

**PUBLIC MATTER
FILED** *RW*

MAR 21 2012

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

**STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO**

In the Matter of)	Case No.: 11-V-16724-LMA
)	
KURT KEVIN ROBINSON)	CLARIFICATION ORDER
)	
Member No. 108095)	
)	
<u>A Member of the State Bar.</u>)	

On March 6, 2012, respondent Kurt Kevin Robinson filed a request for release of actual suspension to which the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel (State Bar), by Robin Brune, responded on March 12, 2012.

On March 12, 2012, respondent filed a motion to modify order. On March 16, 2012, the State Bar filed opposition to what it characterized as respondent's motion for modification or early termination of probation.

The aforementioned filings arose from an interpretation of the costs language at page 8, numbered paragraph 3, of the court's December 20, 2011 decision in the captioned matter. That decision allowed respondent to resume the practice of law when "[T]he actual suspension imposed by the California Supreme Court in its Order filed on February 3, 2010, in Supreme Court case no. S176245, has expired"¹ and "[P]etitioner has paid all applicable State Bar fees

¹ That suspension expired on March 5, 2012.



and *previously assessed costs...*”, among other things. (Decision, p. 8, numbered paragraphs 1 and 3. Emphasis added.)

Petitioner has not been permitted to return to active status and to resume the practice of law effective March 6, 2012 because he has not paid in full the costs ordered in S176245. However, on June 30, 2010, this court granted respondent’s motion to allow him to pay these costs in equal installments with his State Bar membership fees for the years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014.

It is the court’s intent that respondent be permitted to return to active status, nunc pro tunc, effective March 6, 2012 and that he continue to pay the costs assessed in S176245 in installments pursuant to this court’s order filed on June 30, 2010.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The decision filed on December 20, 2011 in this matter is modified, at page 8, numbered paragraph 3, by adding after “previously assessed costs”: “as modified by the court’s order filed June 30, 2010”. All other terms and conditions remain the same;
2. Respondent’s actual suspension pursuant to S176245 is terminated and he may resume the practice of law in California, nunc pro tunc, effective March 6, 2012;
3. Respondent’s term or conditions of probation are not terminated despite his return to active status. He remains on probation for the duration and subject to the conditions as ordered in S176245 unless otherwise ordered or recommended in a proceeding pursuant to rule 5.300, *et seq.*, Rules Proc. of State Bar.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 21, 2012



LUCY ARMENDARIZ
Judge of the State Bar Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of San Francisco, on March 21, 2012, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

CLARIFICATION ORDER

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:

KURT KEVIN ROBINSON
4681 DEADWOOD DR
FREMONT, CA 94536

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

ROBIN BRUNE, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on March 21, 2012.



Bernadette C.O. Molina
Case Administrator
State Bar Court