

(Do not write above this line.)

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

<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Erin McKeown Joyce Deputy Trial Counsel State Bar of California 1149 South Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299 Telephone: (213) 765-1356 Facsimile: (213) 765-1319</p> <p>Bar # 149946</p>	<p>Case Number(s): 10-O-6417 10-O-7606 10-O-8057 10-O-8118 10-O-8188</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <p><b>PUBLIC MATTER</b></p> <p><b>FILED</b></p> <p>JUL 20 2011</p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</p> 
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>Wayne Kenneth Teebken 24100 El Toro Road Suite D-216 Laguna Woods, CA 92637 (310) 977-2023</p> <p>Bar # 93013</p>	<p>Submitted to: <b>Assigned Judge</b></p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p><b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p>	
<p>In the Matter of: <b>WAYNE KENNETH TEEBKEN</b></p> <p>Bar # 93013</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>		

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

**A. Parties' Acknowledgments:**

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted May 30, 1980.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.



(Do not write above this line.)

- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of 12 pages, not including the order.
- (4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".
- (6) The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading "Supporting Authority."
- (7) No more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any pending investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.
- (8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):
- Until costs are paid in full, Respondent will remain actually suspended from the practice of law unless relief is obtained per rule 5.130, Rules of Procedure.
  - Costs are to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: two years following the effective date of the Supreme Court order of discipline. (Hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 5.132, Rules of Procedure.) If Respondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified by the State Bar Court, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately.
  - Costs are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs".
  - Costs are entirely waived.

**B. Aggravating Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.**

- (1)  **Prior record of discipline** [see standard 1.2(f)]
- (a)  State Bar Court case # of prior case 01-O-4455, 01-O-4860, 02-O-10083, 02-O-12600, 03-O-2646, 03-O-2971 04-O-10034, 04-O-10734, 04-O-15662, 05-O-2653, 05-O-5103, 06-O-10521, 07-O-12574
  - (b)  Date prior discipline effective August 21, 2010
  - (c)  Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A), Business and Professions Code section 6068(m), Rule of Professional Conduct 1-300(A), Rule of Professional Conduct 3-700(D)(1) and Rule of Professional Conduct 4-100(B)(3)
  - (d)  Degree of prior discipline ninety (90) day actual suspension, one year stayed suspension and two year probation
  - (e)  If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (2)  **Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3)  **Trust Violation:** Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.
- (4)  **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.
- (5)  **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (6)  **Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.
- (7)  **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (8)  **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

**Additional aggravating circumstances:**

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

- (1)  **No Prior Discipline:** Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not deemed serious.
- (2)  **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.
- (3)  **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings. Throughout this proceeding, Respondent cooperated fully with the State Bar, answered the questions that were posed by the State Bar, and entered into this comprehensive stipulation acknowledging his misconduct and settling this case prefilling.
- (4)  **Remorse:** Respondent promptly took objective steps spontaneously demonstrating remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of his/her misconduct.
- (5)  **Restitution:** Respondent paid \$ \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ in restitution to \_\_\_\_\_ without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.
- (6)  **Delay:** These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her.
- (7)  **Good Faith:** Respondent acted in good faith.
- (8)  **Emotional/Physical Difficulties:** At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical disabilities which expert testimony would

establish was directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the product of any illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities.

- (9)  **Severe Financial Stress:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered from severe financial stress which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.
- (10)  **Family Problems:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
- (11)  **Good Character:** Respondent's good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of his/her misconduct.
- (12)  **Rehabilitation:** Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13)  **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

**Additional mitigating circumstances:**

**D. Discipline:**

- (1)  **Stayed Suspension:**
- (a)  Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of three (3) years.
- i.  and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
- ii.  and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
- iii.  and until Respondent does the following:
- (b)  The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

- (2)  **Probation:**

Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of three (3) years, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 9.18, California Rules of Court)

- (3)  **Actual Suspension:**

- (a)  Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of thirty (30) days.
- i.  and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct

- ii.  and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
- iii.  and until Respondent does the following:

**E. Additional Conditions of Probation:**

- (1)  If Respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until he/she proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in the general law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
- (2)  During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3)  Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (4)  Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and conditions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must promptly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request.
- (5)  Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.

In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.

- (6)  Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.
- (7)  Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.
- (8)  Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
  - No Ethics School recommended. Reason: Respondent is required to attend Ethics School as a condition in Case No. 01-O-4455 et al.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (9)  Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.
- (10)  The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Law Office Management Conditions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Conditions         | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Conditions             |

**F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:**

- (1)  **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination:** Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. **Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 5.162(A) & (E), Rules of Procedure.**
- No MPRE recommended. Reason: Respondent is required to pass the MPRE as a condition in Case No. 01-O-4455 et al.
- (2)  **Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court:** Respondent must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
- (3)  **Conditional Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court:** If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 days or more, he/she must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
- (4)  **Credit for Interim Suspension [conviction referral cases only]:** Respondent will be credited for the period of his/her interim suspension toward the stipulated period of actual suspension. Date of commencement of interim suspension:
- (5)  **Other Conditions:**

The Attachment to the Stipulation re Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition comprises pages 7 to 11.

## ATTACHMENT TO

### STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

#### **In the Matter of Wayne Teebken**

**Case Nos. 10-O-6417, 10-O-7606, 10-O-8057, 10-O-8118 and 10-O-8188**

#### **PENDING PROCEEDINGS:**

The disclosure date referred to on page two, paragraph A.(7), was June 22, 2011.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified Rules of Professional Conduct.

#### **Case No. 10-O-6417**

#### **FACTS**

1. In February 2003, Daniel Perez-Cardenas hired Respondent for an immigration matter. Perez-Cardenas was seeking a labor certification and adjustment of status.
2. Sometime in August 2008, Respondent decided to transfer his practice to another attorney.
3. Respondent failed to complete the legal work for which he was hired by Perez-Cardenas before he transferred his practice to the new attorney.
4. Respondent failed to take steps necessary to inform his clients, including Perez-Cardenas, that he would no longer be working on Perez-Cardenas' legal matter.
5. Respondent failed to ensure that the attorney taking over his practice assumed responsibility for Perez-Cardenas' legal matter.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

By failing to complete the legal services for which he was retained by Perez-Cardenas, and by failing to take steps necessary to ensure that the client was informed that a new attorney would be handling the Perez-Cardenas matter and that the new attorney had assumed responsibility for the Perez-Cardenas matter, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in wilful violation of Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A).

#### **Case No. 10-O-6417**

#### **FACTS**

1. In February 2003, Rosendo Almaraz hired Respondent for an immigration matter. Almaraz was seeking a labor certification and adjustment of status.

2. Sometime in August 2008, Respondent decided to transfer his practice to another attorney.
3. Respondent failed to complete the legal work for which he was hired by Almaraz before he transferred his practice to the new attorney.
4. Respondent failed to take steps necessary to inform his clients, including Almaraz, that he would no longer be working on Almaraz' legal matter.
5. Respondent failed to ensure that the attorney taking over his practice assumed responsibility for Almaraz' legal matter.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

By failing to complete the legal services for which he was retained by Almaraz, and by failing to take steps necessary to ensure that the client was informed that a new attorney would be handing the Almaraz matter and that the new attorney had assumed responsibility for the Almaraz matter, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in wilful violation of Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A).

### **Case No. 10-O-8057**

### **FACTS**

6. In May 2005, Humberto Torres hired Respondent for an immigration matter. Torres was seeking a labor certification and adjustment of status for himself and his wife.
7. Sometime in August 2008, Respondent decided to transfer his practice to another attorney.
8. Respondent failed to complete the legal work for which he was hired by Torres before he transferred his practice to the new attorney.
9. Respondent failed to take steps necessary to inform his clients, including Torres, that he would no longer be working on Perez-Cardenas' legal matter.
10. Respondent failed to ensure that the attorney taking over his practice assumed responsibility for Torres' legal matter.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

By failing to complete the legal services for which he was retained by Torres, and by failing to take steps necessary to ensure that the client was informed that a new attorney would be handing the Torres matter and that the new attorney had assumed responsibility for the Torres matter, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in wilful violation of Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A).

**Case No. 10-O-8118**

**FACTS**

1. In June 2005, Ernesto Torres Munoz hired Respondent for an immigration matter. Munoz was seeking a labor certification and adjustment of status.
2. Sometime in August 2008, Respondent decided to transfer his practice to another attorney.
3. Respondent failed to complete the legal work for which he was hired by Munoz before he transferred his practice to the new attorney.
4. Respondent failed to take steps necessary to inform his clients, including Munoz, that he would no longer be working on Munoz' legal matter.
5. Respondent failed to ensure that the attorney taking over his practice assumed responsibility for Munoz' legal matter.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

By failing to complete the legal services for which he was retained by Munoz, and by failing to take steps necessary to ensure that the client was informed that a new attorney would be handling the Munoz matter and that the new attorney had assumed responsibility for the Munoz matter, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in wilful violation of Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A).

**Case No. 10-O-8118**

**FACTS**

1. In June 2005, Juan Carlos Torres hired Respondent for an immigration matter. Torres was seeking a labor certification and adjustment of status.
2. Sometime in August 2008, Respondent decided to transfer his practice to another attorney.
3. Respondent failed to complete the legal work for which he was hired by Torres before he transferred his practice to the new attorney.
4. Respondent failed to take steps necessary to inform his clients, including Torres, that he would no longer be working on Torres' legal matter.
5. Respondent failed to ensure that the attorney taking over his practice assumed responsibility for Torres' legal matter.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By failing to complete the legal services for which he was retained by Torres, and by failing to take steps necessary to ensure that the client was informed that a new attorney would be handling the Torres matter and that the new attorney had assumed responsibility for the Torres matter, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in wilful violation of Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A).

## AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE

### STANDARDS FOR ATTORNEY SANCTIONS

To determine the appropriate level of discipline, the standards provide guidance. *Drociak v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1085; *In the Matter of Sampson*, 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 119. A disciplinary recommendation must be consistent with the discipline in similar proceedings. See *Snyder v. State Bar* (1990) 49 Cal.3d 1302. Also, the recommended discipline must rest upon a balanced consideration of relevant factors. *In the Matter of Sampson*, 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 119.

Pursuant to Standard 1.3 of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct:

The primary purposes of disciplinary proceedings conducted by the State Bar of California and of sanctions imposed upon a finding or acknowledgment of a member's professional misconduct are the protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession; the maintenance of high professional standards by attorneys and the preservation of public confidence in the legal profession.

---

Pursuant to Standard 2.4(b) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct:

Culpability of a member of willfully failing to perform services in an individual matter or matters not demonstrating a pattern of misconduct or culpability of a member of willfully failing to communicate with a client shall result in reproof or suspension depending upon the extent of the misconduct and the degree of harm to the client.

---

Respondent has engaged in repeated violations of Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A) in the handling of a series of client matters. A period of actual suspension is warranted under the circumstances since Respondent engaged in multiple instances of misconduct involving his law practice, especially in view of Respondent's prior record of discipline. *In the Matter of Brockway* (Review Dept. 2006) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 944; *In the Matter of Wolff* (Review Dept. 2006) 5 Cal. Bar Ct. Rptr. 1.

In these matters, however, the misconduct occurred during the same time period as the misconduct involved in Respondent's prior discipline, which resulted in a ninety day actual suspension. Accordingly, the prior discipline should not be given significant aggravating weight. *In the Matter of Freydl* (Review Dept. 2001) 4 Cal. Bar Ct. Rptr. 349. The stipulated

discipline of a thirty day actual suspension is sufficient to protect the interests of the public and the profession in these matters.

#### **FURTHER AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES**

The factual statements contained in this Stipulation constitute admissions of fact and may not be withdrawn by either party, except with court approval.

#### **COSTS**



Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed her that as of June 22, 2011, the estimated costs in this matter are \$6,382.60. Respondent further acknowledges that, should this Stipulation be rejected or should relief from the Stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the cost of further proceedings.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Wayne Kenneth Teebken	Case number(s): 10-O-6417, 10-O-7606, 10-O-8057, 10-O-8118 and 10-O-8188
--	--

**SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES**

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

<u>6/22/11</u> Date	 Respondent's Signature	Wayne Kenneth Teebken Print Name
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	n/a Print Name
<u>6-22-11</u> Date	 Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Erin McKeown Joyce Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Wayne Kenneth Teebken	Case Number(s): 10-O-6417, 10-O-7606, 10-O-8057, 10-O-8118 and 10-O-8188
--	--

### ACTUAL SUSPENSION ORDER

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

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

1. Ethics School Requirement: On page 5, paragraph E.8, the parties placed an "x" next to the directive requiring Respondent to attend Ethics School, and they also placed an "x" in the box stating, "No Ethics School recommended." The first "x", indicating that Respondent is required to attend Ethics School, is hereby deleted.
2. Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam Requirement: On page 6, paragraph F.1, the parties placed an "x" in the box requiring Respondent to take and pass the MPRE; and they also inserted an "x" in the box indicating that no MPRE is recommended. The first "x", indicating that Respondent is required to take and pass the MPRE, is hereby deleted.

The parties are bound by the stipulation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed within 15 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved stipulation. (See rule 5.58(E) & (F), Rules of Procedure.) **The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after file date. (See rule 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)**

Date

7/20/11

Judge of the State Bar Court



**DONALD F. MILES**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on July 20, 2011, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

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

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

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

WAYNE KENNETH TEEBKEN  
LAW OFFICES OF W KENNETH TEEBKEN  
837 RONDA SEVILLA UNIT C  
LAGUNA WOODS, CA 92637

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

ERIN JOYCE, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on July 20, 2011.



Rose Luthi  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court