

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department San Francisco			
Counsel For The State Bar Susan I. Kagan Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2037	Case Number (s) 06-0-12903	(for Court's use)	
Bar # 214209 Counsel For Respondent Michael E. Wine 301 N Lake Ave Ste. 800 Pasadena, CA 91101-5113 (626) 796-6688		FILED OCT 2 1 2008 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO	
Bar <b># 58657</b> In the Matter Of: Lester F. Hardy	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING		
Bar # <b>178559</b> A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	ACTUAL SUSPENSION		

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 7, 1995**.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of **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."

<sup>(</sup>Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)

(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):
  - 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

  - (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. See page 8.
- (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. See page 8.
- (8) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

#### Additional aggravating circumstances:

<sup>(</sup>Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)

# 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. See page 8.
- (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. See page 8.
- (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. See page 8.
- (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

No Prior Discipline: Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice. See page 8.

**D.** Discipline:

<sup>(</sup>Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)

#### (1) X Stayed Suspension:

- (a) Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of two (2) years.
  - 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)  $\square$  The above-referenced suspension is stayed.
- (2)  $\square$  **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 **thirty (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. 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.

<sup>(</sup>Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)

(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) X 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:

	Substance Abuse Conditions		Law Office Management Conditions
--	----------------------------	--	----------------------------------

- Medical Conditions
- 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.

#### (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**:

Attachment language begins here (if any):

### FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

#### Facts

1. Prior to May 19, 1999, respondent was hired by Michael and Lyndsey Harrison, "Harrison Vineyards, Inc." ("Vineyard"), and the "Michael and Lyndsey Harrison 1998 Family Trust" ("Family Trust") to prepare trust documents, give estate planning advice and counsel his clients on business matters relating to their food and wine business.

2. At the time of hire, the parties did not enter into written fee agreement.

3. At all relevant times, Lyndsey Harrison was a co-trustee and one of the beneficiaries of the Family Trust. At all relevant times, Michael and Lyndsey Harrison's daughter, Jill Harrison, was also a co-trustee and one of the beneficiaries of the Family Trust. At all relevant times, respondent represented Lyndsey Harrison and Jill Harrison in their role as co-trustee and beneficiary, as well as the other beneficiaries to the Family Trust. Although there was a potential conflict of interest due to respondent's representation of these clients, respondent did not advise his clients of the potential conflict of interest, or obtain informed written consent to the potential conflict of interest.

4. On May 19, 1999, Michael Harrison died.

5. After Michael Harrison's death, respondent continued to represent Lyndsey Harrison, Jill Harrison, the Vineyard and the beneficiaries of the Family Trust. As part of his representation, respondent agreed to handle the administration of Michael Harrison's estate and the transfer of assets, including the Vineyard, to the Family Trust.

6. On June 23, 1999, respondent filed a probate action in the *Estate of Michael Harrison*, Napa County Superior Court Case No. 26-06364. Thereafter, respondent failed to pursue the probate matter. However, for approximately five years following the filing of the action, respondent continued to make false statements to Lyndsey Harrison regarding his progress in the matter.

7. As part of his representation, respondent agreed to handle the Vineyard's application for a use permit to allow for increased wine production, tours and tastings. Thereafter, respondent failed to take any steps to obtain the use permit. Nonetheless, respondent continued to make false statements to Lyndsey Harrison regarding his progress in obtaining the use permit.

8. In May 2001, Lyndsey Harrison advised respondent that she wanted to sell the Vineyard. At the time, other beneficiaries of the Family Trust objected to the Vineyard being sold. This created an actual conflict of interest between Lindsey Harrison and the other beneficiaries of the Family Trust. Respondent knew that an actual conflict of interest existed, but continued to represent the clients and did not advise them of the actual conflict of interest, or obtain informed written consent to the actual conflict of interest.

9. On June 3, 2004, respondent admitted to Lyndsey Harrison that he had lied to her on numerous occasions regarding his work on the probate action and the use permit.

#### Conclusions of Law

By making numerous false statements to Lyndsey Harrison regarding his progress in the probate action and his work obtaining the use permit, respondent committed acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty and corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.

By not taking any steps to complete the probate action in the *Estate of Michael Harrison*, Napa County Superior Court Case No. 26-06364, or to obtain a use permit for the Vineyard, respondent intentionally, recklessly, and repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in willful violation of rule 3-110(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

<sup>(</sup>Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)

By accepting representation of Lyndsey Harrison and the other beneficiaries of the Family Trust when the interests of the clients potentially conflicted without the informed written consent of each client, respondent wilfully violated rule 3-310(C)(1) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

By continuing representation of Lyndsey Harrison and the other beneficiaries of the Family Trust when the interests of the clients actually conflicted without the informed written consent of each client, respondent wilfully violated rule 3-310(C)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

#### PENDING PROCEEDINGS

The disclosure date referred to on page two, paragraph A (7) was September 10, 2008.

#### STATE BAR ETHICS SCHOOL

Because respondent has agreed to attend State Bar Ethics School as part of this stipulation, respondent may receive Minimum Continuing Legal Education credit upon the satisfactory completion of State Bar Ethics School.

#### FACTS SUPPORTING AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

#### AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES

Standard 1.2(b)(ii). Respondent's numerous false statements to his client over a five-year period demonstrates multiple acts of misconduct.

Standard 1.2(b)(iii). Respondent's numerous false statements to his client over a five-year period demonstrates that his misconduct was surrounded by dishonesty.

#### **MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES**

Standard 1.2(e)(i). Respondent has been in practice since 1995. He has no prior record of discipline.

Standard 1.2(e)(iv). Respondent represents that he suffered extreme emotional difficulties which expert testimony would establish were directly responsible for the misconduct and have since been resolved. Specifically, during the time period of the misconduct in question, respondent experienced a major depressive disorder which went untreated and which included features such as trouble concentrating, sleeping, depressed mood and anxiety. Such symptoms caused him to experience difficulties managing his caseload. While respondent could continue to perform most other activities of his everyday life away from work, he could not face his inability to perform up to his normal professional standards at work. Respondent thus froze and was unable to complete all of his work in a timely basis and failed to face up to his shortcomings. Such behavior on his part resulted in respondent holding an irrational belief that things would somehow work out on their own. When things did not in fact work out, respondent's representation of Lyndsey Harrison and Jill Harrison spun out of control. As a result of respondent's inability to deal with the true state of affairs in the *Estate of Michael Harrison* and his responsibility for the same, he began to cover up his shortcomings and also to lie to his client about the status of the case. Respondent began seeing a psychotherapist for his major depressive disorder, and while the same has now resolved itself, he continues to see her on a bimonthly basis to minimize the chance that similar episodes will happen in the future.

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

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

#### SUPPORTING AUTHORITY

Standard 2.3 requires an actual suspension or disbarment for a respondent that has committed an act of moral turpitude.

(Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004.)

Standard 2.4(b) requires a reproval or suspension for a respondent who has wilfully failed to perform services in which he was retained.

Standard 2.10 requires that a violation of any provision of the Rules of Professional Conduct not specified in the standards (e.g., rules 3-310(C)(1) and 3-310(C)(2)) shall result in reproval or suspension according to the gravity of the offense or harm, if any, to the victim, with due regard to the purpose of imposing discipline set forth in standard 1.3.

In accordance with the standards, a 30-day actual suspension is the proper discipline for respondent's willful violation of section 6106 of the Business and Professions Code. (See *Drociak* v. *State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1085 [30 days' actual suspension for violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106; no prior record of discipline].)

(Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004.)

In the Matter of Lester F. Hardy

Case number(s): 06-0-12903

## **Medical Conditions**

- a. Unless Respondent has been terminated from the Lawyer Assistance Program ("LAP") prior to respondent's successful completion of the LAP, respondent must comply with all provisions and conditions of respondent's Participation Agreement with the LAP and must provide an appropriate waiver authorizing the LAP to provide the Office of Probation and this court with information regarding the terms and conditions of respondent's participation in the LAP and respondent's compliance or non-compliance with LAP requirements. Revocation of the written waiver for release of LAP information is a violation of this condition. However, if respondent has successfully completed the LAP, respondent need not comply with this condition.
- b. Respondent must obtain psychiatric or psychological help/treatment from a duly licensed psychiatrist, psychologist, or clinical social worker at respondent's own expense a minimum of **two (2)** times per month and must furnish evidence to the Office of Probation that respondent is so complying with each quarterly report. Help/treatment should commence immediately, and in any event, no later than thirty (30) days after the effective date of the discipline in this matter. Treatment must continue for **xxx** days *or* **xxx** months *or* **two (2)** years *or*, the period of probation or until a motion to modify this condition is granted and that ruling becomes final.

If the treating psychiatrist, psychologist, or clinical social worker determines that there has been a substantial change in respondent's condition, respondent or Office of the Chief Trial Counsel may file a motion for modification of this condition with the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court, pursuant to rule 550 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar. The motion must be supported by a written statement from the psychiatrist, psychologist, or clinical social worker, by affidavit or under penalty of perjury, in support of the proposed modification.

c. Upon the request of the Office of Probation, respondent must provide the Office of Probation with medical waivers and access to all of respondent's medical records. Revocation of any medical waiver is a violation of this condition. Any medical records obtained by the Office of Probation are confidential and no information concerning them or their contents will be given to anyone except members of the Office of Probation, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel, and the State Bar Court, who are directly involved with maintaining, enforcing or adjudicating this condition.

Other:

10 Page #

(Do not write above this line.) In the Matter of Lester F. Hardy	Nº 19-19	Case number(s): 06-O-12903		
		, 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

# **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.

9/19/08	A	Lester F. Hardy
Date	Respondent's Signature	Print Name
9/20/08	Le Wini	<u>Michael E. Wine, Esq.</u>
Date /	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
9/20/08	All	Susan  . Kagan
Date	Deputy Friar Counsel's Signature	Print Name

(Slipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004.)

(Do not write above this line.) In the Matter Of Lester F. Hardy	Case Number(s): 06-0-12903

# 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.)

Judge of the

Date

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

[Rule 62(b), Rules Proc.; Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of San Francisco, on October 21, 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:

by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

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

1

X

by certified mail, No. , with return receipt requested, through the United States Postal Service at , California, addressed as follows:

by overnight mail at , California, addressed as follows:

by fax transmission, at fax number . No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.

By personal service by leaving the documents in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or a person having charge of the attorney's office, addressed as follows:

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

SUSAN KAGAN, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on October 21, 2008.

George Hue

Case Administrator State Bar Court