

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California
Hearing Department
Los Angeles



<p>Counsel For The State Bar Ashod Mooradian Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 S. Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015 (213) 765-1004</p> <p>Bar # 194283</p>	<p>Case Number (s) 09-O-13308; 09-O-19353; 09-O-19355; 09-O-19358; 09-O-18320; 09-O-19455; 10-O-00250; 10-O-00252; 10-O-00253; 10-O-00327; 10-O-00328; 10-O-00329</p>	<p>(for Court's use)</p> <p>FILED</p> <p>SEP 23 2010 <i>MC</i></p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</p> <p>PUBLIC MATTER</p>
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>Brian Colombana 23016 Lake Forest Drive, Suite 351 Laguna Hills, CA 92653</p> <p>Bar # 238272</p>	<p>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</p>	
<p>In the Matter of: BRIAN COLOMBANA</p> <p>Bar # 238272</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>	<p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING; ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT</p> <p>DISBARMENT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p>	

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

A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted **November 29, 2005**.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of (11) pages, not including the order.
- (4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law."
- (6) The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading "Supporting Authority."

- (7) No more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, respondent has been advised in writing of any pending investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.
- (8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):
 - Costs to be awarded to the State Bar
 - Costs waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs"
 - Costs entirely waived
- (9) ORDER OF INACTIVE ENROLLMENT:
The parties are aware that if this stipulation is approved, the judge will issue an order of inactive enrollment under Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), and Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, rule 220(c).

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**
 - (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) **Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3) **Trust Violation:** Trust funds or property were involved and respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.
- (4) **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice. **See Stipulation Attachment, page 8, section "C", paragraph 1.**
- (5) **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (6) **Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.
- (7) **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. **See Stipulation Attachment, page 8, section "C", paragraph 2.**

- (8) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:
None.

C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating circumstances are required.

- (1) **No Prior Discipline:** Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not deemed serious.
- (2) **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.
- (3) **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings. **See Stipulation Attachment, page 8, section "D", paragraph 1.**
- (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. **See Stipulation Attachment, page 8, section "D", paragraph 2.**
- (5) **Restitution:** Respondent paid \$ _____ on _____ in restitution to _____ without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.
- (6) **Delay:** These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her.
- (7) **Good Faith:** Respondent acted in good faith.
- (8) **Emotional/Physical Difficulties:** At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical disabilities which expert testimony would establish was directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the product of any illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities.
- (9) **Severe Financial Stress:** At the time of the misconduct, respondent suffered from severe financial stress which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.
- (10) **Family Problems:** At the time of the misconduct, respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
- (11) **Good Character:** Respondent's good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of his/her misconduct.
- (12) **Rehabilitation:** Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13) **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances:
None.

D. Discipline: Disbarment.

E. Additional Requirements:

- (1) **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.

- (2) **Restitution:** Respondent must make restitution to _____ in the amount of \$ _____ plus 10 percent interest per year from _____. If the Client Security Fund has reimbursed _____ for all or any portion of the principal amount, respondent must pay restitution to CSF of the amount paid plus applicable interest and costs in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5. Respondent must pay the above restitution and furnish satisfactory proof of payment to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles no later than _____ days from the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this case.

- (3) **Client Security Fund Reimbursement:** Respondent must also reimburse the Client Security Fund to the extent that the misconduct in this matter results in the payment of funds and such payment obligation is enforceable as provided under Business and Professions Code section 6140.5.

- (4) **Other: See Stipulation Attachment, page 10, section "H" for Restitution requirements.**

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: BRIAN COLOMBANA, SBN 238272

CASE NUMBER(S): 09-O-13308; 09-O-19353; 09-O-19355; 09-O-19358;
 09-O-18320; 09-O-19455; 10-O-00250; 10-O-00252;
 10-O-00253; 10-O-00327; 10-O-00328; 10-O-00329

A. WAIVER OF VARIANCE BETWEEN NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES AND STIPULATED FACTS AND CULPABILITY:

The parties waive any variance between the Notice of Disciplinary Charges filed on July 30, 2010 and the facts and/or conclusions of law contained in this stipulation. Additionally, the parties waive the issuance of an amended Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The parties further waive the right to the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges and to a formal hearing on any charge not included in the pending Notice of Disciplinary Charges.

B. FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

BRIAN COLOMBANA ("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.

Statement of Facts:

1. Respondent was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on November 29, 2005, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.
2. Since at least December 2008, Respondent has operated a loan modification law practice. Respondent's loan modification operation has been conducted under various names including Loan Negotiators of America, Housing Law Center, Mortgage Relief Law Center, Paragon Law Group, Ideal Real Estate Solutions, Liberty Law Firm and the Law Offices of Brian J. Colombana, a professional corporation.
3. At all times relevant to this case, Respondent advertised loan modification legal services through the names listed in paragraph two using websites, direct mail letters, postcards, email, television commercials, radio advertisements and billboards.
4. From January 2009 through January 2010, Respondent was employed by several clients (who resided in California and in other States) to represent them in negotiating with their home mortgage lenders and obtaining modifications of their home mortgage loans.

5. Those clients included:

Case Number	Client Name	Date Client Paid Advanced Attorney Fees to Respondent	Amount of Advanced Attorney Fees Client Paid to Respondent	Client's State of Residence and Location of Property
09-O-13308	Michelle Briseno	January 5, 2009	\$2,790.00	California
09-O-19353	Kami Steed	March 16, 2009	\$2,400.00 ¹	Utah
09-O-19355	David Stelter	September 2, 2009	\$3,295.00	California
09-O-19358	Mylene Alqueza	August 24, 2009	\$4,450.00	California
09-O-18320	Linda Stone	May 29, 2009	\$2,990.00	Minnesota
09-O-19455	Barbara Mervine	November 24, 2009	\$2,590.00	Maryland
10-O-00250	Xiao Ming Chen	August, 25, 2009	\$2,495.50	New York
10-O-00252	Jose Argueta	April 5, 2009	\$1,900.00	California
10-O-00253	Joyce Meck	July 21, 2009	\$2,438.00	New Mexico
10-O-00327	Christina LeBrecque	June 14, 2009	\$3,390.00	Nevada
10-O-00328	Denise Evans	November 13, 2009	\$1,750.00	South Carolina
10-O-00329	Henri Leleu	June 24, 2009	\$5,490.00	Nevada

Total Advanced Attorney Fees \$35,978.50

6. Each of the clients listed in paragraph five entered into a contract for legal services with Respondent whereby Respondent agreed to negotiate modifications of the client's home mortgage loans on properties in the states where they resided.

7. Respondent charged and collected advanced attorneys fees from each of the clients listed in paragraph five in the states where the clients resided and where the subject real property was located, notwithstanding the fact that Respondent was only licensed to practice law in California.

8. Respondent is not presently, and has never been licensed to practice law in any state other than California. Respondent knew that eight (8) of the clients listed in paragraph five and their properties were located in jurisdictions in which he was not entitled to practice law.

9. Respondent failed to obtain the loan modifications contracted for under Respondent's fee agreement for the clients listed in paragraph five.

10. Thus, Respondent did not earn the advanced fees collected or charged and collected illegal fees from the clients listed in paragraph five.

11. Some of the clients listed in paragraph five repeatedly attempted to communicate with Respondent and his staff without success.

¹ Respondent refunded \$1,200.00 to Kami Steed on July 12, 2009.

12. Respondent did not refund any of the advanced attorney fees paid to him by the eleven of the twelve clients listed in paragraph five.

13. Respondent did not render to any of the clients listed in paragraph five an accounting of Respondent's unearned advanced attorney fees at the time of termination or upon the demand of a client.

Conclusions of Law:

14. By failing to obtain loan modifications in the representation of the clients listed in paragraph five, Respondent intentionally, recklessly or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

15. By failing to refund promptly to the clients listed in paragraph five any part of the fee paid in advance that has not been earned, Respondent willfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

16. By failing to respond to his clients' repeated inquiries regarding the status of their cases, Respondent failed to adequately communicate with the clients listed in paragraph five in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

17. By failing to provide his clients with an accounting of advanced fees and/or costs they paid, Respondent willfully failed to render appropriate accounts to the clients listed in paragraph five in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(3).

18. By entering into contracts for legal services with Kami Steed, Linda Stone, Barbara Mervine, Xiao Ming Chen, Joyce Meck, Christina LaBrecque, Denise Evans and Henri Leleu, who all resided in states in which Respondent was not licensed to practice law, to obtain modifications of home mortgage loans on real property located in those states, Respondent practiced law in jurisdictions where to do so would be a violation of the regulations of the legal profession in those jurisdictions, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 1-300(B).

19. By entering into agreements for, charging and collecting legal fees for services from Kami Steed, Linda Stone, Barbara Mervine, Xiao Ming Chen, Joyce Meck, Christina LaBrecque, Denise Evans and Henri Leleu, where Respondent was not licensed to practice law in California, Respondent willfully entered into agreements for, charged and collected illegal fees in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-200(A).

20. By repeatedly, recklessly and intentionally engaging in a pattern of failing to perform competent legal services for Michelle Briseno, David Stelter, Mylene Alqueza and Jose Argueta, Respondent willfully committed acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

21. By undertaking to represent Kami Steed, Linda Stone, Barbara Mervine, Xiao Ming Chen, Joyce Meck, Christina LaBrecque, Denise Evans and Henri Leleu, in the states these

clients were domiciled and where the subject real properties were located, Respondent engaged in a scheme to defraud these clients, by exploiting them for personal gain and accepting employment where he was not licensed to practice law, Respondent willfully committed acts involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

22. By charging and collecting advanced attorney fees after October 11, 2009, Respondent violated Civil Code section 2944.7 in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

C. FACTS SUPPORTING AGGRAVATION.

1. Respondent's clients were seriously harmed by the above described misconduct.² Most, if not all, of the clients who hired Respondent did so because they were financially distressed. Thus, the loss of the use of the money they paid for services that were not performed or had no value, caused significant harm to Respondent's clients. In addition, two clients lost their homes through foreclosure, one client had to sell his home at a loss and one other client had to cash in insurance policies to bring the home mortgage current and avoid foreclosure.

2. Respondent's misconduct involves twelve (12) separate client matters constituting multiple acts of misconduct, demonstrating a pattern of willful failure to perform services and a habitual disregard for his clients and demonstrating an abandonment of the causes in which he was retained.³

D. FACTS SUPPORTING MITIGATION.

1. Respondent has exhibited candor and cooperation during this matter pending before the State Bar Court.⁴ Respondent's candor and cooperation began very soon after the filing of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges in this matter. Respondent has voluntarily cooperated with the State Bar, informally providing documents and other information that assisted the State Bar in its understanding of Respondent's misconduct herein. After the initial status conference Respondent also agreed to meet with the State Bar to make a statement, answer questions and provide explanations regarding his misconduct. Further, Respondent's candor during this meeting included his making significant admissions. Finally, Respondent agreed to a stipulation regarding facts, conclusions of law and level of discipline that will fully resolve all pending matters less than three weeks after the initial status conference.

2. Respondent has expressed to the State Bar his remorse for his misconduct.⁵ Respondent is remorseful because he was ultimately unsuccessful in achieving the result his clients desired. Respondent is now taking steps to atone for the consequences of his misconduct. Finally, Respondent recognizes his wrongdoing in all twelve (12) client matters.

² Standard 1.2(b)(iv).

³ Standard 1.2(b)(ii).

⁴ Standard 1.2(e)(v).

⁵ Standard 1.2(e)(vii).

E. AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

In *In re Silvertan*⁶, the California Supreme Court held that the *Standards For Attorney Sanctions For Professional Misconduct* (“Standard” or “Standards”) are entitled to “great weight” and the Court will “not reject a recommendation arising from the *Standards* unless [it has] grave doubts as to the propriety of the recommended discipline.” The *Standards* are not binding but “they promote the consistent and uniform application of disciplinary measures.”⁷ The “presumptively appropriate level of discipline” for any misconduct is as set forth in the standards.⁸

Standard 1.3 provides that the primary purposes of attorney discipline are, “the protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession; the maintenance of high legal professional standards by attorneys and the preservation of public confidence in the legal profession.”

Standard 1.6(a) provides that if two or more acts of misconduct are found in the same proceeding, the sanction imposed shall be the more or most severe of the different applicable sanctions. *Standard 1.6(b)* provides that a greater or lesser degree of discipline than the appropriate sanction prescribed by these standards shall be imposed or recommended, depending on the net effect of the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, if any.

Standard 2.3 provides that culpability of a member of an act of moral turpitude, fraud, or intentional dishonesty toward a court, client or another person or of concealment of a material fact to a court, client or another person shall result in actual suspension or disbarment depending upon the extent to which the victim of the misconduct is harmed or misled and depending upon the magnitude of the act of misconduct and the degree to which it relates to the member's acts within the practice of law.

Standard 2.4(a) provides that culpability of a member of a pattern of wilfully failing to perform services demonstrating the member's abandonment of the causes in which he or she was retained shall result in disbarment.

Standard 2.6 provides that culpability of a member of a violation of sections 6068(a), 6125 and 6126 of the Business and Professions Code, depending on the gravity of the offense or the harm, if any, to the victim, with due regard to the purposes of imposing discipline set forth in *Standard 1.3*, which would be analogous to the Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 1-300(B) charges.

Standard 2.7 provides that culpability of a member of a wilful violation of that portion of rule 4-200, Rules of Professional Conduct, regarding the entering into an agreement for, charging or collecting an unconscionable fee for legal services shall result in at least a six-month actual suspension from the practice of law, irrespective of mitigating circumstances.

⁶ (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 81, 92.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ See *Morgan v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 598, 607.

Habitual disregard by an attorney for the interests of his clients combined with failure to communicate with such clients justifies disbarment.⁹ Even when such neglect is grossly negligent or careless, disbarment is justified.¹⁰ Abandonment of numerous clients is the appropriate level of discipline even where the attorney has no prior record of discipline.¹¹

In the present matter, Respondent's misconduct resulted in significant harm to multiple clients. The misconduct constituted a pattern of willfully failing to perform and a habitual disregard for his client's interests and included failing to communicate, failing to refund unearned fees, the unauthorized practice of law in another jurisdiction and other misconduct. Therefore, the appropriate level of discipline in this matter is disbarment.

Further, the parties submit that the stipulated discipline in this matter complies with the *Standards* both specifically and with regard to the general purposes and goals of the disciplinary process.

F. COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of September 17, 2010, the estimated prosecution costs in this matter are approximately \$9,105.00. Respondent acknowledges that this figure is an estimate only. 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.

G. PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to on page two, paragraph A.(7) was September 17, 2010.

H. FINANCIAL CONDITIONS, RESTITUTION

Respondent must pay restitution to the clients listed in paragraph five, in the amounts said clients paid to Respondent, as detailed in paragraph five, including the principal amount, plus interest of ten (10) percent per annum calculated from the date the client paid Respondent. If any of the clients listed in paragraph five have already received a full refund from Respondent, no further restitution will be due from Respondent pursuant to this stipulation upon acceptable proof of refund to the State Bar. If the Client Security Fund ("CSF") has reimbursed any of the clients for all or any portion of the amounts listed in paragraph five, Respondent must also pay restitution to CSF in the amounts paid, plus any applicable interest and costs.

⁹ *Twohy v. State Bar* (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 502, 512.

¹⁰ *Farnham v. State Bar* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 429, 446.



¹¹ *See Coombs v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 679 [disbarment was appropriate where the attorney was found culpable of misconduct in thirteen (13) separate client matters which included, among other violations, abandonment of clients, failure to return client files, false representations that services for which he had been retained had been performed, failure to provide an accounting of fees and a failure to refund unearned fees].

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of BRIAN COLOMBANA	Case number(s): 09-O-13308; 09-O-19353; 09-O-19355; 09-O-19358; 09-O-18320; 09-O-19455; 10-O-00250; 10-O-00252; 10-O-00253; 10-O-00327; 10-O-00328; 10-O-00329
--	---

SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES

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

<u>9/17/10</u> Date	 Respondent's Signature	Brian Colombana Print Name
<u>9/17/10</u> Date	 Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Ashod Mooradian Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of
BRIAN COLOMBANA

Case Number(s):
**09-O-13308; 09-O-19353; 09-O-19355; 09-O-19358;
09-O-18320; 09-O-19455; 10-O-00250; 10-O-00252;
10-O-00253; 10-O-00327; 10-O-00328; 10-O-00329**

ORDER

Finding the stipulation to be fair to the parties and that it adequately protects the public, IT IS ORDERED that the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without prejudice, and:

- The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- All Hearing dates are vacated.

The parties are bound by the stipulation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed within 15 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved stipulation. (See rule 135(b), Rules of Procedure.) **The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after file date. (See rule 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)**

Respondent is ordered transferred to involuntary inactive status pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4). Respondent's inactive enrollment will be effective three (3) calendar days after this order is served by mail and will terminate upon the effective date of the Supreme Court's order imposing discipline herein, or as provided for by rule 490(b) of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, or as otherwise ordered by the Supreme Court pursuant to its plenary jurisdiction.

09-23-10
Date


Judge of the State Bar Court

RICHARD A. PLATEL

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 September 23, 2010, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING; ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

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

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

BRIAN J COLOMBANA
23016 LAKE FOREST DR STE 351
LAGUNA HILLS CA 92653

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:

ASHOD MOORADIAN, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on September 23, 2010.



Angela Carpenter
Case Administrator
State Bar Court