


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

Counsel For The State Bar Miho Murai Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 S. Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299 213-765-1219 Bar # 235178	Case Number (s) 07-H-10071	(for Court's use) FILED  NOV - 6 2007 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES
Counsel For Respondent Stephen Allan Rodriguez, Sr. 4801 Wilshire Blvd., #301 Los Angeles, CA 90010 323-937-9773 Bar # 158840	PUBLIC MATTER	
In the Matter Of: STEPHEN ADRIAN RODRIGUEZ Bar # 219019 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)		
Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING STAYED SUSPENSION; NO ACTUAL SUSPENSION <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED		

Note: All information required by this form and any additional information which cannot be provided in the space provided, must be set forth in an attachment to this stipulation under specific headings, e.g., "Facts," "Dismissals," "Conclusions of Law," "Supporting Authority," etc.

A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted **February 8, 2002**.
- (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."



- (7) No more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any pending investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.
- (8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):
- ☐ costs added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline.
 - ☒ costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: **two (2) 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 **05-O-00098**
 - (b) ☒ Date prior discipline effective **December 9, 2005**
 - (c) ☒ Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: **Rule 3-110(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct**
 - (d) ☒ Degree of prior discipline **Public Reprimand**
 - (e) ☐ If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline."
- (2) ☐ **Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3) ☐ **Trust Violation:** Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.
- (4) ☐ **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.
- (5) ☐ **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (6) ☐ **Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.
- (7) ☐ **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (8) ☐ **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances

N/A

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. **Respondent has displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the State Bar throughout the 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. **Respondent has acknowledged and accepted responsibility for his misconduct. He has taken the MPRE on at least two separate occasions, although he has yet to achieve a passing score.**
- (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.
- (9) ☐ **Severe Financial Stress:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered from severe financial stress which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.
- (10) ☐ **Family Problems:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
- (11) ☐ **Good Character:** Respondent's good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of his/her misconduct.
- (12) ☐ **Rehabilitation:** Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13) ☐ **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances

Respondent has been diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder and received special accommodations during the bar exam. He is attempting to receive special accommodations for the MPRE, which he believes will enable him to pass the examination.

Respondent now realizes the seriousness of his misconduct and his ethical responsibilities to timely comply with the terms and conditions of any disciplinary order imposed against him.

D. Discipline:

(1) ☒ **Stayed Suspension:**

(a) ☒ Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of **six (6) months**.

- 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:

The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) ☒ **Probation:**

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) ☒ During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (2) ☒ 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.
- (3) ☒ 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.
- (4) ☒ 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.

- (5) ☐ 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.
- (6) ☒ 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.
- (7) ☐ 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 State Bar Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
- ☒ No Ethics School recommended. Reason: **Respondent attended Ethics School on July 20, 2006, and passed the test given at the end of the session.**
- (8) ☐ 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.
- (9) ☐ The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input 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 within one year. **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) ☐ **Other Conditions:**

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: STEPHEN ADRIAN RODRIGUEZ

CASE NUMBER: O7-H-10071

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Stephen Adrian Rodriguez ("Respondent") admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

FACTS

1. Respondent was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on February 8, 2002, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.
2. On or about October 19, 2005, Respondent entered into a Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition ("Stipulation") with the State Bar of California in case no. 05-O-00098.
3. On or about November 18, 2005, the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court filed an Order approving the Stipulation and imposing upon Respondent a public reproof with conditions (the "Order").
4. On or about November 18, 2005, the Order was properly served by mail upon Respondent.
5. The Order and the public reproof became effective on December 9, 2005.
6. Pursuant to the November 18, 2005 Order, Respondent was required to comply with certain terms and conditions attached to the public reproof, including the following conditions:
 - a. To comply with the State Bar Act and the Rules of Professional Conduct during the condition period attached to the reproof;
 - b. To submit to the Office of Probation written quarterly reports each January 10, April 10, July 10 and October 10 of each year or part thereof during the condition period attached to the reproof, certifying under penalty of perjury that he has complied with all provisions of the State Bar Act and the Rules of Professional Conduct during the preceding calendar quarter or part thereof covered by the report and to file a final report no earlier than twenty days prior to the expiration of the condition period attached to the reproof and not later than the last day of said period; and
 - c. To take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE") administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners and provide satisfactory evidence of same to the Office of Probation within one (1) year of the effective date of the

discipline order.

7. On or about December 5, 2005, a Probation Deputy from the Office of Probation wrote a letter to Respondent in which she reminded Respondent of the terms and conditions of the public reprobation imposed upon Respondent pursuant to the November 18, 2005 Order. In the December 5, 2005 letter, the Probation Deputy specifically advised Respondent that his first quarterly report was due on April 10, 2006, that he was required to take and pass the MPRE by or before December 9, 2006, and that he was required to complete State Bar Ethics School and provide proof of his compliance to the Office of Probation by or before December 9, 2006. Enclosed with the letter to Respondent were a copy of the portion of the Stipulation setting forth the conditions of Respondent's reprobation, a Quarterly Report form specially tailored for Respondent to use to submit his quarterly reports, a quarterly report information sheet, a schedule for the MPRE, and an information sheet and schedule for State Bar Ethics School.
8. The Probation Deputy's December 5, 2005 letter to Respondent was mailed on or about December 5, 2005 via the U.S. Postal Service, first class postage prepaid, in a sealed envelope properly addressed to Respondent at his State Bar membership records address. The letter was not returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable or for any other reason.
9. Respondent received the December 5, 2005 letter from the Probation Deputy.
10. On or about April 4, 2006, Respondent filed the April 10, 2006 quarterly report with the Office of Probation, but the report was defective. In the report, Respondent failed to certify under penalty of perjury that he had complied with the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
11. On or about May 31, 2006, a Supervising Attorney from the Office of Probation wrote a letter to Respondent advising him that the April 10, 2006 quarterly report that was filed on or about April 4, 2006 was defective. In the letter, she enclosed a blank quarterly report form and requested Respondent to correct the defect and re-submit the April 10, 2006 quarterly report within the next week.
12. The Supervising Attorney's May 31, 2006 letter to Respondent was mailed on or about May 31, 2006 via the U.S. Postal Service, first class postage prepaid, in a sealed envelope properly addressed to Respondent at his State Bar membership records address. The letter was not returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable or for any other reason.
13. Respondent received the May 31, 2006 letter from the Supervising Attorney.
14. On or about July 10, 2006, Respondent belatedly re-submitted the amended April 10, 2006 quarterly report to the Office of Probation. He failed to submit it by June 7, 2006, as requested by the Supervising Attorney from the Office of Probation.
15. On or about July 10, 2006, Respondent timely filed the July 10, 2006 quarterly report with the Office of Probation.

//

16. On or about August 30, 2006, a Probation Deputy from the Office of Probation wrote a letter to Respondent acknowledging receipt of the July 10, 2006 quarterly report. In the letter, she reminded him that his next quarterly report was due on or before October 10, 2006, that the final report was due by December 9, 2006, and that he must submit proof of completion of the MPRE no later than December 9, 2006. In bold writing, she advised him that, **"FAILURE TO TIMELY FILE THE FINAL REPORT AND/OR ANY OTHER REQUIRED PROOF OF COMPLIANCE WILL RESULT IN A REFERRAL FOR REVIEW AND DETERMINATION OF FURTHER ACTION."**
17. The Probation Deputy's August 30, 2006 letter to Respondent was mailed on or about August 30, 2006 via the U.S. Postal Service, first class postage prepaid, in a sealed envelope addressed to Respondent at his State Bar membership records address. The August 30, 2006 letter was not returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable or for any other reason.
18. Respondent received the August 30, 2006 letter from the Probation Deputy.
19. On or about October 11, 2006, Respondent belatedly filed with the Office of Probation the quarterly report, which was due on or before October 10, 2006.
20. On or about December 13, 2006, after the reapproval period ended, Respondent filed a motion for extension of time to take and provide proof of passage of the MPRE.
21. On or about December 14, 2006, Respondent belatedly filed with the Office of Probation the final report, which was due on or before December 9, 2006. In the final report, Respondent indicated that he had taken the MPRE on November 4, 2006, but did not pass the examination. He indicated in the final report that he had registered to take the March 10, 2007 MPRE.
22. On or about December 20, 2006, the State Bar of California, by and through the Office of Probation, filed and properly served Respondent with its opposition to his motion for extension of time.
23. On or about January 3, 2007, Respondent filed a reply to the State Bar's opposition to his motion for extension of time.
24. On or about January 4, 2007, the State Bar Court filed its Order, denying Respondent's motion for extension of time based on the fact that Respondent's motion was not timely.
25. On or about January 11, 2007, Respondent filed a motion for reconsideration.
26. On or about January 19, 2007, the State Bar of California, by and through the Office of Probation, filed and properly served Respondent with its opposition to Respondent's motion for reconsideration.
27. On or about February 14, 2007, the State Bar Court filed its Order, denying Respondent's motion for reconsideration because no good cause had been shown.
28. On or about March 10, 2007, Respondent took the MPRE, but did not receive a passing score.

29. To date, Respondent has failed to submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of passage of the MPRE, which should have been completed no later than December 9, 2006.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By failing to timely re-submit a compliant quarterly report that was due on April 10, 2006, by failing to timely submit the quarterly report that was due on October 10, 2006 and the final report that was due on December 9, 2006, and by failing to submit proof of passage of the MPRE, which proof was due by December 9, 2006, Respondent failed to comply with the conditions of the public reproof, in willful violation of rule 1-110 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS

The disclosure date referred to on page two, paragraph A(7), was October 4, 2007.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE

Pursuant to Standard 1.3 of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct ("Standards"), 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."

Here, the requested discipline complies with Standard 1.3.

Standard 1.6(a) provides that the appropriate sanction for an act of professional misconduct shall be the sanction set forth in the Standards for the particular misconduct found or acknowledged.

Standard 2.9 provides that, "[c]ulpability of a member of a wilful violation of rule 1-110, Rules of Professional Conduct, *shall* result in suspension" (emphasis added).

Finally, Standard 1.7(a) provides that if a member is found culpable of misconduct and has a prior record of one imposition of discipline, the degree of discipline imposed in the current proceeding shall be greater than that imposed in the prior proceeding unless the prior was remote in time and the offense for which it was imposed was so minimal that it would be manifestly unjust to impose greater discipline in the current proceeding.

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 Silvertown* (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.

//
//
//

In the case at bar, the stipulated discipline is within the range of discipline prescribed by the Standards as set forth above. Also, it is supported by case law. The case most analogous to the matter before us is *Conroy v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 799. In *Conroy*, the underlying discipline was a private reproof with conditions, one of which was that respondent was required to take and pass the Professional Responsibility Examination ("PRE") within one year of the effective date of the reproof, on or before December 30, 1987. The respondent failed to timely take and pass the PRE. However, he did tardily take and pass the PRE in March 1988, before the State Bar filed the reproof violation proceeding. In *Conroy*, the respondent defaulted at the Hearing Department level and was found culpable of willful violation of rule 9-101 of the former Rules of Professional Conduct, the precursor to rule 1-110 of the Rules of the Professional Conduct.

The Supreme Court in *Conroy* deemed the belated passage of the PRE to be an "extenuating factor," but not "significant mitigation." In aggravation, the Court found that the respondent had the one prior private reproof, that by defaulting, the respondent failed to appreciate the seriousness of the charges and the importance of participating in the State Bar proceedings, and that by suggesting on review that his misconduct was a mere technical lapse, he had failed to show remorse for his misconduct. On balance, the Supreme Court concluded that the aggravating circumstances significantly outweighed the mitigating circumstances, and imposed a one (1) year suspension from practice, stayed, with a one (1) year period of probation on terms and conditions, including a sixty-day (60) actual suspension.

Unlike the attorney in *Conroy*, who only violated a single condition of his reproof, Respondent violated three separate reproof conditions: belatedly filing his quarterly reports, belatedly filing his final report, and failing to take and pass the MPRE by December 9, 2006, as ordered. Also, Respondent, unlike the attorney in *Conroy*, still has not taken and passed the MPRE, and therefore, has not brought himself into compliance with the conditions of his reproof. Although Respondent claims that he took the MPRE (for the third time) in August 2007, he waited until November 2006 to first take the exam, even though he was fully aware that he was required to take and pass the MPRE by December 9, 2006.

Moreover, even though Respondent's misconduct is more egregious than that of the attorney in *Conroy*, the State Bar is willing to resolve the matter for less discipline because Respondent has been participating in the disciplinary proceedings, has been candid and cooperative, and has acknowledged and accepted responsibility for his misconduct. More importantly, unlike the attorney in *Conroy*, who was found to have several aggravating factors against him, the only aggravation against Respondent is his prior record of discipline. Thus, by imposing a six (6) months period of stayed suspension, with one (1) year probation with conditions, the public, the courts, and the legal profession would be adequately protected and the purposes of the disciplinary proceedings will be achieved.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that, as of October 4, 2007, the costs in this matter are \$1,636.00. Costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following two (2) billing cycles following the effective date of the Supreme Court order. Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from this stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the costs of further proceedings.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of STEPHEN ADRIAN RODRIGUEZ	Case number(s): 07-H-10071
---	--------------------------------------

SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES

By their signatures below, the parties and their counsel, as applicable, signify their agreement with each of the recitations and each of the terms and conditions of this Stipulation Re Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

<u>10/19/07</u> Date	<u>Stephen A. Rodriguez</u> Respondent's Signature	<u>STEPHEN ADRIAN RODRIGUEZ</u> Print Name
<u>10-19-07</u> Date	<u>S Rodriguez</u> Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u>STEPHEN ALLAN RODRIGUEZ, SR.</u> Print Name
<u>10-19-07</u> Date	<u>M. Murai</u> Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>MIHO MURAI</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter Of
STEPHEN ADRIAN RODRIGUEZ

Case Number(s):
07-H-10071

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

11/5/07


Judge of the State Bar Court

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

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on November 6, 2007, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

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

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


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

**STEPHEN A. RODRIGUEZ
4801 WILSHIRE BLVD #301
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010**

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

Miho Murai, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **November 6, 2007.**



Milagro del R. Salmeron
Case Administrator
State Bar Court