

1 Gastone Bebi, Esq. (#110183)
THE LAW OFFICES OF GASTONE BEBI
2 444 West "C" Street, Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92101
3 (619) 237-0514
(619) 374-1985 (Facsimile)

4 Attorneys for Respondent
5 MARY ELIZABETH BULLOCK

FILED
MAY 15 2009
STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES

6
7
8 **THE STATE BAR COURT**
9 **HEARING DEPARTMENT-LOS ANGELES**

10 In the Matter of:)
11 MARY ELIZABETH BULLOCK)
12)
13 Member of the State Bar Of California)
14 (Member No 153212)
15

Case No. 07-O-11692
ANSWER TO NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY
CHARGES

16 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

17 Respondent MARY ELIZABETH BULLOCK (hereinafter "Respondent") hereby responds to
18 the Notice Of Disciplinary Charges filed herein: Attached hereto is a Response To Disciplinary Charges
19 previously submitted by Respondent. Respondent hereby incorporates by reference, as though fully set
20 forth herein, the contents of said Response in this Answer To Notice Of Disciplinary charges..

21
22 Dated: May 13, 2009

THE LAW OFFICES
OF GASTONE BEBI

23
24 By: 
25 Gastone Bebi
26 Attorney for Respondent
27
28

Respondent's Answer

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE CASE NO. 05-O-04727-DFM

I, the undersigned, say: I am over 18 years of age, employed in the County of San Diego in which County the within mentioned mailing occurred; that I am not a party to the subject action.

My business address is The Law Offices of Gastone Bebi, 444 West "C" Street, Suite 400, San Diego California, 92101.

I served the foregoing document described as Defendants **RESPONSE** by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Office Of The Chief Trial Counsel Enforcement

Mr. Eli Morgenstern
Deputy Trial Counsel
The State Bar Of California
1149 South Hill Street,
Los Angeles CA 90015-2299
Fax (213) 765-1318

I caused such envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States mail in the City of San Diego, California, on May 13, 2009. That there is delivery service by the United States mail at the places so addressed, or regular communication by United States mail between the place of mailing and the places so addressed.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: 5/13/09


Gastone Bebi

Hon. Mary Elizabeth Bullock (Ret.)
3955 Faircross Place, Unit Number 73
San Diego, California 92115
Direct Telephone Numbers (619) 866-1076 / (619)795-1472
Undersigned's Facsimile (619) 727-4907

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES

In the matter of)	<u>Case No. 07-O-11692</u>
)	
MARY ELIZABETH BULLOCK)	
No. 153212)	RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF
)	DISCIPLINARY CHARGES
)	
A Member of the State Bar)	
_____)	

"INJUSTICE ANYWHERE, THREATENS JUSTICE EVERYWHERE"

—Martin Luther King

TO THE HONORABLE DONALD F. MILES PRESIDING JUDGE, STATE BAR COURT, HEARING DEPARTMENT, LOS ANGELES, THE RESPONDENT, HON. MARY ELIZABETH BULLOCK, SUBMITS ANSWERS TO THE NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES (HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS "NDC") IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASE, PURSUANT TO THE REQUEST OF THE HONORABLE DONALD F. MILES ON APRIL 27, 2009.

COUNT ONE

Case Number 07-O-11692
Business and Professions Code Section 6068(a)
[Failure to Comply with Laws - Prohibited Outside Employment]

Response to allegations made by the California State Bar in Case No. 07-0-11692

1. Respondent denies that the State Bar Court has jurisdiction over personal loans made to an officemate and friend. Moreover, the State Bar Court has no enforcement authority, and therefore no jurisdiction over what the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity

COUNT THREE

**Case Number 07-O-11692
Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-300
[Business Transaction With a Client]**

17. Respondent adamantly denies all allegations in paragraph 17, Count Three.
18. All responses from paragraph 1 through 17 are incorporated by reference.
19. Respondent affirms paragraph nineteen as her employer failed to pay her and the monies were loaned to Respondent as a personal loan, and for no other reason, so she could pay her rent.
20. Respondent affirms paragraph twenty, Count Three on the incorporation of paragraph 19, Count Three.
21. Respondent affirms paragraph three with the exception of the date, which Respondent is uncertain. See Paragraphs 17-21, Count Three.
22. Respondent received a personal loan from Castillo which does not necessitate the same stringent requirements, if any, as had there been an attorney-client relationship. Therefore, Respondent denies allegations as so stated in paragraph 22, Count Three.
23. Respondent denies allegations in paragraph 23, Count Three, as personal loans of \$2,000 do not usually require a collateral security. Respondent and Castillo were friends and office mates and the trust bond did not require security on a personal loan.
24. Respondent affirms that the personal loan was not reduced to a writing. Respondent and Castillo did not see the necessity of reducing the personal loan to paper as Castillo had a carbon copy check so the amount of the loan was memorialized.
25. Respondent has not had the opportunity to repay the loan but within approximately one month will be in a position to do so. See Exhibit D.
26. Respondent affirms paragraph 26, Count Three as interest was to be paid at the time of repayment.
27. Respondent adamantly denies paragraph 27, Count Three, as there was no business transaction and therefore no violation of Rule 3-300, Rules of Professional Conduct.

EXHIBIT A

1 THE LAW OFFICE OF
ERIC S. ERDMANN P.C. #171707
2 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
5190 Governor Drive
3 Suite 208
San Diego, CA 92122
4 Telephone:
(858) 558-0466
5 Fax: (858) 453-1799

6 Attorneys for Complainant Gigi Castillo

7
8 IRVING N. TRANEN
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

11
12 GIGI CASTILLO

13 Complainant,

COMPLAINT NO. 0-99000058-SD

SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

14
15 vs.

16
17 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION

18 Respondent Agency,

19
20
21
22 Complainant Gigi Castillo, hereby substitutes Attorney Eric S. Erdmann , as her
23 attorney / representative of record in place of herself in the above Complaint.

24
25 Dated: 5/17, 2000


Complainant

26 I hereby consent to the foregoing substitution.

27
28 Dated: 5/18, 2000


ERIC S. ERDMANN, Attorney At Law


1 THE LAW OFFICE OF
2 ERIC S. ERDMANN #171707
3 ATTORNEY AT LAW
4 12617 CELESTIAL COURT
5 POWAY, CA 92064

Telephone:

619 249-4406

Fax: 858 486-7541

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff Gigi Castillo



7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10
11 GIGI CASTILLO

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14
15 CARI M. DOMINGUEZ, CHAIRWOMAN,
16 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
17 OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

18 Defendant.
19
20

COMPLAINT NO. 00CV 2560 IEG (JFS)

SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY

Hon. Irma E. Gonzalez
Place: United States District
Court Southern District of
California

21
22 Please take notice that Plaintiff Gigi Castillo hereby substitutes Attorney Courtney Lockhart
23 California Bar # 225128 in place of Attorney Eric S. Erdmann California Bar #171707:

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///


27 ///

28 ///


1 The New Attorney of Record for the Plaintiff, mailing address and telephone number are
2 as follows:

3 Telephone No.: (619) 886-2267
4 Fax: No.: (619) 546-8733
5 Address: 1446 Essex St, San Diego, CA 92103
6
7

8 I consent to this substitution and stipulation dated July 22, 2005:

9
10 
11 _____
12 ERIC S. ERDMANN
13 Former Attorney for Plaintiff

14 I consent to this substitution and stipulation dated July 22, 2005:

15 
16 _____
17 Courtney Lockhart
18 New Attorney for Plaintiff

19 I consent to this substitution and stipulation dated July 29, 2005:

20 
21 _____
22 Gigi Castillo
23 Plaintiff

24 All parties in this stipulation, stipulate that this substitution of Attorney may be signed in
25 parts and a facsimile signature will be considered as an original.

26 ///

27 
28 By: _____
ERIC S. ERDMANN
Attorney for Plaintiff

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FILED
05 AUG -3 PM 2:13
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY: *JH* DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GIGI CASTILLO
Plaintiff,

vs.

CARI M. DOMINGUEZ, CHAIRWOMAN,
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
Defendant.

COMPLAINT NO. 00CV 2560 IEG (JFS)

ORDER

After review of the court record, circumstances concerning Plaintiff's original Attorney of Record being called back to active military service, consent of the Plaintiff and Attorneys for the Plaintiff; it is hereby ordered that the substitution of attorney, substituting Attorney Eric S. Erdmann for Attorney Courtney Lockhart is granted.

Dated: 8/3/05

Anna E. Gonzalez

Judge / Magistrate

71

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FILED

05 JUL 18 PM 8:49

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY: *[Signature]*
DEPUTY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GIGI CASTILLO,

Plaintiff,

v.

IDA CASTRO, Chairwoman, Equal
Employment Opportunity Commission,

Defendants.

Civil No. 00 CV 2560 IEG (JFS)

**SECOND CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE ORDER REGULATING
DISCOVERY AND OTHER PRETRIAL
PROCEEDINGS**

(Fed. R. Civ. P. 16)
(Local Rule 16.1)
(Fed. R. Civ. P. 26)

A Status Conference was held on July 14, 2005. Specially appearing on behalf of Plaintiff was Ms. Lockhart, and also attending was Mary Bullock. Beth Levine and John Sherlock appeared on behalf of Defendant. After being advised of the status of the case, the Court, *sua sponte*, issues the following Case Management Order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. On or before August 15, 2005, Plaintiff is directed to execute a new release of medical records, and any motion to join other parties, to amend the pleadings, or to file additional pleadings shall be filed.
2. All discovery shall be completed by all parties on or before February 1, 2006. All disputes concerning discovery shall be brought to the attention of the Magistrate Judge no later than thirty (30) days following the date upon which the event giving rise to the discovery dispute

69

1 occurred. "Completed" means that all discovery under Rules 30-36 of the Federal Rules of Civil
2 Procedure must be initiated a sufficient period of time in advance of the cut-off date, so that it may
3 be completed by the cut-off date, taking into account the times for service, notice, and response as
4 set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Counsel shall meet and confer pursuant to the
5 requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 and Local Rule 26.1(a)

6 3. On or before October 7, 2005, all parties shall exchange with all other parties either
7 a re-submitted or amended list of all expert witnesses expected to be called at trial. The list shall
8 include the name, address, and phone number of the expert and a brief statement identifying the
9 subject areas as to which the expert is expected to testify. The list shall also include the normal rates
10 the expert charges for deposition and trial testimony.

11 On or before October 21, 2005, any party may supplement its designation in response to any
12 other party's designation so long as that party has not, in the October 7 submission, already retained
13 an expert to testify on that subject. Each witness designated by a party shall prepare a new and/or
14 further supplement to the previous expert reports to be provided to all other parties no later than
15 December 1, 2005, containing the following information:

16 (a) a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed by that expert and the basis and
17 the reasons for those opinions;

18 (b) the data or other information considered by the witness in forming his or her opinions;

19 (c) any exhibits to be used as a summary of or support for the opinions;

20 (d) the qualifications of the expert, including a list of all publications authored by the
21 witness within the preceding ten years;

22 (e) the compensation to be paid for work performed, as well as deposition and trial
23 testimony;

24 (f) a list of any other cases, by court, case name and case number, in which the witness
25 has testified as an expert at trial or by deposition, within the preceding four years. Discovery
26 regarding experts, including files and depositions, shall be allowed as a matter of course.

27 Any party that fails to make these disclosures shall not absent substantial justification, be
28 permitted to use evidence or testimony not disclosed at any hearing or at the time of trial. In

1 addition, the Court may impose sanctions as permitted by FRCP 37(c).

2 4. Any party, through any expert designated, may, in accordance with FRCP 26(e),
3 supplement any of its expert reports regarding evidence intended solely to contradict or rebut
4 evidence on the same subject matter identified in an expert report submitted by another party. Any
5 such supplemental reports are due on or before December 15, 2005. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.
6 26(a)(2), these requirements apply to all experts offering expert opinions under Fed. R. Evid. 702,
7 703, 704, and 705, respectively.

8 5. All motions, other than motions to amend or join parties, or motions in limine, shall
9 be filed SO AS TO BE HEARD on or before January 20, 2006. Motions will not be heard or
10 calendared unless counsel for the moving party has obtained a motion hearing date from the law
11 clerk of the judge who will hear the motion. Be advised that the Court will not give a motion
12 hearing date unless the parties are prepared to file their moving papers in compliance with
13 Local Rule 7.1. Be further advised that the period of time between the date you request a
14 motion date and the hearing date may be approximately four to six weeks from the date of the
15 request. Please plan accordingly. For example, you may need to contact the judge's law clerk at
16 least six weeks in advance of the motion cut-off to calendar the motion. Failure of counsel to timely
17 request a motion date may result in the motion not being heard. Motions will not be heard on the
18 above date unless you have obtained that date in advance from the judge's law clerk.

19 6. As to all motions, it is counsels' responsibility to call and confirm hearing dates so
20 that motions are heard ON OR BEFORE the dates indicated.

21 7. Briefs or memoranda in support of or in opposition to any pending motion shall not
22 exceed twenty-five (25) pages in length without permission of the judge or magistrate judge who will
23 hear the motion. No reply memorandum shall exceed ten (10) pages without leave of the judge or
24 magistrate judge who will hear the motion.

25 8. A Mandatory Settlement Conference shall be conducted on November 17, 2005 at
26 10:00 a.m. in the chambers of Magistrate Judge James F. Stiven. Counsel shall submit confidential
27 settlement statements directly to chambers no later than November 10, 2005. If the case does not
28 settle sooner, another Mandatory Settlement Conference shall be conducted on March 10, 2006 at

SEP-07-2005 11:01

**PASSMAN
& KAPLAN**
Attorneys at Law P.C.

1090 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
PHONE (202) 789-0100 FAX (202) 789-0101
www.passmanandkaplan.com

Edward H. Passman (DC, MD)
Joseph V. Kaplan (DC, MD)

Sandra Mazlish (DC, NY)
Bryan J. Schwartz (DC, CA)
Debra A. D'Agostino (NY)*
Kenneth C. Wu (DC, IL)
Lynette A. Whitfield (MD)*

Of Counsel
Gary M. Gilbert (MD, FL) ▲

*Practice in DC limited to matters and
procedures before federal agencies

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO: Gigi Castillo (c/o Mary Elizabeth Bullock) FAX #: 619-303-5143
FR: Joe Kaplan, Esq. DT: September 7, 2005
RE: Representation

The following information is enclosed consisting of 7 pages, including this cover sheet:

Gigi, pursuant to our initial consultation, attached are the fee agreement and power of attorney. Please read the agreement carefully. If you have any questions, please call me before signing. If acceptable, initial the bottom of each page, sign and date the last page of the fee agreement and sign and date the power of attorney. Please write in your Social Security Number on each document where indicated. FedEx them back to me along with a check for \$7,500 made payable to "Passman & Kaplan, PC." You also need to send me, expeditiously, the court complaint, answer, deposition transcripts, Report of Investigation, Court orders and, when possible, the medical documents. ALSO, if you authorize me to speak to Mary Elizabeth Bullock about your case in your absence, please indicate that to me in writing. I look forward to working with you.

Joe

Hard copy will will not follow.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This facsimile transmission is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) designated above. It may also constitute an attorney-client communication or represent attorney work product and may therefore be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication (or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure or use of the information contained herein is Strictly Prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by telephone immediately to arrange return of the document to us. Thank you.

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES INDICATED, PLEASE CALL 202-789-0100 IMMEDIATELY.

TO FAX A RETURN, THE NUMBER IS 202-789-0101.

▲ Maryland Office:
8401 Colesville Road, Suite 315
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel. 301-608-0880 Fax 301-608-0881

POWER OF ATTORNEY

This is to certify that I,

Gigi Castillo

488-62-1849

NAME

SSN

6252 Lolly Lane

ADDRESS

San Diego,

CA

92114

CITY

STATE

ZIP

619-557-7287

619-527-0715

PHONE (WORK)

(HOME)

do hereby grant **PASSMAN & KAPLAN, P.C.**, attorneys at law, 1090 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005, **POWER OF ATTORNEY** to act for and on my behalf in all matters coincidental to my case, including the right to have access to records pertaining to me which are contained in records, reports, investigations, examinations or system(s) of records maintained by any agency or office of the Government of the United States, any state government, any municipal government, or any other governmental entity, including documents and records otherwise protected from disclosure under the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a.

Dated: 9/7/05

Gigi Castillo
Signature

COURTNEY B. LOCKHART, ESQ.
1446 ESSEX STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
(619)886-2267
CLOCKHARTLAW@GMAIL.COM

August 10, 2005

United States Attorney's Office
Assistant US Attorney
Beth L. Levine
880 Front St., Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101
Fax (619)557-5004

Via Facsimile Only

Dear Ms. Levine:

Please find the enclosed Medical Releases with the originals to follow via US Mail.


In addition, please allow this email to confirm my telephone message of August 9, 2005, wherein I requested that you graciously allow my client a two week extension to amend her pleadings. As previously noted, I have only recently received two banker's boxes of documents in this matter and am attempting to get up to speed rather quickly. Further, it has come to my attention that pertinent documents are missing and my client's prior counsel improperly and/or inaccurately plead certain factual allegations.

To that end, I am confident that you will deem my request to be reasonable so that we may all be on the same page with regard to the accuracy of Ms. Castillo's factual allegations.

In the event you require a more formal agreement be drafted or elect not to grant the requested extension please so advise at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,



Courtney B. Lockhart,
Attorney at Law

COURTNEY B. LOCKHART, ESQ.
1446 ESSEX STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
(619)886-2267
CLOCKHARTLAW@GMAIL.COM

August 11, 2005

United States Attorney's Office
Assistant US Attorney
Beth L. Levine
880 Front St., Room 6293
San Diego, CA 92101
Fax (619)557-5004

Via Facsimile Only


Dear Ms. Levine:

Please allow this correspondence to memorialize your telephone message of August 11, 2005, wherein you graciously agreed to allow my client a two week extension to file a motion to amend her pleadings. Accordingly, the new date that said motions will be filed by is August 29, 2005.

In addition, per your message I will send you a draft of any amended pleadings in the event you desire to stipulate to allow said filing.

As always, your cooperation is greatly appreciated.


Sincerely,



Courtney B. Lockhart,
Attorney at Law

1 Courtney Lockhart
2 1446 Essex Street
3 San Diego, CA
4 92103
5 Telephone: 619 886-2267
6 Fax: 619 546-8733

7 Attorney for Plaintiff Gigi Castillo



8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **GIGI CASTILLO**

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13
14 **CARI M. DOMINGUEZ, CHAIRWOMAN,**
15 **EQUAL EMPLOYMENT**
16 **OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION**

17 Defendant.

18 **COMPLAINT NO. 00CV 2560 IEG (JFS)**

19 **SUBSTITUTION OF ATTORNEY**

20
21 **Hon. Irma E. Gonzalez**
22 **Place: United States District**
23 **Court Southern District of**
24 **California**

25 Please take notice that Plaintiff Gigi Castillo hereby substitutes herself in pro per in place
26 of Attorney Courtney Lockhart California Bar # 225128. Ms. Castillo respectfully requests
27 a three week extension on all deadlines for the month of August 2005 and September
28 2005 while she secures new counsel.

///

///

///


///

///

///


United States Attorney's Office

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



San Diego County Office
Federal Offices Building
880 Front Street, Room 6295
San Diego, California 92101-8893

Imperial County Office
321 South Waterman Avenue
Room 204
El Centro, California 92243-2215



FAX COVER SHEET

TO:	<i>Courtney Lockhart Esq</i>		
ORGANIZATION:			
PHONE:		FAX NO.:	<i>(619) 546-8733</i>
DATE:	<i>8/2/05</i>	PAGES:	<i>3</i>
<p><i>Re: Lige Castillo V. Dominguez</i></p>			
TRANSMITTED BY:	<i>Christina</i>	TIME:	<i>5:20 p.m.</i>
FROM:	<i>Beth H. Levine, ASST</i>		
ORGANIZATION:			
PHONE:		FAX NO.:	<i>(619) 557-5704</i>
<p><small>NOTE: If you do not receive the total number of pages indicated above, please call the individual listed above. IMPORTANT: If this fax was erroneously sent to your fax number, please contact sending individual immediately</small></p>			



U.S. Department of Justice

CAROL C. LAM
United States Attorney
Southern District of California

Beth L. Levine*
Assistant United States Attorney

(619) 557-7185
Fax (619) 557-5004

San Diego County Office*
Federal Office Building
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, California 92101-8893

Imperial County Office
321 South Waterman Avenue
Room 204
El Centro, California 92243-2215

August 2, 2005

Courtney Lockhart, Esq.
1446 Essex Street
San Diego, CA 92103

Re: Gigi Castillo v. Dominguez
Case No. 00CV2560-IEG(JFS)

Dear Ms. Lockhart:

Just today I received the substitution of counsel in the above-referenced case. Based upon Ms. Bullock's representations during the telephonic status conference held on July 14, 2005, I had expected to receive it within a few days after the conference. Because of the delay, I was unable, until now, to forward the new medical and psych releases for Ms. Castillo to sign. I would very much appreciate your having her sign the forms immediately so that I can obtain updated records. In prior responses to interrogatories, Ms. Castillo listed Kaiser Permanente and Dr. Lawrence Woodburn as health care providers. In light of the short time frames provided by the court, please also have Ms. Castillo identify, by name, address, telephone number, and specialty, if any, any additional health care providers she has visited since June 2002. If this additional information cannot be provided with the signed releases, please let me know immediately.

Thank you very much for your prompt response.

Very truly yours,

CAROL C. LAM
United States Attorney

BETH L. LEVINE
Assistant U.S. Attorney

① June 02, - present
② relevant to case

Enclosures

~~REDACTED RECEIVED THIS NOTICE YESTERDAY BY FAX~~

Just complete and return the authorization below. ~~REDACTED AND ITS FAX~~

CASE: 002560-CV-ATTYSUBST Doc #: 00070 Name Id: 292602 Imported: 08/04/2005 13:18

COURTNEY LOCKHART
LAW OFFICE OF COURTNEY LOCKHART
1446 ESSEX STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92103

Authorization to Send Orders and Judgments by Facsimile Transmission

The Clerk of Court for the Southern District of California is authorized to transmit notice of entry of judgment or orders under Fed.R.Civ.P. 77 and Fed.R.Crim.P. 49 by facsimile transmission of judgments, orders or notices in any case in which this capability exists and the undersigned is designated for service according to Civ LR 83.3(f). I understand that this electronic notice will be in lieu of notice by mail. The following telephone number is dedicated for facsimile transmission:

Fax Phone # _____	Firm Name _____
Phone # _____	Attorney Name _____
State Bar # _____	Street Address _____
Signature _____	City, State, Zip _____

Notice: Attorneys must comply with Civ LR 83.3(e) regarding change of address or fax number to ensure proper service.

~~REDACTED~~
Mail or Fax to:

United States District Court
W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Clerk of Court
880 Front Street, #4290
San Diego, CA 92101-8900

~~REDACTED~~

VISIT US ON-LINE AT www.casd.uscourts.gov

You'll find Local Rules, district and magistrate judge calendars, frequently requested General Orders, vacancy announcements, answers to frequently asked questions, as well as general court information.

You Could Have Received This Notice Yesterday By Fax

Just complete and return the authorization below. It's FREE and it's FAST!

CASE: 002560-CV-O Doc #: 00071 Name Id: 292602 Imported: 08/04/2005 13:18 JAH

COURTNEY LOCKHART
LAW OFFICE OF COURTNEY LOCKHART
1446 ESSEX STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92103

Authorization to Send Orders and Judgments by Facsimile Transmission

The Clerk of Court for the Southern District of California is authorized to transmit notice of entry of judgment or orders under Fed.R.Civ.P. 77 and Fed.R.Crim.P. 49 by facsimile transmission of judgments, orders or notices in any case in which this capability exists and the undersigned is designated for service according to Civ LR 83.3(f). I understand that this electronic notice will be in lieu of notice by mail. The following telephone number is dedicated for facsimile transmission:

Fax Phone #	<u>619 546 8733</u>	Firm Name	<u>Courtney Lockhart</u>
Phone #	<u>619 886 2267</u>	Attorney Name	<u>Courtney Lockhart</u>
State Bar #	<u>225128</u>	Street Address	<u>1446 Essex St.</u>
Signature		City, State, Zip	<u>San Diego Ca 92103</u>

Notice: Attorneys must comply with Civ LR 83.3(e) regarding change of address or fax number to ensure proper service.

Mail or Fax to:

United States District Court
W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Clerk of Court
880 Front Street, #4290
San Diego, CA 92101-8900

Fax: (619) 557-5175

VISIT US ON-LINE AT www.casd.uscourts.gov

You'll find Local Rules, district and magistrate judge calendars, frequently requested General Orders, vacancy announcements, answers to frequently asked questions, as well as general court information.

AUTHORIZATION TO RELEASE MEDICAL INFORMATION

PATIENT:

RELEASE TO:

NAME: Gigi Castillo

Representatives of the
United States Attorney's Office
or Department of Justice

BIRTH DATE: February 12, 1944

INFORMATION REQUESTED: I request and authorize any physician, nurse, hospital and other medical health care providers and suppliers to release the information specified below to representatives of the United States Attorney's Office or the Department of Justice.

Any and all records regarding care, treatment, services and/or supplies furnished to Gigi Castillo, including but not limited to:

- 1. Copy of complete medical chart, records, reports, progress notes, interview notes, histories, correspondence, discharge summaries, x-ray and all imagery, laboratory tests, pathology tissue, and all diagnostic studies whether in electronic data or other format, and
- 2. Billing records.

PURPOSE OR NEED FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS TO BE USED: The information is required for use in connection with my lawsuit, Castillo v. Dominguez, Case No. 00CV2560, now pending in U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California.

CERTIFICATION: I certify that this request has been made voluntarily and that this information given above is accurate to the best of my knowledge. I understand that I may revoke this Authorization at any time, provided that revocation is in writing, except to the extent that action already has been taken in reliance this Authorization. I understand that the doctor, health care provider, or health plan from whom my medical information is requested in this Authorization, may not condition treatment, payment, enrollment or eligibility for benefits on whether I sign this authorization. I understand the potential for the information disclosed pursuant to this Authorization to be subject to redisclosure by the recipient and no longer be protected by federal privacy regulations, Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, set forth at 45 C.F.R. Parts 160 and 164.

EXPIRATION: This Authorization automatically will expire upon completion of the litigation in Castillo v. Dominguez, Case No. 00CV2560.

OTHER CONDITIONS:

A copy of this Authorization or my signature thereon shall be used with the same effectiveness as an original.

Communications between provider and any representative of the U.S. Attorney's Office/Department of Justice are authorized.

SIGNATURE OF PATIENT: _____

MONTH/DAY/YEAR

PRINT OR TYPE NAME

1 **10:00 a.m.** in the chambers of Magistrate Judge James F. Stiven. Counsel shall submit confidential
2 settlement statements directly to chambers no later than **March 3, 2006**. Each party's settlement
3 statement shall set forth the party's statement of the case, identify controlling legal issues, concisely
4 set out issues of liability and damages, and shall set forth the party's settlement position, including
5 the last offer or demand made by that party, and a separate statement of the offer or demand the party
6 is prepared to make at the settlement conference. Settlement conference briefs shall not be filed
7 with the Clerk of the Court, nor shall they be served on opposing counsel.

8 9. All parties and claims adjusters for insured defendants and representatives with
9 complete authority to enter into a binding settlement, as well as the principal attorney(s) responsible
10 for the litigation, must be present and legally and factually prepared to discuss and resolve the case
11 at the mandatory settlement conference. Retained outside corporate counsel shall not appear on
12 behalf of a corporation as the party who has the authority to negotiate and enter into a settlement.

13 10. Parties or their counsel shall serve on each other and file with the Clerk of the Court
14 their Memoranda of Contentions of Fact and Law in compliance with Local Rule 16.1(f)(3) and (4)
15 on or before **April 3, 2006**.

16 11. All parties or their counsel shall also fully comply with the Pretrial Disclosure
17 requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3) on or before **April 3, 2006**. Failure to comply with these
18 disclosure requirements could result in evidence preclusion or other sanctions under Fed. R.
19 Civ. P. 37.

20 12. Counsel shall meet together and take the action required by Local Rule 16.1(f)(5) on
21 or before **April 10, 2006**. At this meeting, counsel shall discuss and attempt to enter into
22 stipulations and agreements resulting in simplification of the triable issues. Counsel shall exchange
23 copies and/or display all exhibits other than those to be used for impeachment, lists of witnesses and
24 their addresses including experts who will be called to testify, and written contentions of applicable
25 facts and law. The exhibits shall be prepared in accordance with Local Rule 16.1(f)(4)(c). Counsel
26 shall note any objections they have to any other parties' Pretrial Disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. P.
27 26(a)(3). Counsel shall cooperate in the preparation of the proposed pretrial conference order.

28 13. The proposed final pretrial conference order, including objections they have to any

1 other parties' Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3) Pretrial Disclosures shall be prepared, served and lodged with
 2 the Clerk of the Court on or before April 17, 2006, and shall be in the form prescribed in and in
 3 compliance with Local Rule 16.1(f)(7). Counsel shall also bring a court copy of the pretrial order
 4 to the pretrial conference.

5 14. The final pretrial conference shall be held before the Honorable Irma E. Gonzalez,
 6 United States District Court Judge, on April 24, 2006 at 10:30 a.m.

7 15. The dates and times set forth herein will not be further modified except for good
 8 cause shown.

9 16. Plaintiff's counsel shall serve a copy of this order on all parties that enter this case
 10 hereafter.

11
 12 DATED: 7-14-05


 Hon. James F. Stiven
 United States Magistrate Judge

14 Copy to: Hon. Irma E. Gonzalez
 U.S. District Judge
 15 All Counsel of Record
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

EXHIBIT B

6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114
March 4, 2009

Donald F. Miles, Judge of the State Bar Court
THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299

**Regarding Case No. 07-O-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock
Only Alleged Complainant: Gigi Castillo (see DECISION to believe it)**

Dear Judge Miles:

This letter is an appeal to correct inaccuracies of relevant statements made in your PUBLIC MATTER DECISION dated January 21, 2009. Mr. Morgenstern furnished false statements on paper and on telephone conversations with me about the following: (see letter enclosed, dated February 23, 2009, from Mr. Morgenstern to Gigi Castillo).

The statement number **“(1) employed Ms. Bullock to represent you in your discrimination case against the EEOC”** is inaccurate.

The right statement for Number 1 should read:

(1) employed Ms. Bullock to represent you in your discrimination case against the EEOC after she (Ms. Bullock) retires.

Mr. Morgenstern intentionally omitted the phrase **“after she (Ms. Bullock) retires”** to make out Case No. 07-O-11692.

The statement number **“(2) paid Ms. Bullock \$5,000 to represent you in your discrimination case against the EEOC”** is again inaccurate.

It was Atty. Courtney Lockhart who represented me in my case against the EEOC after Atty. Eric Erdmann left to go to war in Iraq. Atty. Lockhart representing me was also announced at the status telephonic conference on July 14, 2005 that she in fact succeeded Eric Erdmann as my attorney of record. However, Atty. Lockhart readily abandoned me after her receipt of the \$2,500. The remaining \$2,500 was to establish Ms. Bullock's law office after she retires from EEOC..

Therefore, the right statement for No. 2 should read:

(2) paid Ms. Bullock \$5,000 to represent you in your discrimination case against the EEOC after she (Ms. Bullock) retires. It is

however noted that \$2,500 was given to Atty. Lockhart as "Retainer Fee" for being your attorney of record.

The statement number (3) **received legal advice from Ms. Bullock in regard to your discrimination case"** is inaccurate in its entirety. I never said Ms. Bullock gave me legal advice although carelessly assumed by Mr. Morgenstern.

Also, in the **PUBLIC MATTER DECISION** dated January 21, 2006, wherein it was stated on page 3, **"From in or about June 2005 until in or about August 2005, respondent rendered legal advice and analysis to Castillo regarding equal employment opportunity law and its application to the discrimination complaint"** is inaccurate. At that time, no analysis of my case against the EEOC was done by Ms. Bullock as far as I am aware of.

If Mr. Morgenstern is seriously diligent and holds his position in high esteem as a Deputy Trial Attorney, he should not have proceeded in fashioning out Case No. 07-O-1162, **without my filling out the California Attorney Complaint Form**. In this way, there would not have been this dispute as to what he says I said, which is what is happening now.

I firmly believe that the State Bar of California's rule of thumb requires that if documents and information come from third parties, verification is direly needed from the source of those statements submitted. Failure to do so is the height of gross negligence in the performance of one's job duties and your Office should not tolerate undue negligence to preserve its credibility to the public.

By not allowing me to fill up the California Attorney Complaint Form and by intentionally failing to verify third party information, Mr. Morgenstern committed abuse of discretion. America is governed by democratic principles where human beings are given some forms of courtesy. Even dogs have rights in America. How about me?

What Mr. Morgenstern did was stripped me completely of my rights by allowing anybody to talk for me or write anything about me and presumed that I would not say anything and accept everything as long as I'd be offered to have my money back because I am a poor old Filipino – this is very disgraceful!!!

I take grievous offense in my being used by Mr. Morgenstern on Case No. 07-O-11692 in the performance of his job as a Deputy Trial Counsel, most especially that your DECISION is a PUBLIC MATTER for everyone to read, analyze and quote someday.

To tell you the truth, I could care less about Ms. Bullock's committing acts of professional misconduct or the suspension of her license and/or disbaring her from the practice of law, but please don't ever omit important parts of what I said and make them as my own statements because that is tantamount to making me a "liar." I want to make it clear to you that I have nothing to gain whether Ms. Bullock could practice law or not.

What I care most of all is my being made a participant without my consent and made lies about what they say I said. In the Filipino culture, there is nothing more outrageous than to be made a liar especially at my ripe age. Do you know, Sir, that there are Filipinos who would rather die than be branded a "liar"? I think it is fair to suspect that there must be great stakes waiting for Mr. Morgenstern at the conclusion of Case No. 07-O-11692 to go to this extent of making out intentional inaccuracies.

And inasmuch as Ms. Bullock did not have the chance to even represent me in my case against the EEOC to date, the money I gave her turned into a personal loan which is nobody's business, not even the State Bar of California or Mr. Morgenstern, the EEOC and the US Department of Justice. Who else besides me and my family, would justifiably really cares if I have that money or lose it?

Judge Miles, also please note that I filed a lawsuit against my employer which is the reason that EEOC conveniently submitted to the State Bar of California the Office of Inspector General (OIG) Reports, without my consent, to get back at me even after my retirement, in efforts to retaliate further against me. This resurrected all the wounds inflicted to me during my 27 years of employment. I even have firm reason to believe that Case No. 07-O-11692 was instigated by EEOC that did the initial investigation in 2005, but was not however successful in terminating Ms. Bullock for misconduct. So the matter was turned over to the State Bar of California for action without my input. This way, EEOC further retaliates against me and Ms. Bullock, because we were the only district employees who had the temerity to stand up for justice. Hence, the case was assigned to Atty. Morgenstern with the distinct role to break Standard Intake Procedures.

Relating to discharge attempts of EEOC for employee misconduct, there was also a time when the same Investigators from OIG (two Investigators) were also sent to investigate me for the \$20.00 I gave to a discharged Charging Party to feed her children. The OIG Investigators were immediately flown first class to San Diego to stay in a five star hotel. While nothing came out of this ludicrous case, it reinforces once more the extent of harassment inflicted on me, not to mention misuse of taxpayers' money. Such government action has similarity to Case No. 07-O-11692.

Another glaring inaccuracy on Atty. Morgenstern's statement is found in his letter to me dated February 23, 2009 where he stated under "**Complainant - State Bar Initiated.**" There is no way that all of a sudden he saw me in his dreams or on TV and then cooked up an unpalatable recipe of lies. If he says that he initiated Case No 07-O-11692 after talking to me on the telephone asking me among other things, "Do you want your money back? And I responded, "That would be nice." Never in my wildest imagination did I know that to obtain for me the money loaned to Ms. Bullock would entail him telling lies about me and Ms. Bullock. His tactic of getting my money back is a dishonest way of making a living and I can't accept that. But when I asked him a copy of pertinent documents, he hides under the cloak of confidentiality - a cowardly response.

With the time, money and effort I have been spending in defense of the truth in Case No. 07-O-11692 since my receipt of PUBLIC MATTER DECISION, I will hold you and your good Office especially Mr. Morgenstern responsible for disturbing my peaceful life in retirement. During this time of depressed economy, instead of spending my precious time and energy to take care of business matters, my whole attention has been diverted in defense of the truth. It took me at least five days to prepare this letter to you.

I hope and pray to my Higher God that I could live through to bring this matter to its fruition. But just in case I won't, I will make sure that my five children and fourteen grandchildren will continue to pursue the truth in my defense. You have to believe me when I say that I will surely rise up from my grave to defend my good name and my honor in that I did not make those above disputed statements as Mr. Morgenstern says I said.

Judge Miles, kindly put yourself in my shoes to fully understand where I am coming from and what I am trying to convey to you. You yourself will also retire someday and you would detest such kind of baggage still hovering over your head. I am too old to play Atty. Morgenstern and his cohort's game. If Atty. Morgenstern thinks that I should be grateful to him for his efforts to get back the money loaned to Ms. Bullock which I should in fact be very grateful, my conscience does not accept it because I cannot sell my soul. Therefore, please do advise Atty. Morgenstern to shelve the money he is offering me because the kind of truth I seek is beyond the commerce of men.

Therefore, I am requesting that my good name and the circumstances about me be deleted from Case No. 07-O-11692 in its entirety. I am also requesting that disciplinary action be given to Atty. Morgenstern for furnishing you inaccurate information that formed the basis of your PUBLIC MATTER DECISION.

Sincerely yours,

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.

6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114
February 20, 2009

Holly Fujie, President
State Bar Board of Governors
1000 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Case No. 07-O-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock

Dear President Fujie:

This letter comes to you as a surprise and I don't mean to intrude into your peaceful day. However, there is no other recourse than to seek your benevolent indulgence at this point. I have contacted several places to put a stop to the harassment being instituted by the State Bar of California, but to no avail. Please, kindly help me get all the documents that mentioned my name and/or made reference to my name on Case No. 07-O-11692.

Our former employer, the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) contrived with the State Bar of California in its laconic attempt to destroy the career and life of both Ms. Bullock and myself. Thus, the State Bar conjured to make me a Complainant without my consent and came out with an issue that should have been buried in 2005. EEOC must have a deep-seated hatred against both Ms. Bullock and me being victims of our employer's discriminatory practices but had rallied against it during our entire career. Because we work in isolation being branded as "trouble-makers" we became "friends in misery" through the years.

But I am now a poor, old, and powerless woman with a heart ailment that's acquired during my employment. Originally from a destitute third world country, I retired under duress in 2006 as a Federal Investigator after working 27 years. I loved my job but had to spend part of my time going in and out of court spending hard earned money in my defense.

Ms. Bullock retired on disability as an Administrative Judge in 2007. She has been very sick, gets in and out of the hospital where she is at again today. Her daily bread and butter are harassing letters from the State Bar of California.

The above scenario of subduing the weak and helpless reminds me of a forgotten episode in the annals of American history during the Philippine-American War in 1898. When America invaded the Philippines, it sent its experienced soldiers (in warfare against the Americans Indians) with rifles on hand, to fight the Filipinos with only machetes and spears trying to defend themselves and their land against greedy invaders. After successfully killing million Filipinos, of course the American soldiers came home victorious and were awarded "Medals of Honor."

What prize victory when the playing field is unequal?

Sane minds would think that the State Bar of California can better spend their time and effort by going after those who put Americans and the world into this grim economy. That should be a more honorable victory for them than going after the weak and the powerless!

Case No. 07-O-11692 has no other purpose than to bring me nearer to my grave with enormous emotional stress. I should spend my precious time working on my mortgages before I go homeless, but instead I am busy trying to absolve myself to contributing to Ms. Bullock's demise. I very much need to retire in peace.

Please do help me obtain the documents where my name was mentioned on Case No. 07-O-11692. Mr. Eli Morgenstern from the State Bar of California has invoked "confidentiality" but what is confidential when my good name is mentioned, but is being tarnished to suit a malicious intent? I am confident that you can help me in this predicament. I very much appreciate a response from you.

Sincerely yours,

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.

P.S. I no longer have money to hire a lawyer to defend me and my interest as some had sold and cheated me, but EEOC is represented by the US Department of Justice with a battalion of lawyers drawing sizeable salaries on taxpayers' money. The playing field is against me and I am not getting justice anywhere. Besides losing her license to practice law, Ms. Bullock is of no help to me even if she wants to as she is just now skin and bones, fighting for her dear life.



STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

1149 SOUTH HILL STREET, 5th FLOOR, LOS ANGELES, CA 90015-2299

MICHELLE CRAMTON

Court Administrator

(213) 765-1461

michelle.cramton@calbar.ca.gov

February 18, 2009

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.
6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114

Dear Ms. Castillo:

Your letter to Donald F. Miles, Judge of the State Bar Court, dated February 10, 2009 was referred to me for response.

The issues you raise cannot be addressed by the Court. Therefore, I am forwarding your correspondence to the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michelle Cramton".

Michelle Cramton
Court Administrator
State Bar Court – Los Angeles

6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114
February 18, 2009

Scott J. Drexel, Chief Trial Counsel, State Bar of California
1149 South Hill street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299

Case No. 07-O-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock

Dear Chief Trial Counsel Drexel:

I am writing you to appeal the denial of my request addressed to Mr. Eli D. Morgenstern under the Freedom of Information Act, for a copy of all written documents that mentioned my name and/or made reference to my name contained on Case No. 07-O-11692. While it maybe the California State Bar's policy or your own for all I know, there is nothing under the California Constitution or any of the citations mentioned on Mr. Morgenstern's response to me, that lawfully denies me the said request.

Please, kindly understand the dilemma and emotional stress your agency had unnecessarily put me into. The "Decision" on Case No. 07-O-11692 sent to me by Mr. Morgenstern clearly identified me as the "Complainant." Anybody in their right mind would be as perplexed as I am, most especially after advising Investigator Lisa Foster in 2007 that I be excluded from any investigation she was pursuing. What happened with this request? It should be very easy on your part to understand why I would need the above requested documents instead of hiding under the cloak of irrelevant rules. I did not ask to be put into this situation – your agency decided to clandestinely insert my name without my consent which is against public policy.

Therefore, I appeal to renew my request to you for a copy of all written documents that mentioned my name and/or made reference to my name relative to Case No. 07-O-11692, under the Freedom of Information Act.

Your diligent and prompt attention to my request is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.

6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114
February 17, 2009

Scott J. Drexel, Chief Trial Counsel
The State Bar of California
1149 South Hill street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299

Case No. 07-O-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock

Dear Chief Trial Counsel Drexel:

I am writing you to appeal the denial of my request addressed to Mr. Elii D. Morgenstern under the Freedom of Information Act, for a copy of all written documents that mentioned my name and/or made reference to my name contained on Case No. 07-O-11692. While it maybe the California State Bar's policy or your own for all I know, there is nothing under the California Constitution or any of the citations mentioned on Mr. Morgenstern's response , that lawfully denies me the said request. Therefore, I appeal to renew my request to you for a copy of all written documents that mentioned my name and/or made reference to my name relative to Case No. 07-O-11692, under the Freedom of Information Act.

Your diligent attention to my request is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.

6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114
February 10, 2009

Donald F. Miles, Judge of the State Bar Court
The State Bar of California
1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299

Case No. 07-O-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock

Dear Judge Miles:

This letter urges you to please reconsider your Decision of the above named case because it contains spurious data, a hoax, highly questionable in its entirety with the malicious intent to injure, do me harm and to create havoc in my life, instead of having me live in peaceful retirement. Specifically, please consider the following circumstances:

1. The "Decision" identified only one alleged complainant, which is myself. However, I never did make any oral or had submitted any written complaint to the California Bar against Ms. Bullock, for the money I gave her and/or loaned her in 2005;
2. California Bar dispensed its own intake rules when perfecting Case No. 07-O-11 692 as it bypassed the requirement to have me fill and submit a Complaint Form with my signature;
3. Third party information was used to perfect Case No. 07-O-11692;
4. The information furnished by the third party informants to the California Bar that was used on Case No. 07-O-11692 and its concomitant "Decision" contain erroneous and distorted data;;
5. The third party informants who furnished the information and documents used on Case No. 07-O-11692 failed to obtain my legitimate signature and content;

6. No investigation was attempted by the California Bar to determine the veracity of the information and documents furnished by the third party informants;
7. **Besides the above procedural infractions, the "Decision" of Case No. 07-O-11692 contains distorted and erroneous information, as presented and analyzed below:**
 - a. **Regarding Ms. Bullock's retirement date:** Ms. Bullock never informed me that she would be retiring from the EEOC in or about July 2005. Retirement date is controlled by her employer, the EEOC, and not Ms. Bullock;
 - b. **Regarding my employing Ms. Bullock:** I never did employ Ms. Bullock to represent me in my case against the EEOC, from the remotest past to the present;
 - c. **Regarding Ms. Bullock representing me during a telephonic conference:** Ms. Bullock was in no position to represent me telephonically during the status conference of my court case against the EEOC on or about July 14, 2005. With the Magistrate's consent, Ms. Bullock was there as my moral support being a co-worker. During that telephonic conference, Courtney Lockhart, who I did not know that well was introduced as my new attorney of record and was there to represent me, and not Ms. Bullock;
 - d. **Regarding Ms. Bullock's representing me after she retires:** Ms. Bullock only promised to represent me in court after she retires but this never happened because EEOC had full control of the date of her retirement and it apparently intentionally delayed it to deprive her of the chance to represent me;
 - e. **Regarding the money I gave to Ms. Bullock:** Ms. Bullock had indeed asked me to give \$5,000.00 because Ms. Courtney Lockhart was asking for a retainer fee. Being a co-worker, I trusted Ms.

- f. Bullock and I readily handed her a check amounting \$5,000.00. Ms. Bullock introduced me to Ms. Lockhart but I did not know her well. Ms. Bullock told me that she will give \$2,500.00 to Ms. Lockhart and the remainder will be used to put up her law office after she retires – I believed Ms. Bullock, and I had no problem with that arrangement. I also gave Ms. Bullock another \$2,000.00 to pay her rent because she was experiencing financial difficulties at the time. I don't want my money back if it means suspending or terminating her to practice law. The end does not justify the means.
- g. **Regarding Ms. Bullock's rendition of legal advice and analysis of my lawsuit against EEOC:** Ms. Bullock did not render legal advice and analysis of my case regarding equal employment opportunity laws and its application to my discrimination lawsuit from in or about June 2005 until in or about August 2005. I did not have a need for Ms. Bullock for that purpose as I just won my case at the Ninth Circuit Court. The "Decision" greatly humiliated me, making me appear stupid as it had lost track of the fact that I am quite well-informed with equal employment opportunity laws, analysis of voluminous data, and their application to discrimination complaints which I did for a living for more than 25 years with the EEOC.

In view of the foregoing, it is earnestly requested that the Decision issued on January 21, 2009, be immediately rescinded. However, if it is not in your position to grant my request, kindly inform me the next step in your procedural manual on how and where I can appeal your Decision.

Your attention to this matter is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.

6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114
February 10, 2009

Scott J. Drexel, Chief Trial Counsel
California State Bar Court
1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299

Case No. 07-O-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock

Dear Chief Trial Counsel Drexel:

Enclosed is a copy of my letter addressed to Judge Miles which relates to my requesting for reconsideration of the above-named case.

On the "Decision" sent to me by Deputy Trial Counsel Morgenstern, I was named as a "Complainant" without my consent. And not only that, the "Decision" contains inaccurate information, full of lies, in order to justify in fashioning a case against Ms. Bullock which re-downs to my detriment.

Granting that the intent of the "Decision" is to award me the money she owes over the years, that "Decision" puts me in harms way. Me and my family are trying to survive in this depression but I am not of much help as this case has permeated and interfered into my private life – I have not been able to concentrate to do much of anything. In other words, I am greatly disturbed and depressed of the whole thing. Saying that, there is no provision in the "Decision" that the State Bar of California would readily come to my rescue and defense when I am put in such a predicament.

Chief Drexel, I am an old Filipino woman, retired from the United States government service, the EEOC. I am trying my very best to live in peace to heal the wounds inflicted to one of my kind, a poor powerless immigrant from an oppressed poor third world country. No one represents my kind and interest in Congress. If there is anyone, they would be very afraid to speak on my behalf.

Believe me when I say that I very much need that money your agency is offering me, but not at the expense of trying to extract from the likes of Ms. Bullock who is fighting for her life to live a little bit longer – but who cares to live in a world populated by people who have depleted all your energy and have destroyed everything you had worked so hard to attain, including crushing your dignity? My conscience does not allow me to be a party to hasten the death of a badly wounded being, if you know what I mean.

The “Decision” is something that I cannot take lightly, not when it reaches deep into my personal life, affecting my day to day relationship with my family and other people, most especially when it is rubbing me of a peaceful retirement. While the tenacity of your employees is admirable in their desire to pursue this Case, I doubt if their ultimate interest points to mine. Not when after I have spoken with Deputy Trial Counsel Morgenstern, who refused to entertain any query from me as he was always “busy finishing a brief.”

Whoever is/are responsible in the instigation and the pursuance of Case No. 07-O-11692 has/have the sinister desire to make me suffer, and languished to death - more than what has been intentionally inflicted to me through the 27 years of my employment with the EEOC. This is more than malicious persecution. Why can't I be left alone in peace?

Why did you allow your agency to be an active participant to this malicious persecution? The greatest harm that can be done to a person is to remove their means of livelihood, that's what happened to Ms. Bullock. As for me, because of the utter disturbance of my peace, this CASE takes me away from working to keep what I have. What is there to gain from your end? – certainly, not from the public's interest end, like myself. I rest my case with you, Sir,

Sincerely yours,

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.

6252 Lolly Lane
San Diego, CA 92114
January 17, 2009

Eli D. Morgenstern, Deputy Trial Counsel
THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299

Case No. 07-0-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock

Dear Mr. Morgenstern:

Thank you very much for directing Paula A. Heider, Legal Secretary, to send me the "State Bar of California Client Security Fund Application for Reimbursement" form, which I recently received. In order that I can accurately fill up the stated form, please send me the following documents under the Freedom of Information Act, thus:

A copy of all written documents that mentioned my name or made reference to my name, in any and all format such as: telephonic notes, e-mails, letters, memos, and correspondence to and from individuals, government agencies organizations, and law firms, including but not limited to Case No. 07-0-11692: Mary Elizabeth Bullock.

I anticipate and appreciate your prompt response to this request.

Sincerely,

Gigi Castillo, Ph.D.

EXHIBIT C

James Santiago Grisolia, M.D., Inc.

Diplomate, American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology
Diplomate, American Board of Clinical Neurophysiology

July 11, 2005

RE: BULLOCK, Elizabeth

Ms Bullock has returned with continued fatigue and inattention, as well as nausea and multiple arthralgias. She recently received intravenous IVIG and SoluMedrol with less benefit than usual, apparently owing to the stressful work environment in which she now works. The patient recounts multiple incidents in the workplace which she feels as harassing and emotionally draining.

Under these circumstances, it appears ineffective and even prejudicial to the patient's health to continue working in a stressful, hostile environment. I hereby submit that the patient should go out on disability retirement, contemplating that she will be unable to fulfill the essential duties of her current position at EEOC as long as a hostile environment prevails. I am making her retirement date effective today July 11, 2005.


JAMES S. GRISOLIA, MD

EXHIBIT D

NOTICE TO CASHIER: BE SURE WATERMARK IS ON REVERSE SIDE BEFORE CASHING



CABRILLO CREDIT UNION
Sharp Division - Carlsbad City Division

CABRILLO CREDIT UNION
10075 CARROLL CANYON ROAD
SUITE 200
SAN DIEGO, CA 92131-1107
(800) 727-2328

12 0000077266

90-8086/3222

DATE
05/05/09

NOTICE TO CUSTOMER

The purchase of an Indemnity Bond will be required before this check will be replaced or refunded in the event it is lost, stolen, or misplaced.

CASHIER'S CHECK

** TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS AND 00 CENTS **

\$10,000.00

DR. G. G. CASTILLO

PAY
TO THE
ORDER
OF

RE: HON. MARY B BULLOCK
FINAL REPAYMENT OF PERSONAL LOAN

[Handwritten Signature]

Secured Signature Required Over \$10,000.00

⑈ 1200077266 ⑆ ⑆ 322274488 ⑆ 1898989898989 ⑆