

(Do not write above this line.)

**State Bar Court of California
Hearing Department
Los Angeles**

<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Suzan J. Anderson Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 South Hill Street Los Angeles, California 90015 (213) 765-1000</p> <p>Bar # 160559</p>	<p>Case Number (s) 06-O-12708-DFM</p>	<p>(for Court's use)</p> <p>FILED</p> <p>AUG 22 2007 <i>HC</i></p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</p>
<p>Counsel For Respondent</p> <p>Michael E. Wine 301 N. Lake Avenue Suite 800 Pasadena, California 91101 (626) 796-6688</p> <p>Bar # 58657</p>	<p>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</p>	<p>PUBLIC MATTER</p>
<p>In the Matter Of: GLORIA M. GONG</p> <p>Bar # 163418</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>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</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 2, 1992**.
- (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 **15** pages, not including the order.
- (4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".
- (6) The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading "Supporting Authority."



- (7) No more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any pending investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.
- (8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):
- ☐ until costs are paid in full, Respondent will remain actually suspended from the practice of law unless relief is obtained per rule 284, Rules of Procedure.
 - ☒ costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: **two billing cycles following the 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

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. **Please see Attachment, page 13**
- (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 \$ _____ or _____ 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

Please see attachment, pages 13 and 14

D. Discipline:

(1) ☒ **Stayed Suspension:**

(a) ☒ Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of **one (1) 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) ☒ The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) ☒ **Probation:**

Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of **two (2) years**, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 9.18, California Rules of Court)

(3) ☒ **Actual Suspension:**

(a) ☒ Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of **sixty (60) days**.

- i. ☐ and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct
- ii. ☐ and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
- iii. ☐ and until Respondent does the following:

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

- (1) ☐ If Respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until he/she proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in general law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
- (2) ☒ During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3) ☒ Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (4) ☒ Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and conditions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must promptly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request.

- (5) ☒ Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.

In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.

- (6) ☐ Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.
- (7) ☒ Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.
- (8) ☒ Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
- ☐ No Ethics School recommended. Reason:
- (9) ☐ Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.
- (10) ☒ The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Law Office Management Conditions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Conditions |

F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

- (1) ☒ **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination:** Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. **Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 321(a)(1) & (c), Rules of Procedure.**
- ☐ No MPRE recommended. Reason:
- (2) ☐ **Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court:** Respondent must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.

- (3) ☐ **Conditional Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court:** If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 days or more, he/she must comply with the requirements of rule **9.20**, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
- (4) ☐ **Credit for Interim Suspension [conviction referral cases only]:** Respondent will be credited for the period of his/her interim suspension toward the stipulated period of actual suspension. Date of commencement of interim suspension:
- (5) ☒ **Other Conditions:** Respondent's successful passage of the MPRE taken anytime after the time this Stipulation is signed and before the Supreme Court Order will be deemed to satisfy the MPRE condition in section F.(1) above.

Respondent's successful completion of State Bar Ethics School and passage of the test at State Bar Ethics School taken anytime after the time this Stipulation is signed and before the Supreme Court Order will be deemed to satisfy the Ethics School condition in section E.(8) above.

Respondent's successful completion of six (6) hours of MCLE taken anytime after this Stipulation is signed and before the Supreme Court Order will be deemed to satisfy the MCLE condition in the Law Office Management section post.

(Do not write above this line.)

Attachment language begins here (if any):
Please see attachment, pages 9 through 14

In the Matter of
GLORIA M. GONG,
163418

Case number(s):
06-O-12708-DFM

A Member of the State Bar

Law Office Management Conditions:

- a. ☐ Within 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/**six (6)** months/ 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 **six (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.

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: GLORIA M. GONG

CASE NUMBER(S): 06-O-12708-DFM

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that she is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

COUNT ONE

FACTS

1. On March 20, 2003, Guadalupe Martinez ("Martinez") was two payments behind on the mortgage for her home. On or about that date, Martinez consulted Respondent about her financial situation and legal recourse.
2. On that date, Respondent and Martinez discussed her options for bankruptcy. At that time Respondent anticipated filing a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy on behalf of Martinez.
3. On April 18, 2003, Respondent sent a letter to Martinez saying that she had tried to reach Martinez by phone, without success, and requesting that Martinez contact her. Martinez had not yet retained the Respondent.
4. Martinez contacted Respondent's office and met with Rena, Respondent's paralegal, on May 16, 2003. On that date, Martinez employed the Respondent to represent her in a Chapter 13 Bankruptcy. She paid \$500.00 for which she received receipt number 182076.
5. Martinez advised Rena that she had received a demand letter, dated April 13, 2003, from Citimortgage for the amount of \$2,360.00 in late payments and further notifying her that she was in default. The letter, which was provided to Respondent's office, through Rena, advised that if she did not bring the payments current, Citimortgage would proceed with foreclosure on her home.
6. On that same date, May 16, 2003, Martinez was given a work sheet to provide information to complete the petition for bankruptcy. Martinez completed the paperwork and

provided it to Respondent's office.

7. At the end of May, 2003, Martinez received a notice from Five Star Mortgage ("Five Star") of Default and Notice of Election to sell her home. At this time, Martinez was \$3,948.87 in arrears.

8. On June 30, 2003, Martinez received a notice from Five Star that her house would be foreclosed upon on September 17, 2003. Martinez brought the information to Respondent. Respondent received this notice.

9. From and after May 16, 2003 until August 29, 2003, Respondent took no steps to file the Bankruptcy Petition on behalf of Martinez.

10. Finally, on August 29, 2003, the Chapter 13 petition was presented to Martinez for signature and Martinez signed it.

11. Thereafter, the Bankruptcy petition was never filed. Although Respondent knew that the date of the foreclosure was scheduled for September 17, 2003, Respondent did not take steps to ensure that the document was filed.

12. During the weekend before its occurrence, Martinez learned that the house would be sold on September 15, 2003, not on the scheduled date of September 17, 2003.

13. In the morning of September 15, 2003, Martinez tried to contact Respondent. She left messages with the receptionist and with Rena that Respondent needed to do something to stop the sale of her home. Respondent did not call her back. No action was taken by Respondent to prevent the sale.

14. The sale occurred on September 15, 2003. On that same date, Martinez found posted on her door a Three Day Notice to Quit.

15. On September 19, 2003, Respondent returned the sum of \$699.00 to Martinez through Rena. Martinez did not speak directly to Respondent.

16. Martinez sued Respondent. She obtained a judgment after a jury trial in the sum of \$46,000.00, including a special verdict for breach of fiduciary duty. Respondent has not paid any portion of this judgment.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By failing to file the Bankruptcy petition and/or by failing to take any action to prevent

the sale of Martinez' home, Respondent intentionally, recklessly or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in wilful violation of rule 3-110(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

COUNT TWO

FACTS

17. The stipulated facts of paragraphs 1 through 16 are incorporated herein.

18. By failing to file the bankruptcy petition on behalf of Martinez, Respondent effectively withdrew from representation of Martinez.

19. At no time did Respondent inform Martinez that she was withdrawing from employment in Martinez's case. Nor did Respondent take any other steps to avoid reasonably foreseeable prejudice to her client.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By failing to file the bankruptcy petition on behalf of Martinez, failing to inform Martinez of her intent to withdraw from employment, and failing to take any other steps to avoid prejudice to her client, Respondent wilfully failed, upon termination of employment, to take reasonable steps to avoid reasonably foreseeable prejudice to her client in wilful violation of rule 3-700(A)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A.(7), was July 20, 2007.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of July 17, 2007, the costs in this matter are \$2,296.00. 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.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

Pursuant to Standard I.3, the primary purposes of disciplinary proceedings and imposing sanctions for professional misconduct are, "the protection of the public, the courts and the legal

profession; the maintenance of high professional standards by attorneys; and the preservation of public confidence in the legal profession.”

Standard 2.4(b) states, “Culpability of a member of wilfully failing to perform services in an individual matter or matters not demonstrating a pattern of misconduct or culpability of a member of wilfully 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.”

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 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.

The State Bar recognizes that the Standards should not be applied in a talismanic fashion. *Gary v. State Bar* (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 820, 828. However, Respondent bears the burden to demonstrate that the State Bar should deviate from the Standards.

When Ms. Martinez employed Respondent, her situation was manifestly urgent. Yet for two months between May and August, nothing was prepared or filed. Nothing was ever filed. This was more than a mistake. At best, it was grossly negligent and reckless. Ms. Martinez failed to get precisely what she sought from this Respondent. She was fully abandoned. Respondent was supposed to have used her best efforts to accomplish “with reasonable speed” the purpose for which she was employed and Respondent breached that duty. (*Van Sloten v. State Bar* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 921, 931-932.) Nothing was accomplished at all.

In *Van Sloten, supra*, the member was employed to handle an uncontested divorce. When his client’s spouse stopped cooperating, and despite efforts of his client to contact him, Van Sloten simply discontinued work. At hearing he received a public reproof. The Review Department increased the discipline to two years stayed. The Supreme Court reduced it to six months stayed, noting that it was a failure to perform **without** serious consequences to the client.

In the matter of *Harris v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 1082, the member failed to perform in one client matter, but over a four-year period. In contrast with *Van Sloten*, the conduct of Harris caused substantial harm to the client. Harris was suspended for three years, including ninety (90) days of actual suspension. The Harris court said, in part, quoting language from *Van Sloten*”

“Furthermore, petitioner has shown no remorse, or even an

understanding that her years of neglect were improper in any respect. An attorney's failure to accept responsibility for, or to understand the wrongfulness of, her actions may be an aggravating factor unless it is based on an honest belief in innocence." *Harris, supra*, 51 Cal.3d at p. 1088 citing *Van Sloten, supra*, 48 Cal.3d at p. 932.

In this matter, although the period of time over which the conduct occurred is shorter, Respondent's apparent point of view that it is enough for her to say, "I mailed it," to relieve her of responsibility for her wilful failure to do the one thing she was hired to do, something that was urgent. There is no honest belief in innocence.

In *Layton v. State Bar* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 889, a failure to competently perform in an estate matter led to a suspension of three years, including thirty (30) days actual suspension. Layton had excuses. He blamed his secretary for one. As to his failure to timely file an inventory and appraisal, there were lots of problems, including a misfiling, and the difficulty in locating bank accounts. As the Court said, "In cases involving failure, similar to petitioner's, to perform services diligently, we have not hesitated to impose actual suspension." *Id.* at p. 904.

The discipline recommended here falls within the Standards and case law.

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

FACTS SUPPORTING AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Due to the failure of Respondent to file the Chapter 13 bankruptcy on behalf of Ms. Martinez, Ms. Martinez lost her home and the equity therein that she had purchased herself and owned since 1998. Ms. Martinez also has four children and had to relocate herself and her four children; two sons to live with their father, and she and her two daughters to a small apartment when they were accustomed to living in their own house. Ms. Martinez has a job which she has held for 12 years and would have been able to save the house if the bankruptcy had been filed with the adjusted payment plans that the Bankruptcy Court would have imposed.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

FACTS SUPPORTING MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Although the misconduct herein is serious, Respondent has had no prior record of discipline since being admitted to the practice of law on December 2, 1992.

Respondent volunteered for Catholic Immigration Network from 2001 to 2002.

Respondent has been a special master for the State Bar four or five times over the last five years.

Respondent has been a Judge in Moot Court competitions.

According to Respondent, she now e-files, using Pacer, so the situation which led to this discipline should not arise again.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of
GLORIA M. GONGCase number(s):
06-CI-12708-DFM**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.

7/31/07
Date8/1/07
Date8/1/07
Date
Respondent's SignatureGLORIA M. GONG
Print Name
Respondent's Counsel SignatureMICHAEL E. WINE
Print Name
Deputy Trial Counsel's SignatureSUZAN J. ANDERSON
Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter Of
GLORIA M. GONG, 163418

Case Number(s):
06-O-12708-DFM

ORDER

Finding the stipulation to be fair to the parties and that it adequately protects the public,
IT IS ORDERED that the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without
prejudice, and:

- ☒ The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE
RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- ☐ The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth
below, and the DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- ☐ All Hearing dates are vacated.

The parties are bound by the stipulation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify
the stipulation, filed within 15 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies
or further modifies the approved stipulation. (See rule 135(b), Rules of Procedure.) **The
effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein,
normally 30 days after file date. (See rule 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)**

Date

8-21-07

Judge of the State Bar Court


RICHARD A. HONN

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 August 22, 2007, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION

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:

**MICHAEL E. WINE
301 N LAKE AVE STE 800
PASADENA, CA 91101 - 5113**

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

SUZAN ANDERSON, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **August 22, 2007.**



Tammy R. Cleaver
Case Administrator
State Bar Court