# State Bar Court of California **Hearing Department**



	San Francisco	
Counsel For The State Bar	Case Number (s)	(for Court's use)
Esther J. Rogers THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA 180 Howard Street		PUBLIC MATTER
San Francisco, California 94105-1639 (415) 538-2258	09-O-11933	FILED
		JUN 2 9 2010
Bar # 148246		STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO
Russell K. Ryan 1690 W. Shaw Ave., Ste. 200 Fresno, California 93711 (559) 439-4000	Submitted to: Assigned J	udge
Bar # 139835 In the Matter Of:	STIPULATION RE FACTS DISPOSITION AND ORDE	, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ER APPROVING
Leo A. Akulian	ACTUAL SUSPENSION	
Bar # 208006	☐ PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	
A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)  lote: All information required by this		

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 July 10, 2000.
- 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.
- (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 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."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".

(Do not write above this line.)				
(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):			
		until costs are paid in full, Respondent will remain actually suspended from the practice of law unless relief is obtained per rule 284, Rules of Procedure. costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: (hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure) costs waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs" costs entirely waived		
B. Aggravating Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.				
(1)		Prior record of discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]		
	(a)	State Bar Court case # of prior case		
	(b)	☐ Date prior discipline effective		
	(c)	Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations:		
	(d)	Degree of prior discipline		
	(e)	If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.		
(2)		<b>Dishonesty:</b> 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)		<b>Trust Violation:</b> 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)	$\boxtimes$	<b>Harm:</b> Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice. See attached.		
(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)		<b>Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:</b> Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.		

(3)

(4)

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

Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation

information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar

and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and

purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.

(Do no	ot write	above this line.)		
		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.		
(5)		Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.		
		In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.		
(6)		Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.		
(7)		Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.		
(8)	$\boxtimes$	Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the test give at the end of that session.		
		No Ethics School recommended. Reason:		
(9)		Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.		
(10)  The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:		The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:		
		☐ Substance Abuse Conditions ☐ Law Office Management Conditions		
		Medical Conditions Financial Conditions		
F. C	the	r Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:		
(1)		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 withou 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)	$\boxtimes$	Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court: Respondent must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.		

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

## **ATTACHMENT TO**

## STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

Leo Akulian

CASE NUMBER(S): ET AL.

09-O-11933

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 AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

## **Count One**

#### Facts

On July 12, 2005, Kent Pressley, Jaquette Morson and three children were injured in an automobile accident. On or about February 3, 2006, Pressley and Morson employed respondent to represent them in a personal injury action. The statute of limitations would expire on July 12, 2007. On or about July 12, 2007, respondent's employee arranged for a lawsuit to be filed, but the lawsuit was not filed. On or about July 13, 2007, respondent's employee caused a false complaint to be filed. The false complaint, filed in pro per, alleged that the accident occurred on July 13, 2007 to conceal the expiration of the statute of limitations.

The complaint listed an incorrect address and therefore Pressley and Morson were unaware that the complaint was filed late and that they were listed in pro per on the complaint. Thereafter, no one took any action to prosecute the personal injury matter on behalf of Pressley or Morson and the case was dismissed. Respondent contends that he believed that he informed his clients in June 2007 that he was unable to represent them and therefore was unaware that his staff had filed a complaint.

In or about February 2008, respondent contends that he learned that his employee had filed a late complaint and that the statute of limitations had run.

Between in or about April 2008 and April 2009, respondent and his staff falsely informed Pressley and Morson that their case had settled and the insurance company had paid out funds. Respondent and his staff presented Pressley and Morson with 14 false settlement checks totaling approximately \$53,000 and with fabricated settlements and releases. Respondent engaged in this conduct to conceal a potential claim for malpractice.

In truth and in fact, respondent knew that there were no settlements and that respondent was funding the settlements with his own money.

#### **Conclusions of Law**

By failing to properly supervise his office staff, respondent recklessly failed to perform legal services with competence, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

## **Count Two**

#### **Facts**

Count One is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

#### **Conclusions of Law**

By misrepresenting that there was a settlement in the personal injury case and by providing the clients with funds which respondent purported were personal injury settlement funds, respondent committed acts of moral turpitude and dishonesty, in willful violation of Business and Profession Code section 6106.

## Count Three

#### **Facts**

Count One is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

#### **Conclusions of Law**

By failing to inform his clients that his firm missed the statute of limitations and that respondent may have committed malpractice, respondent failed to respond promptly to a client's reasonable status inquiries, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

## PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(6), was June 3, 2010.

## COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of June 3, 2010, the prosecution costs in this matter are approximately \$2,500. 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.

## AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Standard 1.2(b)(iv). Respondent's conduct significantly harmed Pressley and Morson. They lost their cause of action against the defendants in the personal injury case as a result of respondent's misconduct.

## MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Record (Standard 1.2(e)(i)) Respondent has been admitted since July 2000 and has no prior record of discipline.

Cooperation (Standard 1.2(e)(v)) Respondent agreed to the imposition of discipline without requiring a hearing.

Emotional Difficulties (Standard 1.2(e)(iv)) At the time that the complaint was filed, respondent was distracted from his law practice because his father and grandfather were suffering from terminal illnesses. At the time that respondent discovered that the complaint was filed, he was still distracted because he was mourning the death of his father and grandfather.

In the Matter of	Case number(s):
Leo A. Akulian	09-O-11933

## 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.

	I III	
Date	Respondent's Signature	Leo A. Akulian Print Name
6/7/10 Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Russell K. Ryan Print Name
6/10/10	Esmu Roguer	Esther J. Rogers
Date /	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name

(Do not write about the Matte	···	Case Number(s):	
Leo A. Akulian		09-O-11933	
	0	PRDER	
_	ERED that the requested dismissal	and that it adequately protects the public, of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without	
	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.		
$\boxtimes$	All Hearing dates are vacated.		
the stipula or further r effective of	tion, filed within 15 days after servion modifies the approved stipulation. ( date of this disposition is the effe	pproved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify ce of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies See rule 135(b), Rules of Procedure.) The ective date of the Supreme Court order herein, 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)	
	e 25, 2010	Pur And	
Date		Judge of the State Bar Court	
		LUCY ARMENDARIZ	

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of San Francisco, on June 29, 2010, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

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

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

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

RUSSELL K. RYAN MOTSCHIEDLER, MICHAELIDES & WISHON, LLP 1690 W SHAW AVE STE 200 FRESNO, CA 93711

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

ESTHER ROGERS, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on June 29, 2010.

Laine Silber

Case Administrator

State Bar Court