

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



Counsel For The State Bar

BRANDON K. TADY Office of the Chief Trial Counsel 1149 South Hill Street Los Angeles, California 90015

Case Number (s) 09-C-10309

(for Court's use)

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE

LOS ANGELES

Bar # 83045

In Pro Per Respondent

ROBERT ANDREW KARPUK 1557 Monte Viento Dr. Malibu, California 90265

PUBLIC MATTER

Bar # 93322

In the Matter Of:

ROBERT ANDREW KARPUK

Bar # 93322

A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)

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

ACTUAL SUSPENSION

Submitted to: Settlement Judge

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:

- Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted October 27, 1980. (1)
- The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or (2)disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by (3)this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of 10 pages, not including the order.
- A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included (4) under "Facts."
- Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".
- The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading (6) "Supporting Authority."

(Do u	ot write	above	this line.)	
(7)			than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any nvestigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.	
(8)		ment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 0.7. (Check one option only):		
		relief is obtained per rule 284, Rules of Procedure.		
		essic	ing Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for onal Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances red.	
(1)		Prio	r record of discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]	
	(a)	\boxtimes	State Bar Court case # of prior case 91-O-00850-CEV	
	(b)	\boxtimes	Date prior discipline effective June 26, 1994	
	(c)	\boxtimes	Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: California Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-300	
	(d)		Degree of prior discipline Public Reproval	
	(e)		If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.	
(2)		Dishonesty: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.		
(3)		Trust Violation: Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.		
(4)		Harm: Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of just		
(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)			tiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing emonstrates a pattern of misconduct.	
(8)		No a	aggravating circumstances are involved.	

(Do n	ot write	above this line.)	
Add	itiona	al aggravating circumstances:	
		ating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating imstances are required.	
(1)		No Prior Discipline: Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not deemed serious.	
(2)		No Harm: Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.	
(3)		Candor/Cooperation: Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings.	
(4)		Remorse: Respondent promptly took objective steps spontaneously demonstrating remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of his/her misconduct.	
(5)		Restitution: Respondent paid \$ 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 or 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 stres 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.

Rehabilitation: Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred (12) followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.

No mitigating circumstances are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances

D. Discipline:

- During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of
- Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the (3) 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.
- Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation (4) 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.

(Do no	t write	above	e this line.)	
(5)		July 1 wheth condi- are ar currer	pondent must submit written quarterly reports to the 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Unde ther Respondent has complied with the State Bar Actitions of probation during the preceding calendar quany proceedings pending against him or her in the Stent status of that proceeding. If the first report would mitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extend	r penalty of perjury, Respondent must state t, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all arter. Respondent must also state whether there tate Bar Court and if so, the case number and cover less than 30 days, that report must be
		In add	ddition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing ty (20) days before the last day of the period of prob	ng the same information, is due no earlier than eation and no later than the last day of probation.
(6)		Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.		
(7)		Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.		
(8)		Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the tat the end of that session.		herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of f the Ethics School, and passage of the test given
			No Ethics School recommended. Reason: .	
(9)		must	pondent must comply with all conditions of probation it so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction verbation.	imposed in the underlying criminal matter and with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office
(10)		The f	following conditions are attached hereto and incorpo	prated:
			Substance Abuse Conditions	aw Office Management Conditions
			Medical Conditions	inancial Conditions
F. C	the	r Con	nditions Negotiated by the Parties:	
(1)		Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination: Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 321(a)(1) & (c), Rules of Procedure. No MPRE recommended. Reason:		
(2)	\boxtimes	Rul Cal	ule 9.20, California Rules of Court: Respondent malifornia Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective of	ed in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30

(3)		Conditional Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court: If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 days or more, he/she must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
(4)	\boxtimes	Credit for Interim Suspension [conviction referral cases only]: Respondent will be credited for the period of his/her interim suspension toward the stipulated period of actual suspension. Date of commencement of interim suspension: February 22, 2010.
(5)		Other Conditions:

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

ROBERT ANDREW KARPUK

CASE NUMBER(S): ET AL.

09-C-10309

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits the following facts are true and he is culpable of the violation of the specified statutes.

Case number: 09-C-10309.

FACTS.

- 1. On November 20, 2008, Respondent went to the Fry's Electronics Store ("Fry's") located at 1901, East Ventura Blvd., Oxnard, California. Respondent entered Fry's and he selected seven (7) CDs which he placed in the pockets of his walking shorts. Respondent exited Fry's without paying for the seven (7) CDs. Respondent was arrested by two of Fry's loss prevention officers after he exited the store without paying for the seven (7) CDs.
- 2. On November 20, 2008, Fry's loss prevention officers called the Oxnard Police Department. On November 20, 2008, Respondent was placed under arrest by an Oxnard Police Department officer. On December 16, 2008, the Ventura County District Attorney's Office filed a complaint against Respondent charging him with one count of violating California Penal Code ("Penal Code"), section 484 (a) (petty theft).
- 3. On August 28, 2009, Respondent pled no contest to, and was found guilty of, one count of violating Penal Code, section 484 (a), a misdemeanor. The Ventura County Superior Court sentenced Respondent to 12 months Conditional Revocable Release, payment of restitution of \$99 to Fry's, and a fine of \$100 payable to the State Restitution Fund.
- 4. On February 22, 2010, the Review Department placed Respondent on interim suspension pending final disposition of the criminal conviction proceeding in State Bar Court.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

- 5. Respondent's criminal conviction for violating Penal Code, section 484 (a) is a misdemeanor crime involving moral turpitude.
- 6. Respondent's conviction of violating Penal Code, section 484 (a) involves the commission of an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty, or corruption in wilful violation of California Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

None. The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(6), was August 3, 2010.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of August 3, 2010, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$\$3530. Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from the stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the cost of further proceedings.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND IN CONVICTION PROCEEDING.

- 1. This is a proceeding pursuant to sections 6101 and 6102 of the Business and Professions Code and rule 9.10 of the California Rules of Court.
- 2. On August 28, 2009, Respondent was convicted of violating Penal Code, section 484 (a), a misdemeanor.
- 3. On March 11, 2010, the Review Department of the State Bar Court issued an order referring the matter to the Hearing Department on the following issues: the level of discipline to be imposed.

STATE BAR ETHICS SCHOOL.

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

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

Standard 3.2 provides that final conviction of a member of a crime involving moral turpitude, either inherently or in the facts and circumstances surrounding the crime's commission shall result in disbarment. Only if the most compelling mitigating circumstances clearly predominate, shall disbarment not be imposed. In those latter cases, the discipline shall not be less than two years actual suspension, prospective to any interim suspension imposed, irrespective of mitigating circumstances.

In re Rothrock (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 588. In In re Rothrock, <u>supra</u>, 25 Cal. 2d at page 590, the Supreme Court held that "In cases such as those involving convictions of murder, forgery, extortion, bribery, perjury, robbery, embezzlement and other forms of theft, no difficulty would attend a determination of the question of moral turpitude from a consideration of the record of conviction alone."

Based on *In re Rothrock*, <u>supra</u>, Respondent's conviction of violating Penal Code, section 484 (a) is a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude.

In *In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 184, 209 the California Supreme Court provided an abbreviated analysis for determining the appropriate level of State Bar discipline. The Supreme Court stated: "These decisions provide some guidance, but our determination of the appropriate level of discipline ultimately depends on the answers to two key questions. First, what did Morse do wrong? Second, what is the

discipline most likely to protect the public, the courts, and the legal profession, or stated conversely, to deter Morse from future wrongdoing?" Here, Respondent pled no contest and was found guilty of one count of violating Penal Code, section 484 (a) (petty theft). The stipulated discipline of one (1) year actual suspension, two (2) years stayed suspension, and three (3) year probation with conditions is most likely to deter Respondent from future wrongdoing.

"Tady, Brandon" < Brandon. Tady@calbar.ca.gov>
SIGNATURE PAGE

Cale: August 4, 2010 11:00:59 AM PDT

"Robert Karpuk" < robak2nd@charter.net>
1 Attachment, 32.1 KB

Bob:

Here is the draft signature page. All four documents (form stipulation, attachment, signature, page, and order are presented to the Court for Judge Miles' review and signature.

Thanks.

Brandon

(Do not write above this line.)		
In the Matter of	Case number(s):	
ROBERT ANDREW KARPUK	09-C-10309	

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.

August 52010

Date

Respondent's Signature

Print Name

Print Name

August 2010

Date

Date

Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

Print Name

(Do not write above this line.) In the Matter Of ROBERT ANDREW KARPUK			Case Number(s): 09-C-10309	
		ORI	DER	
	ŠRDI	ERED that the requested dismissal of	d that it adequately protects the public, counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without	
	X	The stipulated facts and disposition a RECOMMENDED to the Supreme C	are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE ourt.	
1919		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 sti or furt effect	pulat her n	tion, filed within 15 days after service on odifies the approved stipulation. (See	oved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies e rule 135(b), Rules of Procedure.) The ve date of the Supreme Court order herein, 8(a), California Rules of Court.)	
pr.	8	125/10	- Albania	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on August 25, 2010, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

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

in a se	aled envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:
\boxtimes	by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:
	ROBERT ANDREW KARPUK 1557 MONTE VIENTE DR MALIBU CA 90265-3061
	by certified mail, No. , with return receipt requested, through the United States Postal Service at , California, addressed as follows:
	by overnight mail at , California, addressed as follows:
	by fax transmission, at fax number . No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.
	By personal service by leaving the documents in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or a person having charge of the attorney's office, addressed as follows:
	by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:
	BRANDON TADY, Enforcement, Los Angeles
	by certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on t 25, 2010.

Angela Carpenter
Case Administrator
State Bar Court