ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California PUBLIC MATTER Hearing Department Los Angeles		
Counsel For The State Bar	Case Number (s) 06-0-13573	(for Court's use)
Dane C. Dauphine Supervising Trial Counsel		FILED
1149 S. Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299 (213) 765-1293		JUN 50 2010
Bar # 146853	·	STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
In Pro Per Respondent		LOS ANGELES
VIvlan McPayah-Obiamalu Obiamalu Law Firm 15322 Central Avenue, Suite B Chino, CA 91710		
(909) 597-3229	Submitted to: Assigned	Judge
Bar # 159598 In the Matter Of: Vivian McPayah-Obiamalu	STIPULATION RE FACTORISPOSITION AND ORI	FS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DER APPROVING
	STAYED SUSPENSION	; NO ACTUAL SUSPENSION
Bar # 159598	☐ PREVIOUS STIPUL	
A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)		

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 is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted June 29, 1992.

STATE BAR OF CALIF.

- (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 8 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®

5 130 409

Staved Suspension

(Do L	ot write	NOOE B	e this line.)	
(7)			than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in	
	pen	nding investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.		
(8)			of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. (Check one option only):	Code §§6086.10 &
		ÇO: (ha CO:	sts added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of disciplin sts to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership y rdship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure) sts waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of sts entirely waived	ears:
I		essio	ting Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sonal Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating red.	
(1)		Prio	or 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 attachment entitled "Prior Discipline.	below or a separate
(2)			nonesty: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, obscient, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Profess	
(3)		to th	st Violation: Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was election to person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct towerty.	
(4)		Hari	m: Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the admir	nistration of justice.
(5)			fference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atoner sequences of his or her misconduct.	nent for the
(6)			k of Cooperation: Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victorium to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.	tims of his/her
(7)			tiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multipermonstrates a pattern of misconduct.	ole acts of wrongdoing
(8)	\boxtimes	No :	aggravating circumstances are involved.	

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. Although Respondent's misconduct involves her client trust account, the misconduct involved errors in accounting practices caused, in part, by medical problems and therefore, is not deemed serious. 2) No Harm: Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct. 3) Candon/Cooperation: Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings. Respondent paid all of the funds due to the complaining witness in Case No. 08-0-13573 (Lopez) prior to that complaining witness's complaint to the State Bar. Respondent was extremely candid during meetings with the State Bar and cooperated with the State Bar during the investigation and in entering into this Stipulation. 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 atributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not atributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. 7) Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith. 8) Emotional/Physical Difficulties: At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult fo	20 11	of Assire	: above this inte./
circumstances are required. No Prior Discipline: Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not deemed serious. Although Respondent's misconduct Involved her cilent trust account, the misconduct involved errors in accounting practices caused, in part, by medical problems and therefore, is not deemed serious. No Harm: Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct. 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. Respondent paid all of the funds due to the complaining witness in Case No. 08-0-13573 (Lopez) prior to that complaining witness's complaint to the State Bar. Respondent was extremely candid during meetings with the State Bar and cooperated with the State Bar during the investigation and in entering into this Stipulation. Remorse: Respondent promptly took objective steps spontaneously demonstrating remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely stone for any consequences of his/her misconduct. Restitution: Respondent paid S on in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings. Palesy: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. Delay: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical disabilities which expert testimony would establish was directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or both to the office to her office for care for her children. Although Respondent to held rest. Therefo	Addi	tiona	al aggravating circumstances
with present misconduct which is not deemed serious. Although Respondent's misconduct Involves her client trust account, the misconduct involved errors in accounting practices caused, in part, by medical problems and therefore, is not deemed serious. No Harm: Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct. 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. Respondent paid all of the funds due to the complaining witness in Case No.08-0-13573 (Lopez) prior to that complaining witness's complaint to the State Bar. Respondent was extremely candid during meetings with the State Bar and cooperated with the State Bar during the investigation and in entering into this Stipulation. 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. Respondent paid S on in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith. 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 liegal drug or substance abuse, and Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities. Respondent has open and the decause she spent the ti			
 (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. Respondent paid all of the funds due to the complaining witness in Case No. 06-0-13573 (Lopez) prior to that complaining witness's complain to the State Bar. Respondent was extremely candid during meetings with the State Bar and cooperated with the State Bar during the investigation and in entering into this Stipulation. (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 were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. (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. Respondent gave birth to children in or about December 2001, in or about October 2003, and in or about July 2006. The pregnancies were high risk and Respondent was out of the office to care for her children. Although Respondent attempted to work from her home during her pregnancies, she was	(1)	⊠	with present misconduct which is not deemed serious. Although Respondent's misconduct involves her client trust account, the misconduct involved errors in accounting practices caused, in part, by
his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings. Respondent paid all of the funds due to the complaining witness in Case No. 06-O-13573 (Lopez) prior to that complaining witness's complaint to the State Bar. Respondent was extremely candid during meetings with the State Bar and cooperated with the State Bar during the investigation and In entering Into this Stipulation. 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. Restitution: Respondent paid \$ on in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings. Delay: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith.	(2)		No Harm: Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.
recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of his/her misconduct. Respondent paid \$ on in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings. Delay: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith. 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. Respondent gave birth to children in or about December 2001, in or about October 2003, and in or about July 2006. The pregnancies were high risk and Respondent was out of the office frequently for medical appointments and due to being placed on bed rest. Thereafter, she was out of the office to care for her children. Although Respondent attempted to work from her home during her pregnancies, she was unable to devote a sufficient time to the client trust accounts, because of her medical condition and because she spent the time that she had communicating with her clients and supervising their matters. Severe Financial Stress: At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martial difficulties with	(3)	\boxtimes	his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings. Respondent paid all of the funds due to the complaining witness in Case No. 06-O-13573 (Lopez) prior to that complaining witness's complaint to the State Bar. Respondent was extremely candid during meetings with the State Bar and cooperated with the State Bar during the investigation and in
disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings. Delay: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith. 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. Respondent gave birth to children in or about December 2001, In or about October 2003, and In or about July 2006. The pregnancies were high risk and Respondent was out of the office frequently for medical appointments and due to being placed on bed rest. Thereafter, she was out of the office to care for her children. Although Respondent attempted to work from her home during her pregnancies, she was unable to devote a sufficient time to the client trust accounts, because of her medical condition and because she spent the time that she had communicating with her clients and supervising their matters. 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, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martial difficulties with	(4)		recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of his/her
Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making it more difficult for her to provide financial records. (7) Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith. 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. Respondent gave birth to children in or about December 2001, in or about October 2003, and in or about July 2006. The pregnancies were high risk and Respondent was out of the office frequently for medical appointments and due to being placed on bed rest. Thereafter, she was out of the office to care for her children. Although Respondent attempted to work from her home during her pregnancies, she was unable to devote a sufficient time to the client trust accounts, because of her medical condition and because she spent the time that she had communicating with her clients and supervising their matters. 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. 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. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martial difficulties with	(5)		
(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. Respondent gave birth to children in or about December 2001, In or about October 2003, and in or about July 2006. The pregnancies were high risk and Respondent was out of the office frequently for medical appointments and due to being placed on bed rest. Thereafter, she was out of the office to care for her children. Although Respondent attempted to work from her home during her pregnancies, she was unable to devote a sufficient time to the client trust accounts, because of her medical condition and because she spent the time that she had communicating with her clients and supervising their matters. (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. 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. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martial difficulties with	(6)	\boxtimes	Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her. The misconduct occurred in 2006 and the delay in prosecution was not attributable to Respondent. The delay has prejudiced Respondent by making
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. Respondent gave birth to children in or about December 2001, in or about October 2003, and in or about July 2006. The pregnancies were high risk and Respondent was out of the office frequently for medical appointments and due to being placed on bed rest. Thereafter, she was out of the office to care for her children. Although Respondent attempted to work from her home during her pregnancies, she was unable to devote a sufficient time to the client trust accounts, because of her medical condition and because she spent the time that she had communicating with her clients and supervising their matters. (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. 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. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martial difficulties with	(7)		Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith.
which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct. 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. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martlal difficulties with	(8)		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. Respondent gave birth to children in or about December 2001, in or about October 2003, and in or about July 2006. The pregnancies were high risk and Respondent was out of the office frequently for medical appointments and due to being placed on bed rest. Thereafter, she was out of the office to care for her children. Although Respondent attempted to work from her home during her pregnancies, she was unable to devote a sufficient time to the client trust accounts, because of her medical condition and because she spent the time
personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martial difficulties with	(9)		which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and
	(10)	⊠	personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature. Between in or about February 2006 and in or about November 2006, Respondent was experiencing significant martial difficulties with

(Do no	ot write	e above	e this lin	e.)	
	its client trust account, which contributed to Respondent's errors in accounting. They have since reconciled and reestablish their marriage and law practice.				
(11)	11) Sound 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. Respondent devotes significant time to representing pro bono clients. Respondent has served as an arbitrator with the the Los Angles Superior Court Alternative Dispute Resolution Program since 2000.				pondent devotes arbitrator with the
(12)		Reh: follo	abilita wed b	tion: Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional miscond convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.	juct occurred
(13)		No r	nitiga	ting circumstances are involved.	
Addi	tiona	al mit	igatin	g circumstances	
D. 1	Disc	iplin	10:		
(1)	\boxtimes	Stay	red Su	spension:	. 1.4
	(a)	\boxtimes	Resp	ondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of six (6) n	nonths.
		1,		and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of represent fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursu 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.	
		ű,		and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditio this stipulation.	ns form attached to
		iii.		and until Respondent does the following:	
	The	abov	/e-refe	erenced suspension is stayed.	
(2)	\boxtimes	Prot	bation	:	
	Respondent is placed on probation for a period of one (1) year, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 9.18 California Rules of Court)				
E. Additional Conditions of Probation:					
(1)	\boxtimes	Durii Profe	ng the	probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State al Conduct.	Bar Act and Rules of
(2)		State infor	e Bar : mation	(10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Reco and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Proba n, including current office address and telephone number, or other address as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.	tion"), all changes of
(3)	purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.			se terms and st meet with the	

(Do no	ot write	above	this line.)	***	
(4)		July 'wheti condi are a curre subm	10, and October 10 of the period of the Respondent has complied with the tions of probation during the preceding proceedings pending against him the status of that proceeding. If the finited on the next quarter date, and control of the proceeding of the proceeding.	probation. Un the State Bar ling calendar n or her in the rst report wou cover the exte	·
		In ad twent	dition to all quarterly reports, a final y (20) days before the last day of th	report, containe period of pi	ining the same information, is due no earlier than robation and no later than the last day of probation.
(5)		condi Durin in add	itions of probation with the probation g the period of probation, Respondi	n monitor to e ent must furni ed to be subm	espondent must promptly review the terms and stablish a manner and schedule of compliance ish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, nitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must
(6)	\boxtimes	inquii direc	ries of the Office of Probation and a	ny probation i	ent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any monitor assigned under these conditions which are g to whether Respondent is complying or has
(7)	\boxtimes	Prob			ne herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of n of the State Bar Ethics School, and passage of the
			No Ethics School recommended.	Reason:	
(8)		must			ion imposed in the underlying criminal matter and in with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office
(9)		The f	ollowing conditions are attached he	reto and inco	rporated:
			Substance Abuse Conditions		Law Office Management Conditions
			Medical Conditions		Financial Conditions
F. C	Othe	r Cor	nditions Negotiated by the F	'arties:	
(1)	⊠	the Cor res	Multistate Professional Responsibilitierence of Bar Examiners, to the C	lity Examination Office of Probatt further hear	ion: Respondent must provide proof of passage of on ("MPRE"), administered by the National ation within one year. Failure to pass the MPRE ring until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Procedure.
٠			No MPRE recommended, Reason:	•	
(2)	\boxtimes	Oth	er Conditions:		
		Off Acc	ice of Probation satisfactory proc	of of attended	scipline herein, Respondent must supply to the nce at a sessionof the Ethics School Client Trust me, and passage of the test given at the end of

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: VI

VIVIAN MCPAYAH-OBIAMALU

CASE NUMBER(S):

06-O-13573

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.

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

FACTS:

- 1. On or about September 17, 2000, David C. Lopez ("Lopez") was a passenger in an automobile driven by Bethany Harper ("Harper") that was involved in a single vehicle accident. Lopez was severely injured and the three other passengers in Harper's automobile were killed in the accident.
- 2. On or about October 9, 2000, Lopez hired Respondent's law firm to represent him regarding the accident on September 17, 2000. On or about September 13, 2001, Respondent filed a civil action obo Lopez in the Orange County Superior Court, case no. 01CC11725, entitled *Lopez v. Harper*. Although Lopez had incurred significant medical expenses, the defendant did not have assets to pay a judgment and had insurance with low policy limits. Lopez incurred medical liens of approximately \$200,000 from three providers, including the County Medical Center, with approximately \$190,000
- 3. In or about November 2001, Harper's automobile insurance carrier paid Harper's policy limits of \$15,000 to Respondent to settle Lopez's claims from the accident on September 17, 2000. Respondent deposited the check into the firm's client trust account at Bank of America, account no. *****-*2599 ("Bof A CTA").
- 4. On April 30, 2002, at the client's direction, Respondent paid \$1,300 of the settlement funds to another attorney employed by the client to file bankruptcy to address the outstanding medical bills. The client filed a bankruptcy petition and obtained a discharge of debts on January 13, 2003. On October 10, 2003, Respondent issued check no. 1059 drawn upon the BofA CTA in the sum of \$5,000 and payable to the client trust account of the attorneys for County USC with instructions to disburse only upon reaching a pro rata settlement agreement with the other lien holders. Respondent almost immediately thereafter went on maternity leave and had a baby on October 16, 2003. In October 2003 and January 2004, Respondent disbursed a total of \$5,000 from the settlement funds to pay her law firm's legal fees. On January 9, 2004, Respondent disbursed \$3,700 from the settlement funds to Adela Hogan, Lopez's mother, intending to disburse the remaining settlement funds to the client.
- 5. Respondent failed to maintain client trust account ledger cards, written trust account journals and monthly reconciliations of the B^{of}A CTA. As a result, she was unaware that check no. 1059 issued to the attorney for the county was never deposited.

_6

¹ The account numbers have been redacted to protect the accounts.

- 6. In or about May 2006, Respondent and her husband began having marital difficulties and subsequently split their practice. Respondent opened a separate client trust account at Wells Fargo Bank ("Wells Fargo CTA"). Due to Respondent's failure to maintain appropriate records concerning the law firm's trust accounts, she failed to distinguish which trust account contained which client's funds.
- 7. In or about December 2005, Lopez visited Respondent's law offices and requested his client file because he needed information to present to the Victim's Compensation Board following the criminal conviction of Harper. Respondent's firm was in the process of moving, and after the move, Respondent was unable to locate Lopez's client file. At this time, Lopez also requested an accounting. Respondent believed that all funds had been disbursed and so informed Lopez.
- 8. Thereafter, Lopez complained to the State Bar, and an investigator wrote to Respondent in August 2006. Respondent sought to recreate the client file and wrote to the Victim's Compensation Fund on behalf of Lopez on September 2006 to provide the information requested by the Respondent also determined that her law firm was unable to confirm that check no. 1059 drawn upon the Board and payable to the attorney for the county had been presented for payment, and calls to that law firm were not returned. On October 17, 2006, Respondent issued a check drawn upon her Wells Fargo CTA and payable to Lopez in the sum of \$5,000.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

9. By failing to maintain client trust account records and render appropriate accounting to Lopez, Respondent failed to maintain complete records of all funds received on behalf of the client and render appropriate accounts to the client regarding them in willful violation of rule 4-100(B)(3), Rules of Professional Conduct.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(7), was June 11, 2010.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct provide, at Standard 2.2(b), for a minimum actual suspension of three months irrespective of mitigating circumstances for the commission of a violation of rule 4-100, Rules of Professional Conduct, which does not result in the willful misappropriation of entrusted funds or property. Under case law, a failure to render appropriate accountings for client funds has resulted in stayed suspension and actual suspension of less than 90 days. (In the Matter of Fonte (Review Dept. 1994) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 751 [60-day actual suspension for failure to account for fees and conflicts in two client matters where attorney had 25 years with no discipline]; In the Matter of Cacioppo (Review Dept. 1992) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 128 [six-month stayed suspension for failure to render a proper accounting of settlement funds and failing to communicate, where attorney had prior public reproval]; In the Matter of Lazarus (Review Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 387 [two-month stayed suspension for failure to notify client of receipt of settlement funds and failure to render an accounting of settlement funds].) Considering the mitigation set forth in Section C, the parties submit that the intent and goals of Standards are met in this matter by the imposition of a stayed suspension with 1 year probation.

(Do not write above this line.)		
In the Matter of Vivian McPayah-Obiamalu	Case number(s): 06-O-13573	

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.

b II D Date	Respondent's Signature	<u>Vivian McPayah-Obiamalu</u> Print Name
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
<u>5 - 15 - 10</u> Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Dane C. Dauphine

On not write above this line.) In the Matter Of	Case Number(s):
/ivian McPayah-Obiamalu	06-Q-13573
·	
	ORDER
adina tha atiaulatian ta ba fatati u	
INDING the supulation to be fair to the part	ties and that it adequately protects the public, ssal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without
ejudice, and:	ssal of counts/charges, if any, is GRAINTED without
The stipulated facts and dispos	sition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE
RECOMMENDED to the Supre	eme Court.
The etimulated facts and discour	APPROVED ACAMORIES
below and the DISCIPLINE IS	sition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth S RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
solow, and the bloom time to	NECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
All Hearing dates are vacated.	
*	
•	
	·
e parties are bound by the eticulation	
e parties are bound by the supulation as	s approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify ervice of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies
further modifies the approved stipulation	n. (See rule 135(b), Rules of Procedure.) The
fective date of this disposition is the e	effective date of the Supreme Court order herein.
ormally 30 days after file date. (See rul	le 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)
66-22-10	_ fluid
Pate	Judge of the State Bar Court
	RICHARD A. PLATEL
	ELLERIA E E E ESTADA
m approved by SBC Executive Committee. (Rev. 5/5/05; 12/	/13/2006.)
	Stayed Suspension Orde
	Page

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 June 30, 2010, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

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

in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:

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

VIVIAN MCPAYAH-OBIAMALU OBIAMALU LAW FIRM 15322 CENTRAL AVE STE B CHINO, CA 91710

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

DANE DAUPHINE, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on June 30, 2010.

Johnnie Lee Smith Case Administrator State Bar Court