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



Counsel For The State Bar Case Number (s) (for Court's use) Wonder J. Liang 09-O-14557 [NOT PUBLIC MATTER Deputy Trial Counsel FILED] 180 Howard Street San Franicsco, California 94105 (415) 538-2372 JAN 18 2011 Bar # 184357 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE Counsel For Respondent SAN FRANCISCO Arthur L. Margolis 2000 Riverside Drive Los Angeles, California 90039-3758 (323) 953-8996 Submitted to: Assigned Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND Bar # 57703 **DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING** In the Matter Of: **EDWARD MORRIS WEISZ PUBLIC REPROVAL** ☐ PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED Bar # 107756 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)

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 May 9, 1983.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of 8 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".

| (Do I | (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) | | | | |
| | | ca: co: an Su (ha | sts added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline (public reproval) see ineligible for costs (private reproval) sts to be paid in equal amounts for the following membership years: Costs to be paid in equal mounts prior to February 1 for the following two billing cycles following the effective date of the preme Court order. rdship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure) sts waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs" sts entirely waived | |
| (9) | The | e parti | es understand that: | |
| | (a) | | A private reproval imposed on a respondent as a result of a stipulation approved by the Court prior to initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's officials State Bar membership records, but is not disclosed in response to public inquiries and is not reported on the State Bar's web page. The record of the proceeding in which such a private reproval was imposed is not available to the public except as part of the record of any subsequent proceeding in which it is introduced as evidents of a prior record of discipline under the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar. | |
| | (b) | | A private reproval imposed on a respondent after initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page. | |
| | (c) | \boxtimes | A public reproval imposed on a respondent is publicly available as part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page. | |
| | | | | |
| B. Aggravating Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required. | | | | |
| (1) | | Prio | r 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 or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline. | |
| | | | | |

| (Do not write above this line.) | | | |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| (2) | | Dishonesty: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct. | |
| (3) | | Trust Violation: Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property. | |
| (4) | | Harm: Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice. | |
| (5) | | Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct. | |
| (6) | | Lack of Cooperation: Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings. | |
| (7) | | Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. | |
| (8) | \boxtimes | No aggravating circumstances are involved. | |
| Addi | tiona | aggravating circumstances: | |
| C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating circumstances are required. | | | |
| (1) | \boxtimes | No Prior Discipline: Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not deemed serious. Respondent has no prior record of discipline in his approximate fifteen years of practice before this instance. | |
| (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 of any illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities. | |

| (Do not write above this line.) | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| (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. | |
| Addi | itiona | al mitigating circumstances: | |
| | | | |
| D. I | Disc | ipline: | |
| (1) | | Private reproval (check applicable conditions, if any, below) | |
| | (a) | Approved by the Court prior to initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (no public disclosure). | |
| <u>or</u> | (p) | Approved by the Court after initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (public disclosure). | |
| (2) | \boxtimes | Public reproval (Check applicable conditions, if any, below) | |
| E. C | ond | litions Attached to Reproval: | |
| (1) | \boxtimes | Respondent must comply with the conditions attached to the reproval for a period of ONE (1) YEAR. | |
| (2) | \boxtimes | During the condition period attached to the reproval, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct. | |
| (3) | | Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code. | |
| (4) | | Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and conditions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must promptly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request. | |
| (5) | \boxtimes | Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the condition period attached to the reproval. 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 the reproval during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state in each report 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 | |

| (DO U | ot write | above this line.) | | |
|-------|-------------|---|--|--|
| | | less than 30 (thirty) days, that report must be submitted on the next following 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 condition period and no later than the last day of the condition period. | | |
| (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 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 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 conditions attached to the reproval. | | |
| (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 given 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) | \boxtimes | Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation within on year of the effective date of the reproval. | | |
| | | ☐ No MPRE recommended. Reason: | | |
| (11) | | The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated: | | |
| | | ☐ Substance Abuse Conditions ☐ Law Office Management Conditions | | |
| | | ☐ Medical Conditions ☐ Financial Conditions | | |
| | | | | |

F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

EDWARD MORRIS WEISZ, SBN 107756

CASE NUMBER(S): ET AL.

09-O-14557 [NOT FILED]

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

FACTS: 09-O-14557:

- 1. On March 12, 2008, Ellen Gomulia ("Gomulia") retained respondent to assist her in obtaining a H-1B visa [foreign worker for specialty occupation]. Gomulia paid respondent \$820. On or about March 21, 2008, her employer Luis Carbonell on behalf of Oncotech also paid respondent \$1500 to obtain a H-1B visa for Gomulia.
- 2. On June 19, 2008, respondent informed Gomulia by email message stating, in part, that she was "not selected in the Random lottery for H-1s for this Fall."
- 3. On July 30, 2008, respondent sent an email message to Gomulia stating, in pertinent part, that he had now received the refunds from USCIS and that the refund checks of \$820 and \$1,500 should be received by Gomulia and Oncotech, respectively, "by the beginning of next week."
 - 4. By August 2008, the representation regarding the obtaining of the H-1B visa was terminated.
 - 5. Respondent had not earned the fees paid by Gomulia and Oncotech.
- 6. From August 2008 to January 2009, respondent did not send the refund to Gomulia or Oncotech.
 - 7. In February 2009, respondent sent a \$500 check to Gomulia.
- 8. In August 2009, respondent sent the remainder of the refund to Gomulia in the amount of \$320.
 - 9. In August 2009, respondent sent the entire refund to Oncotech in the amount of \$1,500.

CONCLUSION OF LAW: 09-O-14557:

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

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(7), was December 29, 2010.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of December 29, 2010, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$1,983.00. 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.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

In the Matter of Hanson (Review Dept. 1994) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 703, 708, the respondent was found culpable of violating rules 3-700(A)(2) and 3-700(D)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct in one client matter. The respondent was publicly reproved. (Id. at 715.)

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.

Respondent admits that the above facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

LAW UFFICE

PAGE

12/29/2010 17:30 DEC-29-2010 14:07

HE STATE BAR OF CALIF.

415 538 2220

09/10 P.009

| (Do not write above this line,) | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| In the Matter of | Case number(s): | |
| | ,, | |
| EDWARD MORRIS WEISZ | 09-O-14557 | |
| SBN 107756 | | |
| | | |

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.

| 14/19/2010 | Pan M. Waris | Edward M. Weisz |
|------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Date | Respondent's Signature | Print Name |
| 1/5/11 | arthur Margala | Arthur L. Margolis |
| Date | Respondent's Counsel Signature | Print Name |
| | | Wonder J. Llang |
| Date | Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature | Print Name |

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.

| Date | Respondent's Signature | Edward M. Weisz Print Name | |
|--------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| • | | Arthur L. Margolis | |
| Date | Respondent's Counsel Signature | Print Name | |
| 1/7/11 | L / Service | Wonder J. Liang | |
| Date | Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature | Print Name | |

| (Do not write above this line.) In the Matter Of Case Number(s): | | |
|--|--|---|
| EDWARD | MORRIS WEISZ | Case Number(s): 09-O-14557 |
| SBN 1077 | 56 | |
| | | ORDER |
| by any cor | at the stipulation protects the nditions attached to the represenges, if any, is GRANTED v | e public and that the interests of Respondent will be served oval, IT IS ORDERED that the requested dismissal of without prejudice, and: |
| | The stipulated facts and di IMPOSED. | sposition are APPROVED AND THE REPROVAL |
| \boxtimes | The stipulated facts and di below, and the REPROVA | sposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth L IMPOSED. |
| \boxtimes | All court dates in the Heari | ng Department are vacated. |
| On page 2 "discipline | of the Stipulation, paragrap (public reproval)" | h A.(8), delete "the Supreme Court order" and insert |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| stipulation, fu <u>r</u> ther mo | , filed within 15 days after se difies the approved stipulatio | n as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the ervice of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies or on. (See rule 125(b), Rules of Procedure.) Otherwise the safter service of this order. |
| Failure to separate p | comply with any condition proceeding for willful brea | ns attached to this reproval may constitute cause for a ch of rule 1-110, Rules of Professional Conduct. |
| January 1 | 8, 2011 | July M |
| Date | | Lucy Armendariz Judge of the State Bar Court |
| | | |

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); 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 January 18, 2011, 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:

ARTHUR LEWIS MARGOLIS MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS LLP 2000 RIVERSIDE DR LOS ANGELES, CA 90039

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

WONDER J. LIANG, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on January 18, 2011.

Bernadette C.O. Molina Case Administrator State Bar Court