acknowledged."

Pursuant to Standard 2.6, the culpability of a member of a violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068 (including sections 6068(a), 6068(j), and 6068(m)), and 6125 and 6126, "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."

CASE LAW

The Supreme Court gives the Standards "great weight," and will reject a recommendation consistent with the Standards only where the Court entertains "grave doubts" as to its propriety. *In re Naney* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 186, 190; see also *In re Silverton* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 81, 91, 92. Further, although the Standards are not mandatory, it is well established that the Standards may be deviated from only when there is a compelling, well-defined reason to do so. *See Aronin v. State Bar* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 276, 291; see also *Bates v. State Bar* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 1056, 1060, fn. 2.

Turning to applicable case law, the range of discipline for unauthorized practice of law in published opinions ranges from thirty days actual suspension to six months actual suspension to disbarment, depending on the gravity of the offense or the harm, if any, to the victim. See In the Matter of Trousil (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 229; see also, Farnham v. State Bar (1976) 17 Cal.3d 605; see also, In the Matter of Taylor (Review Department 1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 563. Given the totality of the relevant facts and circumstances, actual suspension is necessary in this case to effectuate the purpose of the disciplinary proceedings.

The stipulated discipline is within the range of discipline prescribed by the Standards as set forth above. In light of the facts that Respondent has been in practice for more than twenty-five (25) years without any prior discipline, has been candid and cooperative with the State Bar, and has taken responsibility for his actions, a limited period of actual suspension is necessary.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS:

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of January 10, 2008, the estimate prosecution costs in this matter are approximately \$1,983.00. Respondent acknowledges that this figure is an estimate only Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from this stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the costs of further proceedings.

markley 06.12280 stipattchmt\

Do not write above this line.)			
In the Matter of	Case number(s):		
Paul Robert Markley, #102784	06-O-12280		

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.

4-15-08

Respondent's Signature

Paul Robert Markley Print Name

Date

Respondent's Counsel Signatule

Print Name

4-11-0P

Deputy Trial Counsél's Signature

William F. Stralka

Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)				
In the Matter Of Paul Robert Markley, #102784	Case Number(s): 06-O-12280			

OF	RDER			
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.				
	a are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth COMMENDED 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.)				
04-29-08	Mas			
Date	Judge of the State Bar Court			
	RICHARD A. PLATEL			

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 April 30, 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:

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

PAUL ROBERT MARKLEY LAW OFC PAUL R MARKLEY 2790 SKYPARK DR #106 TORRANCE, CA 90505

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

WILLIAM STRALKA, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on April 30, 2008.

Johnnie Lee Smith
Case Administrator
State Bar Court