

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES

In the Matter of) Case Nos.: **10-O-02926 (10-O-03052; 10-O-06693;**
) **10-O-06694; 10-O-06699; 10-O-07029;**
) **10-O-07384; 10-O-07904; 10-O-07920;**
) **10-O-07931; 10-O-07967; 10-O-07970;**
) **10-O-07972; 10-O-07973; 10-O-07974;**
) **10-O-08521; 10-O-08526; 10-O-08529;**
DEAN GREGORY CHANDLER,) **10-O-08716; 10-O-08717; 10-O-08721;**
) **10-O-08722; 10-O-08926; 10-O-08927;**
) **10-O-08933; 10-O-09117; 10-O-09119;**
) **10-O-09497; 10-O-09499; 10-O-09500;**
) **10-O-09502; 10-O-09552; 10-O-09555;**
) **10-O-10125; 10-O-10127; 10-O-10132;**
Member No. 163090,) **10-O-10133; 10-O-10137; 10-O-10140;**
) **10-O-10142; 10-O-10144; 10-O-10338;**
) **10-O-10339; 10-O-10342; 10-O-10403;**
) **10-O-10408; 10-O-10453; 10-O-10454;**
) **10-O-10455; 10-O-10456; 10-O-10457;**
) **10-O-10458; 10-O-10536; 10-O-10610;**
A Member of the State Bar.) **10-O-10897; 10-O-10900; 10-O-10901;**
) **10-O-11081; 10-O-11082; 10-O-11114;**
) **10-O-11118; 10-O-11180; 10-O-11181;**
) **10-O-11182; 11-O-10021; 11-O-10024;**
) **11-O-10026; 11-O-10237; 11-O-10238;**
) **11-O-10239; 11-O-10242; 11-O-10244;**
) **11-O-10285; 11-O-10288; 11-O-10370;**
) **11-O-10521; 11-O-10535; 11-O-10664;**
) **11-O-10668; 11-O-10774; 11-O-10781;**
) **11-O-10807; 11-O-10816; 11-O-11005;**
) **11-O-11007; 11-O-11195; 11-O-11206;**
) **11-O-11215; 11-O-11356; 11-O-11358;**
) **11-O-11439; 11-O-11544; 11-O-11595;**
) **11-O-11598; 11-O-11599; 11-O-11600;**
) **11-O-11603; 11-O-11692; 11-O-11695;**
) **11-O-11699; 11-O-11871; 11-O-11986;**
) **11-O-11996; 11-O-12005; 11-O-12275;**
) **11-O-12404; 11-O-12467; 11-O-12468;**

) 11-O-12472; 11-O-12515; 11-O-12516;
) 11-O-12517; 11-O-12518; 11-O-12666;
) 11-O-12786; 11-O-12824; 11-O-12828;
) 11-O-12928)-PEM
)
)
)
) **DECISION AND ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY**
) **INACTIVE ENROLLMENT**

Respondent Dean Gregory Chandler (respondent) was charged with 116 counts of willfully violating rules 1-300(B) and 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct and one count of willfully violating Business and Professions Code section 6106 in 118 matters. He failed to participate either in person or through counsel, and his default was entered. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel (State Bar) filed a petition for disbarment under rule 5.85 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.¹

Rule 5.85 provides the procedure to follow when an attorney fails to participate in a disciplinary proceeding after receiving adequate notice and opportunity. The rule provides that if an attorney's default is entered for failing to respond to the notice of disciplinary charges (NDC), and the attorney fails to have the default set aside or vacated within 180 days, the State Bar will file a petition requesting the court to recommend the attorney's disbarment.²

In the instant case, the court concludes that the requirements of rule 5.85 have been satisfied, and therefore, grants the petition and recommends that respondent be disbarred from the practice of law.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Respondent was admitted to practice law in this state on December 15, 1992, and has been a member since then.

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all references to rules are to this source.

² If the court determines that any due process requirements are not satisfied, including adequate notice to the attorney, it must deny the petition for disbarment and take other appropriate action to ensure that the matter is promptly resolved. (Rule 5.85(E)(2).)

Procedural Requirements Have Been Satisfied

On March 16, 2012, the State Bar properly served on respondent, at his then membership records address, the Second Amended NDC in this matter by certified mail, return receipt requested. The Second Amended NDC was filed with the court on March 19, 2012. The Second Amended NDC was returned by the United States Postal Service (USPS) marked ““Box Closed.””³ The Second Amended NDC notified respondent that his failure to participate in the proceeding would result in a disbarment recommendation. (Rule 5.41.)

Thereafter, on March 26, 2012, the Second Amended NDC was mailed to respondent by regular first-class mail to respondent’s then current membership records address. This Second Amended NDC was not returned by the USPS.

Respondent had actual notice of this proceeding, as: (1) he telephoned DTC Hernandez and spoke with him on April 5, 2012; (2) DTC Hernandez received a copy of respondent’s proposed answer to the Second Amended NDC by facsimile on April 5, 2012; (3) respondent attempted to file his answer to the Second Amended NDC with the court on April 9, 2012, but it was rejected for filing that same day; (4) on April 25, 2012, respondent telephoned DTC Hernandez and left a telephone message for him; and (5) on April 25, 2012, the court received, by facsimile transmission, an amended answer to the Second Amended NDC which did not bear a signature on either the answer or the attached proof of service.⁴

Respondent failed to file a response to the NDC. The State Bar properly served and filed a motion for entry of respondent’s default on May 14 and 15, 2012, respectively. The motion complied with all the requirements for a default, including a supporting declaration of reasonable diligence by the State Bar deputy trial counsel declaring the additional step taken to provide notice to respondent (rule 5.80) and establishing that respondent had actual notice of this

³ See the declaration of Deputy Trial Counsel Agustin Hernandez (DTC Hernandez) attached to the State Bar’s motion for the entry of respondent’s default.

⁴ This document was not filed by the court.

proceeding. The motion also notified respondent that if he did not timely move to set aside his default, the court would recommend his disbarment. Respondent did not file a response to the motion, and his default was entered on May 31, 2012. The order entering the default was served on respondent at his membership records address by certified mail, return receipt requested. The return receipt was returned to the court stamped June 7, 2012, reflecting that the order was received by Dean Chandler. The court also ordered respondent's involuntary inactive enrollment as a member of the State Bar under Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (e), effective three days after service of the order, and he has remained inactively enrolled since that time.

Respondent also did not seek to have his default set aside or vacated. (Rule 5.83(C)(1) [attorney has 180 days to file motion to set aside default].) On December 26, 2012, the State Bar filed the petition for disbarment.⁵ As required by rule 5.85(A), the State Bar reported in the petition that:

(1) The State Bar has had contact with respondent since his default was entered. On August 24, 2012, DTC Hernandez received a telephone message from respondent asking DTC Hernandez to call respondent to discuss this matter. DTC Hernandez called respondent on August 30, 2012, and left a telephone message for respondent indicating that DTC Hernandez was returning his call. On September 7, 2012, respondent called DTC Hernandez to inquire about resolving this matter. Respondent acknowledged in this telephone conversation that his default had been entered by the court and that any resolution would require that the default be set aside. DTC Hernandez indicated to respondent that he would call him back with a proposal. DTC Hernandez received a telephone message from respondent on September 28, 2012, asking DTC Hernandez to call respondent to discuss this matter. DTC Hernandez called respondent on

⁵ The petition was served on respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to respondent's membership records address.

September 28, 2012, and left respondent a telephone message indicating that DTC Hernandez was returning respondent's call. DTC Hernandez called respondent on October 2, 2012, to discuss issues regarding resolution of this matter. No resolution was reached. On November 26, 2012, respondent served the State Bar with a motion to set aside his default, but to date, respondent has not filed this motion with the court.

(2) There are 119 open investigations pending against respondent.

(3) Respondent has no prior record of discipline.

(4) The Client Security Fund has not yet made any payments on pending reimbursement applications filed against respondent.

Respondent did not respond to the petition for disbarment or move to set aside or vacate the default. The case was submitted for decision on January 28, 2013.

The Admitted Factual Allegations Warrant the Imposition of Discipline

Upon entry of respondent's default, the factual allegations in the NDC are deemed admitted and no further proof is required to establish the truth of such facts. (Rule 5.82.) As set forth below in greater detail, the factual allegations in the NDC support the conclusion that respondent is culpable as charged and, therefore, violated a statute, rule or court order that would warrant the imposition of discipline. (Rule 5.85(E)(1)(d).)

1. Case Number 10-O-02926 (Watson Matter)

Count 1 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (prohibition on practicing law in violation of other jurisdiction's professional regulations) by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 2 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (illegal fee) by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client for legal services in connection with the client’s Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

2. Case Number 10-O-03052 (Dinkelman Matter)

Count 3 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Nevada resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Nevada property, thereby practicing law in Nevada when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Nevada.

Count 4 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Nevada client for legal services in connection with the client’s Nevada property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Nevada.

3. Case Number 10-O-06693 (Gaffney Matter)

Count 5 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a North Carolina resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s North Carolina property, thereby practicing law in North Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in North Carolina.

Count 6 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a North Carolina client for legal services in connection with the client’s North Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in North Carolina.

4. Case Number 10-O-06694 (J. Johnson Matter)

Count 7 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Virginia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Virginia property, thereby practicing law in Virginia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Virginia.

Count 8 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Virginia client for legal services in connection with the client’s Virginia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Virginia.

5. Case Number 10-O-06699 (Kelley Matter)

Count 9 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Florida resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Florida property, thereby practicing law in Florida when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Florida.

Count 10 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Florida client for legal services in connection with the client’s Florida property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Florida.

6. Case Number 10-O-07029 (Chambers Matter)

Count 11 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Mississippi resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Mississippi property,

thereby practicing law in Mississippi when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Mississippi.

Count 12 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Mississippi client for legal services in connection with the client’s Mississippi property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Mississippi.

7. Case Number 10-O-07384 (Mohammed Matter)

Count 13 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Florida residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ Florida property, thereby practicing law in Florida when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Florida.

Count 14 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Florida clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Florida property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Florida.

8. Case Number 10-O-07904 (Prosser Matter)

Count 15 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a South Carolina resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s South Carolina property, thereby practicing law in South Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in South Carolina.

Count 16 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a South Carolina

client for legal services in connection with the client's South Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in South Carolina.

9. Case Number 10-O-07920 (Ross Matter)

Count 17 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Ohio resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 18 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Ohio client for legal services in connection with the client's Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

10. Case Number 10-O-07931 (Dacayanan Matter)

Count 19 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Nevada resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Nevada property, thereby practicing law in Nevada when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Nevada.

Count 20 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Nevada client for legal services in connection with the client's Nevada property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Nevada.

///

///

///

11. Case Number 10-O-07967 (Nehring Matter)

Count 21 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Illinois resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Illinois property, thereby practicing law in Illinois when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Illinois.

Count 22 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Illinois client for legal services in connection with the client’s Illinois property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Illinois.

12. Case Number 10-O-07970 (J. Williams Matter)

Count 23 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a North Carolina resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s North Carolina property, thereby practicing law in North Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in North Carolina.

Count 24 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a North Carolina client for legal services in connection with the client’s North Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in North Carolina.

13. Case Number 10-O-07972 (Denton Matter)

Count 25 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Nebraska resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Nebraska property, thereby

practicing law in Nebraska when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Nebraska.

Count 26 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Nebraska client for legal services in connection with the client’s Nebraska property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Nebraska.

14. Case Number 10-O-07973 (Sparks Matter)

Count 27 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Kentucky resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Kentucky property, thereby practicing law in Kentucky when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Kentucky.

Count 28 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Kentucky client for legal services in connection with the client’s Kentucky property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Kentucky.

15. Case Number 10-O-07974 (Lindo Matter)

Count 29 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New Jersey resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s New Jersey property, thereby practicing law in New Jersey when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New Jersey.

Count 30 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New Jersey

client for legal services in connection with the client's New Jersey property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New Jersey.

16. Case Number 10-O-08521 (Alexander Matter)

Count 31 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Alabama resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Alabama property, thereby practicing law in Alabama when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Alabama.

Count 32 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Alabama client for legal services in connection with the client's Alabama property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Alabama.

17. Case Number 10-O-08526 (Peebles Matter)

Count 33 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Connecticut resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Connecticut property, thereby practicing law in Connecticut when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Connecticut.

Count 34 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Connecticut client for legal services in connection with the client's Connecticut property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Connecticut.

18. Case Number 10-O-08529 (Holben Matter)

Count 35 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a West Virginia resident in order to perform legal

services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's West Virginia property, thereby practicing law in West Virginia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in West Virginia.

Count 36 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a West Virginia client for legal services in connection with the client's West Virginia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in West Virginia.

19. Case Number 10-O-08716 (Egstad Matter)

Count 37 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Minnesota residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Minnesota property, thereby practicing law in Minnesota when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Minnesota.

Count 38 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Minnesota clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Minnesota property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Minnesota.

20. Case Number 10-O-08717 (Don & Nam Matter)

Count 39 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Hawaii residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Hawaii property, thereby practicing law in Hawaii when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Hawaii.

Count 40 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Hawaii clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Hawaii property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Hawaii.

21. Case Number 10-O-08721 (Ahrens Matter)

Count 41 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Illinois resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Illinois property, thereby practicing law in Illinois when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Illinois.

Count 42 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Illinois client for legal services in connection with the client’s Illinois property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Illinois.

22. Case Number 10-O-08722 (Frederick Matter)

Count 43 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 44 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client’s New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

///

23. Case Number 10-O-08926 (Campeau Matter)

Count 45 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Massachusetts resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Massachusetts property, thereby practicing law in Massachusetts when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Massachusetts.

Count 46 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Massachusetts client for legal services in connection with the client’s Massachusetts property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Massachusetts.

24. Case Number 10-O-08927 (Goodman Matter)

Count 47 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Kansas resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Kansas property, thereby practicing law in Kansas when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Kansas.

Count 48 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Kansas client for legal services in connection with the client’s Kansas property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Kansas.

25. Case Number 10-O-08933 (O’Neill Matter)

Count 49 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Pennsylvania resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Pennsylvania

property, thereby practicing law in Pennsylvania when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Pennsylvania.

Count 50 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Pennsylvania client for legal services in connection with the client’s Pennsylvania property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Pennsylvania.

26. Case Number 10-O-09117 (Maggard Matter)

Count 51 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Mississippi resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Mississippi property, thereby practicing law in Mississippi when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Mississippi.

Count 52 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Mississippi client for legal services in connection with the client’s Mississippi property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Mississippi.

27. Case Number 10-O-09119 (K. Smith Matter)

Count 53 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Pennsylvania resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Pennsylvania property, thereby practicing law in Pennsylvania when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Pennsylvania.

Count 54 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Pennsylvania

client for legal services in connection with the client's Pennsylvania property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Pennsylvania.

28. Case Number 10-O-09497 (Collins Matter)

Count 55 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Kansas resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Kansas property, thereby practicing law in Kansas when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Kansas.

Count 56 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Kansas client for legal services in connection with the client's Kansas property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Kansas.

29. Case Number 10-O-09499 (Afful Matter)

Count 57 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Massachusetts resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Massachusetts property, thereby practicing law in Massachusetts when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Massachusetts.

Count 58 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Massachusetts client for legal services in connection with the client's Massachusetts property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Massachusetts.

///

///

30. Case Number 10-O-09500 (Dragalina-Tudoriu Matter)

Count 59 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 60 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client’s New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

31. Case Number 10-O-09502 (Just Matter)

Count 61 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Kentucky residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ Kentucky property, thereby practicing law in Kentucky when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Kentucky.

Count 62 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Kentucky clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Kentucky property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Kentucky.

32. Case Number 10-O-09552 (Winters Matter)

Count 63 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Missouri resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Missouri property, thereby

practicing law in Missouri when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Missouri.

Count 64 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Missouri client for legal services in connection with the client’s Missouri property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Missouri.

33. Case Number 10-O-09555 (Zutman Matter)

Count 65 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional conduct by accepting employment with an Illinois resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Illinois property, thereby practicing law in Illinois when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Illinois.

Count 66 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Illinois client for legal services in connection with the client’s Illinois property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Illinois.

34. Case Number 10-O-10125 (Seeco Matter)

Count 67 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Ohio resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 68 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Ohio client for

legal services in connection with the client's Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

35. Case Number 10-O-10127 (Cook Matter)

Count 69 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with West Virginia residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' West Virginia property, thereby practicing law in West Virginia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in West Virginia.

Count 70 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from West Virginia clients for legal services in connection with the clients' West Virginia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in West Virginia.

36. Case Number 10-O-10132 (Krieser Matter)

Count 71 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Oregon resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Oregon property, thereby practicing law in Oregon when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Oregon.

Count 72 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Oregon client for legal services in connection with the client's Oregon property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Oregon.

///

///

37. Case Number 10-O-10133 (S. Williams Matter)

Count 73 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 74 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client for legal services in connection with the client’s Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

38. Case Number 10-O-10137 (Debo Matter)

Count 75 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Ohio resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 76 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Ohio client for legal services in connection with the client’s Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

39. Case Number 10-O-10140 (Weber Matter)

Count 77 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Minnesota resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Minnesota property,

thereby practicing law in Minnesota when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Minnesota.

Count 78 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Minnesota client for legal services in connection with the client’s Minnesota property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Minnesota.

40. Case Number 10-O-10142 (Cumberland Matter)

Count 79 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Missouri resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Missouri property, thereby practicing law in Missouri when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Missouri.

Count 80 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Missouri client for legal services in connection with the client’s Missouri property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Missouri.

41. Case Number 10-O-10144 (Munoz Matter)

Count 81 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Rhode Island resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Rhode Island property, thereby practicing law in Rhode Island when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Rhode Island.

Count 82 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Rhode Island

client for legal services in connection with the client's Rhode Island property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Rhode Island.

42. Case Number 10-O-10338 (Donold Matter)

Count 83 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Mississippi resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Mississippi property, thereby practicing law in Mississippi when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Mississippi.

Count 84 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Mississippi client for legal services in connection with the client's Mississippi property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Mississippi.

43. Case Number 10-O-10339 (M. de la Cruz Matter)

Count 85 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Hawaii resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Hawaii property, thereby practicing law in Hawaii when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Hawaii.

Count 86 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Hawaii client for legal services in connection with the client's Hawaii property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Hawaii.

44. Case Number 10-O-10342 (Calloway Matter)

Count 87 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Michigan residents in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Michigan property, thereby practicing law in Michigan when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Michigan.

Count 88 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Michigan clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Michigan property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Michigan.

45. Case Number 10-O-10403 (Fernandez Matter)

Count 89 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New Mexico resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's New Mexico property, thereby practicing law in New Mexico when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New Mexico.

Count 90 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New Mexico client for legal services in connection with the client's New Mexico property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New Mexico.

46. Case Number 10-O-10408 (Pullman Matter)

Count 91 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Idaho resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Idaho property, thereby practicing law in Idaho when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Idaho.

Count 92 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Idaho client for

legal services in connection with the client's Idaho property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Idaho.

47. Case Number 10-O-10453 (G. de la Cruz Matter)

Count 93 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Hawaii resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Hawaii property, thereby practicing law in Hawaii when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Hawaii.

Count 94 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Hawaii client for legal services in connection with the client's Hawaii property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Hawaii.

48. Case Number 10-O-10454 (W. Smith Matter)

Count 95 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Michigan resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Michigan property, thereby practicing law in Michigan when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Michigan.

Count 96 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Michigan client for legal services in connection with the client's Michigan property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Michigan.

49. Case Number 10-O-10455 (Biggs Matter)

Count 97 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Ohio resident in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 98 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Ohio client for legal services in connection with the client's Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

50. Case Number 10-O-10457 (Dames Matter)

Count 99 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 100 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client's New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

51. Case Number 10-O-10458 (Brooks Matter)

Count 101 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 102 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client

for legal services in connection with the client's Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

52. Case Number 10-O-10536 (Banks Matter)

Count 103 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Georgia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Georgia property, thereby practicing law in Georgia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Georgia.

Count 104 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Georgia client for legal services in connection with the client's Georgia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Georgia.

53. Case Number 10-O-10610 (Malik Matter)

Count 105 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 106 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client's New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

54. Case Number 10-O-10897 (Schaber Matter)

Count 107 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Florida residents in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Florida property, thereby practicing law in Florida when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Florida.

Count 108 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Florida clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Florida property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Florida.

55. Case Number 10-O-10900 (Sanchez Matter)

Count 109 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Indiana resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Indiana property, thereby practicing law in Indiana when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Indiana.

Count 110 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Indiana client for legal services in connection with the client's Indiana property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Indiana.

56. Case Number 10-O-10901 (Nagy Matter)

Count 111 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 112 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client

for legal services in connection with the client's Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

57. Case Number 10-O-11081 (Fisfoulis Matter)

Count 113 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Michigan resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Michigan property, thereby practicing law in Michigan when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Michigan.

Count 114 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Michigan client for legal services in connection with the client's Michigan property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Michigan.

58. Case Number 10-O-11082 (Skinner Matter)

Count 115 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Ohio resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 116 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Ohio client for legal services in connection with the client's Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

59. Case Number 10-O-11114 (Orellana Matter)

Count 117 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Tennessee resident in order to perform legal services

in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Tennessee property, thereby practicing law in Tennessee when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Tennessee.

Count 118 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Tennessee client for legal services in connection with the client's Tennessee property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Tennessee.

60. Case Number 10-O-11118 (Gregory Matter)

Count 119 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a North Carolina resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's North Carolina property, thereby practicing law in North Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in North Carolina.

Count 120 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a North Carolina client for legal services in connection with the client's North Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in North Carolina.

61. Case Number 10-O-11180 (Hundley Matter)

Count 121 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Virginia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Virginia property, thereby practicing law in Virginia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Virginia.

Count 122 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Virginia client for legal services in connection with the client’s Virginia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Virginia.

62. Case Number 10-O-11181 (Stephens Matter)

Count 123 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Virginia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Virginia property, thereby practicing law in Virginia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Virginia.

Count 124 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Virginia client for legal services in connection with the client’s Virginia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Virginia.

63. Case Number 10-O-11182 (Fox Matter)

Count 125 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Wisconsin resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Wisconsin property, thereby practicing law in Wisconsin when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Wisconsin.

Count 126 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Wisconsin client for legal services in connection with the client’s Wisconsin property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Wisconsin.

///

64. Case Number 11-O-10021 (New Matter)

Count 127 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Tennessee resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Tennessee property, thereby practicing law in Tennessee when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Tennessee.

Count 128 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Tennessee client for legal services in connection with the client’s Tennessee property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Tennessee.

65. Case Number 11-O-10024 (Butler Matter)

Count 129 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with North Carolina residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ North Carolina property, thereby practicing law in North Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in North Carolina.

Count 130 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from North Carolina clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ North Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in North Carolina.

66. Case Number 11-O-10026 (Mayner Matter)

Count 131 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New Jersey resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s New Jersey property,

thereby practicing law in New Jersey when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New Jersey.

Count 132 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New Jersey client for legal services in connection with the client’s New Jersey property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New Jersey.

67. Case Number 11-O-10237 (Androski/Caruso Matter)

Count 133 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Connecticut resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Connecticut property, thereby practicing law in Connecticut when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Connecticut.

Count 134 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Connecticut client for legal services in connection with the client’s Connecticut property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Connecticut.

68. Case Number 11-O-10238 (Bossini Matter)

Count 135 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Washington resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Washington property, thereby practicing law in Washington when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Washington.

Count 136 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Washington

client for legal services in connection with the client's Washington property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Washington.

69. Case Number 11-O-10239 (Haenke Matter)

Count 137 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Washington residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Washington property, thereby practicing law in Washington when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Washington.

Count 138 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Washington clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Washington property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Washington.

70. Case Number 11-O-10242 (Maney Matter)

Count 139 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with North Carolina residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' North Carolina property, thereby practicing law in North Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in North Carolina.

Count 140 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from North Carolina clients for legal services in connection with the clients' North Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in North Carolina.

///

///

71. Case Number 11-O-10244 (Klein Matter)

Count 141 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with New York residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 142 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from New York clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

72. Case Number 11-O-10285 (Gardner Matter)

Count 143 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Georgia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Georgia property, thereby practicing law in Georgia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Georgia.

Count 144 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Georgia client for legal services in connection with the client’s Georgia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Georgia.

73. Case Number 11-O-10288 (Zalovick Matter)

Count 145 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Maryland residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ Maryland property, thereby

practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 146 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Maryland clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

74. Case Number 11-O-10370 (Tsosie Matter)

Count 147 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New Mexico resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s New Mexico property, thereby practicing law in New Mexico when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New Mexico.

Count 148 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New Mexico client for legal services in connection with the client’s New Mexico property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New Mexico.

75. Case Number 11-O-10521 (Root-Baker Matter)

Count 149 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 150 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client

for legal services in connection with the client's Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

76. Case Number 11-O-10535 (Charter Matter)

Count 151 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Minnesota resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Minnesota property, thereby practicing law in Minnesota when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Minnesota.

Count 152 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Minnesota client for legal services in connection with the client's Minnesota property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Minnesota.

77. Case Number 11-O-10664 (Albertson Matter)

Count 153 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Oklahoma resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Oklahoma property, thereby practicing law in Oklahoma when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Oklahoma.

Count 154 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Oklahoma client for legal services in connection with the client's Oklahoma property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Oklahoma.

78. Case Number 11-O-10668 (Reiser Matter)

Count 155 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Nebraska resident in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Nebraska property, thereby practicing law in Nebraska when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Nebraska.

Count 156 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Nebraska client for legal services in connection with the client's Nebraska property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Nebraska.

79. Case Number 11-O-10774 (Hunnicuttt Matter)

Count 157 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a North Carolina resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's North Carolina property, thereby practicing law in North Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in North Carolina.

Count 158 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a North Carolina client for legal services in connection with the client's North Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in North Carolina.

80. Case Number 11-O-10781 (Colella Matter)

Count 159 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 160 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client’s New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

81. Case Number 11-O-10807 (Janes Matter)

Count 161 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Oregon residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ Oregon property, thereby practicing law in Oregon when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Oregon.

Count 162 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Oregon clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Oregon property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Oregon.

82. Case Number 11-O-10816 (Petroviak Matter)

Count 163 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Minnesota residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ Minnesota property, thereby practicing law in Minnesota when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Minnesota.

Count 164 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Minnesota clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Minnesota property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Minnesota.

///

83. Case Number 11-O-11005 (Moses Matter)

Count 165 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Tennessee residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ Tennessee property, thereby practicing law in Tennessee when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Tennessee.

Count 166 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Tennessee clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Tennessee property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Tennessee.

84. Case Number 11-O-11007 (Deleva Matter)

Count 167 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 168 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client for legal services in connection with the client’s Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

85. Case Number 11-O-11195 (Vaughn Matter)

Count 169 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Georgia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Georgia property, thereby

practicing law in Georgia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Georgia.

Count 170 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Georgia client for legal services in connection with the client’s Georgia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Georgia.

86. Case Number 11-O-11206 (Gray Matter)

Count 171 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Hawaii resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Hawaii property, thereby practicing law in Hawaii when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Hawaii.

Count 172 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Hawaii client for legal services in connection with the client’s Hawaii property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Hawaii.

87. Case Number 11-O-11215 (Gilbert Matter)

Count 173 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Georgia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Georgia property, thereby practicing law in Georgia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Georgia.

Count 174 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Georgia client

for legal services in connection with the client's Georgia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Georgia.

88. Case Number 11-O-11356 (O'Neil Matter)

Count 175 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Florida resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Florida property, thereby practicing law in Florida when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Florida.

Count 176 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Florida client for legal services in connection with the client's Florida property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Florida.

89. Case Number 11-O-11358 (Morris Matter)

Count 177 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 178 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client for legal services in connection with the client's Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

90. Case Number 11-O-11439 (Knight Matter)

Count 179 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Michigan residents in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Michigan property, thereby practicing law in Michigan when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Michigan.

Count 180 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Michigan clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Michigan property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Michigan.

91. Case Number 11-O-11544 (Hartwell Matter)

Count 181 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with South Carolina residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' South Carolina property, thereby practicing law in South Carolina when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in South Carolina.

Count 182 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from South Carolina clients for legal services in connection with the clients' South Carolina property, when he was not licensed to practice law in South Carolina.

92. Case Number 11-O-11595 (Robillard Matter)

Count 183 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 184 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client’s New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

93. Case Number 11-O-11598 (Conner Matter)

Count 185 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Virginia residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients’ Virginia property, thereby practicing law in Virginia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Virginia.

Count 186 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Virginia clients for legal services in connection with the clients’ Virginia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Virginia.

94. Case Number 11-O-11599 (Jaisingh Matter)

Count 187 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 188 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client’s New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

///

95. Case Number 11-O-11600 (Slaughter Matter)

Count 189 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Maryland resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 190 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Maryland client for legal services in connection with the client’s Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

96. Case Number 11-O-11603 (Coyle Matter)

Count 191 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Florida resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Florida property, thereby practicing law in Florida when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Florida.

Count 192 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Florida client for legal services in connection with the client’s Florida property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Florida.

97. Case Number 11-O-11692 (Marcotte Matter)

Count 193 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Arkansas resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Arkansas property,

thereby practicing law in Arkansas when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Arkansas.

Count 194 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Arkansas client for legal services in connection with the client’s Arkansas property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Arkansas.

98. Case Number 11-O-11695 (Frias Matter)

Count 195 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Massachusetts resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Massachusetts property, thereby practicing law in Massachusetts when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Massachusetts.

Count 196 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Massachusetts client for legal services in connection with the client’s Massachusetts property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Massachusetts.

99. Case Number 11-O-11699 (Gilstrap Matter)

Count 197 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Georgia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client’s Georgia property, thereby practicing law in Georgia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Georgia.

Count 198 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Georgia client

for legal services in connection with the client's Georgia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Georgia.

100. Case Number 11-O-11871 (Greenberg Matter)

Count 199 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Connecticut resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Connecticut property, thereby practicing law in Connecticut when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Connecticut.

Count 200 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Connecticut client for legal services in connection with the client's Connecticut property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Connecticut.

101. Case Number 11-O-11986 (Feathers Matter)

Count 201 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Maryland residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Maryland property, thereby practicing law in Maryland when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Maryland.

Count 202 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Maryland clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Maryland property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Maryland.

102. Case Number 11-O-11996 (Lewis Matter)

Count 203 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Alabama residents in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Alabama property, thereby practicing law in Alabama when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Alabama.

Count 204 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Alabama clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Alabama property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Alabama.

103. Case Number 11-O-12005 (Barker Matter)

Count 205 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with Ohio residents in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the clients' Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 206 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from Ohio clients for legal services in connection with the clients' Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

104. Case Number 11-O-12275 (Ridlehoover Matter)

Count 207 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Virginia resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Virginia property, thereby practicing law in Virginia when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Virginia.

Count 208 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Virginia client

for legal services in connection with the client's Virginia property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Virginia.

105. Case Number 11-O-12404 (Garcia Matter)

Count 209 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New York resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's New York property, thereby practicing law in New York when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New York.

Count 210 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New York client for legal services in connection with the client's New York property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New York.

106. Case Number 11-O-12467 (Morningstar Matter)

Count 211 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Washington resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Washington property, thereby practicing law in Washington when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Washington.

Count 212 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Washington client for legal services in connection with the client's Washington property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Washington.

107. Case Number 11-O-12468 (Crutchfield Matter)

Count 213 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Louisiana resident in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Louisiana property, thereby practicing law in Louisiana when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Louisiana.

Count 214 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Louisiana client for legal services in connection with the client's Louisiana property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Louisiana.

108. Case Number 11-O-12472 (Crumly Matter)

Count 215 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Idaho resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Idaho property, thereby practicing law in Idaho when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Idaho.

Count 216 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Idaho client for legal services in connection with the client's Idaho property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Idaho.

109. Case Number 11-O-12515 (Pheng Matter)

Count 217 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Illinois resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Illinois property, thereby practicing law in Illinois when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Illinois.

Count 218 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Illinois client

for legal services in connection with the client's Illinois property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Illinois.

110. Case Number 11-O-12516 (Gilbert Matter)

Count 219 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Illinois resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Illinois property, thereby practicing law in Illinois when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Illinois.

Count 220 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Illinois client for legal services in connection with the client's Illinois property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Illinois.

111. Case Number 11-O-12517 (Clark Matter)

Count 221 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Illinois resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Illinois property, thereby practicing law in Illinois when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Illinois.

Count 222 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Illinois client for legal services in connection with the client's Illinois property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Illinois.

112. Case Number 11-O-12666 (Finch Matter)

Count 223 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Arizona resident in order to perform legal services in

connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Arizona property, thereby practicing law in Arizona when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Arizona.

Count 224 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Arizona client for legal services in connection with the client's Arizona property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Arizona.

113. Case Number 11-O-12786 (A. Johnson Matter)

Count 225 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a New Jersey resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's New Jersey property, thereby practicing law in New Jersey when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in New Jersey.

Count 226 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a New Jersey client for legal services in connection with the client's New Jersey property, when he was not licensed to practice law in New Jersey.

114. Case Number 11-O-12824 (Bayomi Matter)

Count 227 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Ohio resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 228 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Ohio client for

legal services in connection with the client's Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

115. Case Number 11-O-12828 (Holmes Matter)

Count 229 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with a Massachusetts resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Massachusetts property, thereby practicing law in Massachusetts when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Massachusetts.

Count 230 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from a Massachusetts client for legal services in connection with the client's Massachusetts property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Massachusetts.

116. Case Number 11-O-12928 (Chohan Matter)

Count 231 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(B) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by accepting employment with an Ohio resident in order to perform legal services in connection with a home mortgage loan modification for the client's Ohio property, thereby practicing law in Ohio when he had never been admitted to practice law in that state, and thereby willfully violating the regulations of the profession in Ohio.

Count 232 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct by entering into an agreement for, charging, and collecting fees from an Ohio client for legal services in connection with the client's Ohio property, when he was not licensed to practice law in Ohio.

117. Case Numbers: 10-O-02926 (10-O-03052; 10-O-06693; 10-O-06694; 10-O-06699; 10-O-07029; 10-O-07384; 10-O-07904; 10-O-07920; 10-O-07931; 10-O-07967;

10-O-07970; 10-O-07972; 10-O-07973; 10-O-07974;
10-O-08521; 10-O-08526; 10-O-08529; 10-O-08716;
10-O-08717; 10-O-08721; 10-O-08722; 10-O-08926;
10-O-08927; 10-O-08933; 10-O-09117; 10-O-09119;
10-O-09497; 10-O-09499; 10-O-09500; 10-O-09502;
10-O-09552; 10-O-09555; 10-O-10125; 10-O-10127;
10-O-10132; 10-O-10133; 10-O-10137; 10-O-10140;
10-O-10142; 10-O-10144; 10-O-10338; 10-O-10339;
10-O-10342; 10-O-10403; 10-O-10408; 10-O-10453;
10-O-10454; 10-O-10455; 10-O-10456; 10-O-10457;
10-O-10458; 10-O-10536; 10-O-10610; 10-O-10897;
10-O-10900; 10-O-10901; 10-O-11081; 10-O-11082;
10-O-11114; 10-O-11118; 10-O-11180; 10-O-11181;
10-O-11182; 11-O-10021; 11-O-10024; 11-O-10026;
11-O-10237; 11-O-10238; 11-O-10239; 11-O-10242;
11-O-10244; 11-O-10285; 11-O-10288; 11-O-10370;
11-O-10521; 11-O-10535; 11-O-10664; 11-O-10668;
11-O-10774; 11-O-10781; 11-O-10807; 11-O-10816;
11-O-11005; 11-O-11007; 11-O-11195; 11-O-11206;
11-O-11215; 11-O-11356; 11-O-11358; 11-O-11439;
11-O-11544; 11-O-11595; 11-O-11598; 11-O-11599;
11-O-11600; 11-O-11603; 11-O-11692; 11-O-11695;
11-O-11699; 11-O-11871; 11-O-11986; 11-O-11996;
11-O-12005; 11-O-12275; 11-O-12404; 11-O-12467;
11-O-12468; 11-O-12472; 11-O-12515; 11-O-12516;
11-O-12517; 11-O-12518; 11-O-12666; 11-O-12786;
11-O-12824; 11-O-12828; 11-O-12928)

Count 233 – Respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6106 (moral turpitude) by engaging in a scheme to defraud the individuals in counts 1 through 232, above, by exploiting these individuals for personal gain and accepting employment where he was not licensed to perform legal services.⁶

Disbarment is Recommended

Based on the above, the court concludes that the requirements of rule 5.85(E) have been satisfied, and respondent’s disbarment must be recommended. In particular:

- (1) the NDC was properly served on respondent under rule 5.25;

⁶ There are no facts set forth above to support culpability with respect to case numbers 10-O-10456 and 11-O-12518. Accordingly, these cases are ordered dismissed without prejudice.

(2) respondent had actual notice of this proceeding prior to the entry of his default, as he telephoned DTC Hernandez twice and spoke with him on one occasion, and respondent attempted twice to file an answer to the Second Amended NDC;

(3) the default was properly entered under rule 5.80; and

(4) the factual allegations in the NDC deemed admitted by the entry of the default support a finding that respondent violated a statute, rule or court order that would warrant the imposition of discipline.

Despite actual notice and opportunity, respondent failed to participate in this disciplinary proceeding. As set forth in the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, the court must recommend his disbarment.

RECOMMENDATION

Disbarment

The court recommends that respondent Dean Gregory Chandler be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of California and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys.

Restitution

The court also recommends that respondent be ordered to make restitution to the following payees:

- (1) Marie G. Watson in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from November 15, 2009;
- (2) Henry C. Dinkelman in the amount of \$795 plus 10% interest per year from March 22, 2009;
- (3) Edward F. Gaffney in the amount of \$3,995 plus 10% interest per year from December 29, 2009;
- (4) Johnny R. Johnson, Sr. in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from July 12, 2009;
- (5) Scott J. Kelley in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from August 3, 2009;

- (6) Regina Chambers in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from December 9, 2009;
- (7) Gowrie H. and Tufail Mohammed, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from September 16, 2009;
- (8) Robert M. Prosser in the amount of \$3,500 plus 10% interest per year from November 30, 2009;
- (9) Raymond D. Ross in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 1, 2010;
- (10) Alberto Dacayanan, Jr. in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 22, 2010;
- (11) Charles W. Nehring, Jr. in the amount of \$4,495 plus 10% interest per year from October 14, 2009;
- (12) John S. Williams in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 29, 2010;
- (13) Dawnyal Denton in the amount of \$3,880 plus 10% interest per year from November 3, 2009;
- (14) Sherry Sparks in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 28, 2010;
- (15) Francisco Lindo in the amount of \$3,995 plus 10% interest per year from June 23, 2009;
- (16) Barry Alexander in the amount of \$3,995 plus 10% interest per year from February 15, 2010;
- (17) Jeffrey Peebles in the amount of \$2,330 plus 10% interest per year from May 21, 2010;
- (18) Jeannette Renee Holben in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from November 17, 2009;
- (19) David and Erin Marie Egstad, jointly, in the amount of \$3,494.98 plus 10% interest per year from December 15, 2009;
- (20) Yong Don and Og Nam, jointly, in the amount of \$8,990 plus 10% interest per year from December 31, 2009;
- (21) Arnold G. Ahrens in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from February 10, 2010;
- (22) James Frederick in the amount of \$4,995 plus 10% interest per year from August 6, 2009;

- (23) Ray Campeau in the amount of \$2,680 plus 10% interest per year from April 20, 2010;
- (24) Josh Goodman in the amount of \$3,500 plus 10% interest per year from March 5, 2010;
- (25) Joseph O'Neill in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 8, 2010;
- (26) Jimmy G. Maggard in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from March 24, 2010;
- (27) Kelly J. Smith in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from January 7, 2010;
- (28) Randy L. Collins in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from June 18, 2009;
- (29) Stephen J. Afful in the amount of \$3,400 plus 10% interest per year from May 20, 2010;
- (30) Loana Dragalina-Tudoriu in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from November 1, 2010;
- (31) Donna and James Just, jointly, in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from April 14, 2010;
- (32) Grant Winters in the amount of \$2,247.50 plus 10% interest per year from May 17, 2010;
- (33) Valentina Zutman in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from February 2, 2010;
- (34) Edward Seeco in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from March 8, 2010;
- (35) Teddy and Cyndi Cook, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from March 21, 2010;
- (36) Jane E. Krieser in the amount of \$15,724.90 plus 10% interest per year from March 23, 2010;
- (37) Shelena L. Williams in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from December 29, 2009;
- (38) Linda Debo in the amount of \$2,500 plus 10% interest per year from November 4, 2009;
- (39) Rebecca A. Weber in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from March 12, 2010;

- (40) Larry J. Cumberland in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from May 20, 2010;
- (41) Luis F. Munoz in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from May 12, 2009;
- (42) Sudie Donold in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from July 1, 2009;
- (43) Marcario A. de la Cruz in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 7, 2010;
- (44) Randy and Sandra Calloway, jointly, in the amount of \$2,495 plus 10% interest per year from April 12, 2010;
- (45) Jose G. Fernandez in the amount of \$2,400 plus 10% interest per year from November 12, 2009;
- (46) Thane E. Pullman in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from December 2, 2009;
- (47) Glenn P. de la Cruz in the amount of \$4,495 plus 10% interest per year from December 14, 2009;
- (48) William O. Smith in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from June 11, 2010;
- (49) Walter E. Biggs II in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from February 22, 2010;
- (50) Andrea Dames in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from March 1, 2010;
- (51) Christopher Daniel Brooks in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 22, 2010;
- (52) Randy G. Banks in the amount of \$4,495 plus 10% interest per year from June 17, 2010;
- (53) Attual Malik in the amount of \$4,495 plus 10% interest per year from September 15, 2009;
- (54) Edward and Aimee Schaber, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 20, 2010;
- (55) Peter Sanchez in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from October 9, 2009;
- (56) Alex Nagy in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from April 6, 2010;

- (57) Vasilios Fisfoulis in the amount of \$5,500 plus 10% interest per year from February 11, 2010;
- (58) Robert Skinner in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 13, 2010;
- (59) Richard Orellana in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from September 28, 2009;
- (60) Jon G. Gregory in the amount of \$4,495 plus 10% interest per year from October 9, 2009;
- (61) Jennifer Hundley in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from October 29, 2009;
- (62) Mignon Stephens in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from July 9, 2009;
- (63) Paul C. Fox in the amount of \$3,164.14 plus 10% interest per year from May 18, 2010;
- (64) Sherry New in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from May 27, 2010;
- (65) Charles and Carrie Butler, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from December 3, 2009;
- (66) Reginald Mayner, Sr. in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from June 2, 2009;
- (67) Edward J. Androski obo Candie Caruso in the amount of \$3,500 plus 10% interest per year from February 5, 2010;
- (68) Gina M. Bossini in the amount of \$3,500 plus 10% interest per year from April 30, 2009;
- (69) Aime and Matthew Haenke, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from October 22, 2009;
- (70) Andrew and Christy Maney, jointly, in the amount of \$2,058.16 plus 10% interest per year from February 15, 2010;
- (71) Joann and Thomas Klein, jointly, in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from February 28, 2009;
- (72) Sylvia Gardner in the amount of \$4,372.50 plus 10% interest per year from October 16, 2010;
- (73) Rickey and Sandra Zalovick, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from February 23, 2010;

- (74) Virgil Tsosie in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from February 8, 2010;
- (75) Nakia Root-Baker in the amount of \$1,747.50 plus 10% interest per year from April 2, 2010;
- (76) Joe D. Charter in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from March 16, 2010;
- (77) Bill Albertson in the amount of \$2,000 plus 10% interest per year from September 15, 2010;
- (78) Scott Reiser in the amount of \$2,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 20, 2010;
- (79) Christin Hunnicutt in the amount of \$2,495 plus 10% interest per year from March 16, 2010;
- (80) Glenn B. Colella in the amount of \$3,995 plus 10% interest per year from November 18, 2009;
- (81) Danielle and Brandon Janes, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from March 16, 2010;
- (82) Mike and Patty Petrowiak, jointly, in the amount of \$3,500 plus 10% interest per year from December 3, 2009;
- (83) Roy and Lillian Moses, jointly, in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from January 25, 2010;
- (84) David Deleva in the amount of \$3,995 plus 10% interest per year from February 9, 2010;
- (85) Deborah Vaughn in the amount of \$1,747.50 plus 10% interest per year from May 19, 2010;
- (86) Amalia Gray in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from February 23, 2010;
- (87) Gerri Gilbert in the amount of \$998 plus 10% interest per year from January 27, 2010;
- (88) Wynita O'Neil in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from June 25, 2009;
- (89) Juanita L. Morris in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 6, 2010;
- (90) Michael and Consuelo Knight, jointly, in the amount of \$3,995 plus 10% interest per year from June 12, 2010;

- (91) Paul Sr. and Judy Hartwell, jointly, in the amount of \$2,600 plus 10% interest per year from October 6, 2010;
- (92) Linda M. Robillard in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from July 21, 2009;
- (93) Ronald and Patricia Conner, jointly, in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from March 31, 2010;
- (94) Yasmin Jaisingh in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from October 4, 2009;
- (95) Terrence E. Slaughter in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from May 18, 2010;
- (96) Michael Coyle in the amount of \$1,950 plus 10% interest per year from March 8, 2010;
- (97) Joyce A. Marcotte in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from June 9, 2010;
- (98) Gladys Frias in the amount of \$5,190 plus 10% interest per year from July 1, 2009;
- (99) Estelle S. Gilstrap in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from January 20, 2010;
- (100) Karen J. Greenberg in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from April 2, 2010;
- (101) Jean A. and David S. Feathers, jointly, in the amount of \$2,000 plus 10% interest per year from July 2, 2009;
- (102) Joe A. and Loretta B. Lewis, jointly, in the amount of \$2,151.01 plus 10% interest per year from January 13, 2010;
- (103) Robert and Karen Barker, jointly, in the amount of \$3,000 plus 10% interest per year from August 4, 2009;
- (104) Michelle L. Ridlehoover in the amount of \$4,882.74 plus 10% interest per year from October 6, 2009;
- (105) Betty Garcia in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from April 2, 2010;
- (106) Spencer Morningstar in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from May 26, 2009;
- (107) Bruce C. Crutchfield in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from March 16, 2010;

- (108) Victor Crumly in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from December 14, 2009;
- (109) Leang Pheng in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from June 15, 2009;
- (110) Beverly Gilbert in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from April 19, 2010;
- (111) Tim E. Clark in the amount of \$1,995 plus 10% interest per year from February 25, 2010;
- (112) Samantha T. Finch in the amount of \$3,371.50 plus 10% interest per year from June 2, 2010;
- (113) Ahmed Bayomi in the amount of \$3,495 plus 10% interest per year from November 24, 2009;
- (114) Sharon K. Holmes in the amount of \$2,995 plus 10% interest per year from July 3, 2009; and
- (115) Zia U. Chohan in the amount of \$3,919 plus 10% interest per year from December 29, 2009.⁷

Any restitution owed to the Client Security Fund is enforceable as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.5, subdivisions (c) and (d).

California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20

The court also recommends that respondent be ordered to comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this proceeding.

Costs

The court further recommends that costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10, such costs being enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

///

⁷ The court does not recommend that restitution be paid to Alice Johnson (see counts 225 and 226) as the evidence fails to establish how much money was paid as an advanced fee to respondent.

INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

In accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), the court orders that Dean Gregory Chandler, State Bar number 163090, be involuntarily enrolled as an inactive member of the State Bar of California, effective three calendar days after the service of this decision and order. (Rule 5.111(D).)

Dated: May _____, 2013

PAT McELROY
Judge of the State Bar Court