State Bar Court of California **Hearing Department** San Francisco REPROVAL Counsel For The State Bar For Court use only Case Number(s): 11-0-17270 Christine Souhrada NOT FOR PUBLICATION Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street, 7th fl. San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2183 **PUBLIC MATTER** Bar # 228256 JUN 12 2012 In Pro Per Respondent STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO Craig Lee Henderson 5134 Archerest Way Sacramento, CA 95835 Submitted to: Settlement Judge Bar # 194953 STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING In the Matter of: Craig Lee Henderson PRIVATE REPROVAL Bar # 194953 PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)

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

A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted May 26, 1998.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of 9 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."

kwiktag [©] 018 035 466

(Do	not wri	te abov	re this line.)	
(5) ⁻	Co Lav		lons of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of	
(6)		The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading "Supporting Authority."		
(7)			than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.	
(8)			t of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & (Check one option only):	
		re _[Ca	osts are added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline (public proval). ase ineligible for costs (private reproval). asts are to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years:	
		(H Re Co	ardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 5.132, Rules of Procedure.) If espondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified by the State Bar burt, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately.	
-	H	Co	osts are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs". Sts are entirely waived.	
(9) The parties understand that:			les understand that:	
	(a)		A private reproval imposed on a respondent as a result of a stipulation approved by the Court prior to initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, but is not disclosed in response to public inquiries and is not reported on the State Bar's web page. The record of the proceeding in which such a private reproval was imposed is not available to the public except as part of the record of any subsequent proceeding in which it is introduced as evidence of a prior record of discipline under the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.	
	(b)	X	A private reproval imposed on a respondent after initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.	
	(c)		A public reproval imposed on a respondent is publicly available as part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.	
)rc		iona	ting Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for all Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances	
1)		Prio	r record of discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]	
	(a)		State Bar Court case # of prior case	
	(b)		Date prior discipline effective	
	(c)		Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations:	
	(d)		Degree of prior discipline	

(Do n	ot writ	e above this line.)			
	(e)	If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline.			
(2)		Dishonesty: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.			
(3)		Trust Violation: Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.			
(4)		Harm: Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.			
(5)		Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.			
(6)		Lack of Cooperation: Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.			
(7)		Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.			
(8)	\boxtimes	No aggravating circumstances are involved.			
Add	itiona	al aggravating circumstances:			
		ating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating stances 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.			
(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			

(Do n	ot writ	e above this line.)	
		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.	
Addi	tion	al mitigating circumstances:	
		Respondent has no prior record of discipline since he was admitted in 1998.	
	the miti alm	Further, although respondent initially failed to cooperate in the State Bar's investigation resulting the 6068(i) violation described herein; after charges were filed against respondent, he began operating by collecting information and documents related to the matter being investigated by State Bar from the New York courts, as well as others involved. Normally, this would not warrant igation, however, it should be noted that in this particular case, the matter being investigated was nost 20 years old and documents were difficult to obtain. Respondent, through multiple mmunications with the court clerk(s), was able to obtain additional documents which had not en obtained previously.	
D. D	isci	pline:	
(1) Private reproval (check applicable conditions, if any, below)		Private reproval (check applicable conditions, if any, below)	
	(a)	Approved by the Court prior to initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (no public disclosure).	
<u>or</u>	(b)	Approved by the Court after initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (public disclosure).	
(2)		Public reproval (Check applicable conditions, if any, below)	
E. C	ond	litions Attached to Reproval:	
(1)	\boxtimes	Respondent must comply with the conditions attached to the reproval for a period of one year.	
(2)	Ø	During the condition period attached to the reproval, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.	
(3)	\boxtimes	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.	

(Do n	ot writ	e above this (ine.)		
(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 July 10, and October 10 of the condition period attached to the reproval. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of the reproval during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent also state in each report whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover the state of the state of the next following quarter date, and cover the extended period.			
		In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the condition period and no later than the last day of the condition period.		
(6)		Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish such reports as may be requested, in addition the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate full with the monitor.		
· (7)		Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the conditions attached to the reproval.		
(8)	×	Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.		
	`	□ No Ethics School recommended. Reason:		
(9)	Ø	Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.		
(10)	\boxtimes	Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation within one year of the effective date of the reproval.		
		☐ No MPRE recommended. Reason;		
(11)		The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:		
		☐ Substance Abuse Conditions ☐ Law Office Management Conditions		
		☐ Medical Conditions ☐ Financial Conditions		
F. O	the	Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:		

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

Craig Lee Henderson

CASE NUMBER(S):

11-O-17270

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

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

Case No. 11-O-17270 (State Bar Investigation)

FACTS:

- 1. On September 9, 2011, the State Bar opened an investigation into case no. 11-O-17270.
- 2. On December 8, 2011, a State Bar investigator mailed a letter to respondent regarding respondent's conduct in the matter being investigated as case no. 11-O-17270. This letter requested that respondent respond in writing to specified allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar.
- 3. Respondent received the letter but did not provide a written response or otherwise cooperate in the State Bar's investigation.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

4. By failing to respond to the State Bar investigator's December 8, 2011 letter, Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation against him in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(7), was May 30, 2012.

STATE BAR ETHICS SCHOOL.

Because respondent has agreed to attend State Bar Ethics School as part of this stipulation, respondent may receive Minimum Continuing Legal Education credit upon the satisfactory completion of State Bar Ethics School.

///

///

///

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

A violaiton of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i) is covered by standard 2.6, which reads:

2.6 OFFENSES INVOLVING OTHER SPECIFIED SECTIONS OF THE BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE

Culpability of a member of a violation of any of the following provisions of the Business and Professions Code shall result in disbarment or suspension depending on the gravity of the offense or the harm, if any, to the victim, with due regard to the purposes of imposing discipline set forth in standard 1.3:

- (a)Sections 6067 and 6068;
- (b) Sections 6103 through 6105;
- (c)Section 6106.1;
- (d)Sections 6125 and 6126;
- (e)Sections 6128 through 6130; or
- (f)Sections 6151 through 6153

However, standard 1.6(b) states "The appropriate sanction shall be the sanction imposed unless: ... (ii) Mitigating circumstances are found to surround the particular act of misconduct found or acknowledged and the net effect of those mitigating circumstances, by themselves and in balance with any aggravating circumstances found, demonstrates that the purposes of imposing sanctions set forth in standard 1.3 will be properly fulfilled if a lesser degree of sanction is imposed. In that case, a lesser degree of sanction than the appropriate sanction shall be imposed or recommended."

In this case, respondent has practiced 16 years with no prior record of discipline and cooperated post-filing as described above.

Further, despite standard 2.6, case law does not support disbarment or suspension for a single abberational violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i) by an attorney with no prior record of discipline in 14 years of practice who subsequently cooperated. Although a case directly on point was not able to be found, two cases can be analogized:

In the Matter of Respondent Y (Rev. Dept. 1998) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 862 involved a different but analogous subsection of section 6068: subsection(o). Subsections (o) and (i) both involve an attorney's duty to communicate and cooperate with the State Bar before charges have been brought but at a time when the state bar is investigating or may choose to investigate a member's conduct. The review department found that the attorney violated not only 6068(o) [failure to report a sanction], but also 6103 [failure to pay the sanction]. Despite the additional 6103 charge the review department recommended only a private reproval citing to the attorney's lack of prior discipline and the "narrow" violations.

In the Matter of Respondent C (Rev. Dept. 1991) 1 Ca. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 439 involved another analogous subsection of 6068: subsection (m) (however, in this case, the court found a violation of the commonlaw duty to communicate/ 6068(a) violation as the misconduct occurred before 6068(m) was effective). The attorney, who had practeced for 30 years without prior discipline, committed only a single failure to communicate. The court recommended an admonition.

/// ///

///

DISMISSALS.

After the filing of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges in this matter, additional information and documents have been obtained by the State Bar. The parties respectfully request the Court to dismiss the following alleged violations in the interest of justice:

Case No.	Count	Alleged Violation
11-O-17270	1	Business and Professions Code, section 6106

In the Matter of: Craig Lee Henderso	on	Case number(s): 11-O-17270		
	SIGNAT	URE OF THE P	ARTIES	
by their signatures bel ecitations and each of	ow, the parties and their cou f the terms and conditions o	f this Stipulation Re	s, signify their agreeme Facts, Conclusions of	nt with each of the Law, and Disposition
6/11/12	Crain of	7. Henleum Craig Lee Henderson		
Pate	Respondent's Signatur	· _	Print Name	igerson
ate	Respondent's Counse	Signature	Print Name	
6/11/12	_ UN N		Christine Soul	nrada
até /	Deputy Trial Counsel's	Signature	Print Name	

In the Matter of: Craig Lee Henderson	Case Number(s): 11-O-17270			
	REPROVAL ORDER			
Finding that the stipulation protects the puattached to the reproval, IT IS ORDERED prejudice, and:	ublic and that the interests of Respondent will be served by any conditions that the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED withou			
The stipulated facts and dis	position are APPROVED AND THE REPROVAL IMPOSED.			
The stipulated facts and dis REPROVAL IMPOSED.	sposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the			
All court dates in the Hearing	ng Department are vacated.			
	`			
within 15 days after service of this order, i	s approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed s granted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved of Procedure.) Otherwise the stipulation shall be effective 15 days after			
Failure to comply with any conditions a proceeding for willful breach of rule 1-	attached to this reproval may constitute cause for a separate			
June 12, 2012	tat Mc Elina			
Date	Judge of the State Bar Court			

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of San Francisco, on June 12, 2012, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

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

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

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

CRAIG L. HENDERSON 5134 ARCHCREST WAY SACRAMENTO, CA 95835

COURTESY COPY TO: CRAIG L. HENDERSON 1430 T STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95811

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

CHRISTINE A. SOUHRADA, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on June 12, 2012.

Mazie Yip

Case Administrator

State Bar Court