

(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>Michael J. Glass Senior Trial Counsel 1149 S. Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299 (213) 765-1254</p> <p>Bar # 102700</p>	<p>Case Number(s): 12-O-12451 DFM</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <p style="text-align: center;">FILED</p> <p style="text-align: center;">APR - 2 2013 <i>Mc</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</p>
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>Cornell John Price P.O. Box 91773 Pasadena, CA 91109 (213) 858-6976</p> <p>Bar # 62443</p>	<p>PUBLIC MATTER</p>	
<p>In the Matter of: CORNELL JOHN PRICE</p> <p>Bar # 62443</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>	<p>Submitted to: Assigned Judge</p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</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 December 20, 1974.
- (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 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."

(Effective January 1, 2011)



Mc

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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: three (3) billing cycles following the effective date 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
 - (b) Date prior discipline effective
 - (c) Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations:
 - (d) Degree of prior discipline
 - (e) If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.
- (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. See Attachment Page 3.
- (5) **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct. See Attachment Page 3.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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. See Attachment Page 3.
- (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.
- (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:

See Attachment Page 3.

D. Discipline:

- (1) **Stayed Suspension:**

- (a) Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of two (2) 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 two (2) 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

(Do not write above this line.)

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: .
- (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.**

(Do not write above this line.)

- No MPRE recommended. Reason:
- (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:**

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: CORNELL JOHN PRICE

CASE NUMBER(S): 12-O-12451 - DFM

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. 12-O-12451 DFM (Complainant: Kathy Thabet)

FACTS:

1. On October 18, 2011, Kathy Thabet ("Thabet") employed Respondent to represent her in a federal criminal matter entitled *United States of America vs. Kathy Thabet*, Case No. CR-11-893 ODW, United States District Court (Central Dist. of Calif.) ("the criminal action").
2. On October 18, 2011, Thabet paid Respondent \$15,000 in advanced fees. On October 18, 2011, Thabet filed a Request for Approval of Substitution of Attorney, attempting to substitute Respondent in as Thabet's counsel of record in the criminal action.
3. On October 26, 2011, the court denied Thabet's Request for Approval of Substitution of Attorney.
4. Immediately after the court denied her request for substitution of attorney, Thabet terminated Respondent's services. On October 26, 2011, Thabet requested that Respondent refund the advanced fees in the amount of \$15,000. On October 28, 2011, Respondent refunded \$10,000 of the advanced fees to Thabet.
5. After October 28, 2011, Thabet requested that Respondent refund the \$5,000 balance and submitted numerous requests for an accounting to Respondent. Respondent received the requests. Respondent failed to provide the refund of the \$5,000 and failed to provide Thabet with an accounting.
6. Respondent did not earn any portion of the \$5,000 balance in advanced fees.
7. On April 4, 2012, the State Bar opened an investigation in Case No. 12-O-12451 based on allegations of misconduct against Respondent by Thabet.
8. On April 18, 2012, a State Bar Investigator spoke with Respondent by telephone regarding the allegations of misconduct against Respondent in the instant matter. On April 18, 2012, the State Bar Investigator sent Respondent an e-mail, as requested by Respondent, with an attached letter

dated April 18, 2012, regarding the allegations. The letter requested a written response to the allegations by May 2, 2012, as well as an accounting of the advanced fees Respondent did not refund to Thabet. Respondent received the e-mail and attached letter.

9. Respondent did not respond to the State Bar Investigator's April 18, 2012, letter.

10. On May 14, 2012, the State Bar Investigator spoke with Respondent by telephone and the Respondent requested an extension of time to submit his response.

11. On May 22, 2012, the State Bar Investigator sent Respondent a letter stating that Respondent's request for an extension of time to submit his response was granted, and that Respondent's response was due by May 29, 2012. Respondent received the State Bar Investigator's May 22, 2012, letter.

12. Respondent never provided the State Bar a written response or an accounting for the balance of advanced fees that Respondent did not refund to Thabet.

13. In August 2012 Thabet commenced Fee Arbitration Proceedings against Respondent, before the Los Angeles County Bar Association Attorney-Client Dispute Resolution Services, with regard to Respondent's failure to refund the remaining \$5,000. On August 24, 2012, Thabet appeared at the Fee Arbitration Hearing. Respondent had notice of the Fee Arbitration Hearing. Respondent did not appear at the Fee Arbitration Hearing and did not file a reply to Thabet's Petition for Fee Arbitration.

14. On September 24, 2012, the arbitrator rendered a Fee Arbitration Award in favor of Thabet in the amount of \$5,000, as the balance of the advanced fees which Respondent did not refund to Thabet, plus \$150 in costs for the Arbitration, for a total of \$5,150. On October 11, 2012, the Arbitration Award was served on Thabet and Respondent. Respondent received a copy of the Arbitration Award.

15. On February 13, 2013, Respondent sent Thabet a Cashier's Check in the amount of \$5,150 as payment of the Arbitration Award, but only after a Notice of Disciplinary Charges ("NDC") was filed in the instant matter.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

16. By failing to refund the \$5,000 balance of the advanced fees to Thabet until February 13, 2013, Respondent failed to promptly refund any part of a fee paid in advance that had not been earned, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

17. By failing to provide Thabet with an accounting for the balance of the \$5,000 in advanced fees paid by Thabet, Respondent failed to render appropriate accounts to a client regarding all funds coming into Respondent's possession, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(3).

18. By failing to provide a written response to the State Bar investigator's letters dated April 18, 2012, and May 22, 2012, and by failing to provide an accounting of the balance of \$5,000 in advanced fees that Respondent did not refund did not refund to Thabet, Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(i).

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.2(b)(ii)): Respondent has engaged in multiple acts of misconduct by failing to promptly refund the \$5,000 to client Thabet, failing to provide an accounting to client Thabet, and failing to cooperate in the State Bar Investigation of Case No. 12-O-12451.

Harm (Std. 1.2(b)(iv)): As a result of Respondent's misconduct, client Thabet suffered harm as she was without the \$5,000 which Respondent failed to refund for approximately fourteen months. Additionally, client Thabet had to initiate Fee Arbitration Proceedings against Respondent and incur a \$150 fee in an effort to get Respondent to refund the \$5,000.

Indifference (Std. 1.2(b)(v)): Respondent failed to show any remorse by failing to refund the \$5,000 to client Thabet for approximately fourteen months, and then only after the State Bar filed an NDC.

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Record of Discipline: Although Respondent's current misconduct is serious, at the time of the misconduct, Respondent had no prior record of discipline over approximately 37 years of practice prior to the misconduct which is entitled to mitigation. (See *In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41, 49 [attorney with seventeen years of discipline-free practice entitled to mitigation despite serious misconduct].)

Pretrial Stipulation: Respondent is also receiving mitigation for entering into a full stipulation to resolve this matter prior to trial, thereby preserving State Bar Court time and resources. (See *Riordan, id.*, 5 Cal State Bar Ct. Rptr., at p. 50.) However, the mitigating weight given to Respondent's cooperation in entering into the stipulation is tempered by Respondent's failure to participate in the State Bar investigation.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct provide a "process of fixing discipline" pursuant to a set of written principles to "better discharge the purposes of attorney discipline as announced by the Supreme Court." (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, Introduction (all further references to standards are to this source).) The primary purposes of disciplinary proceedings and of the sanctions imposed 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.” (*In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 205; std. 1.3.)

Although not binding, the standards are entitled to “great weight” and should be followed “whenever possible” in determining level of discipline. (*In re Silverton* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 81, 92, quoting *In re Brown* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 205, 220 and *In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 267, fn. 11.) Adherence to the standards in the great majority of cases serves the valuable purpose of eliminating disparity and assuring consistency, that is, the imposition of similar attorney discipline for instances of similar attorney misconduct. (*In re Naney* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 186, 190.) Any discipline recommendation different from that set forth in the applicable standards should clearly explain the reasons for the deviation. (*Blair v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 762, 776, fn. 5.)

Respondent admits to committing three acts of professional misconduct. Standard 1.6 (a) requires that where a Respondent acknowledges two or more acts of misconduct, and different sanctions are prescribed by the standards that apply to those acts, the sanction imposed shall be the more or most severe prescribed in the applicable standards.

The most severe sanction applicable to Respondent’s misconduct is found in standard 2.2(b) which applies to Respondent’s violation of rule 4-100(B)(3).

Standard 2.2(b) provides that, “Culpability of a member of commingling of entrusted funds or property with personal property or the commission of another violation of rule 4-100, Rules of Professional Conduct, none of which offenses results in the wilful misappropriation of entrusted funds or property shall result in at least a three month actual suspension from the practice of law, irrespective of mitigating circumstances.”

Notwithstanding the application of standard 2.2(b), the gravamen of Respondent’s misconduct concerns his failure to promptly refund the \$5,000.00 in unearned fees to client Kathy Thabet. Standard 2.10 applies to Respondent’s violation of rule 3-700(D)(2) which requires discipline ranging from a reproof to suspension.

In the instant case, there is a compelling justification and reason to deviate from the three month actual suspension requirement of standard 2.2(b) and impose discipline in the range of standard 2.10 which is applicable to a violation of rule 3-700(D)(2). (See *Silverton, supra.*, 36 Cal. 4th at p. 92.) The essence of the instant misconduct by Respondent is Respondent’s failure to promptly refund the \$5,000.00 in unearned fees to client Kathy Thabet. Respondent did ultimately refund the \$5,000 in unearned fees to the client, although it was approximately fourteen months after Ms. Thabet made the request for the refund and after the client had completed Fee Arbitration and made a complaint to the State Bar. Still, the facts and circumstances show that this was an isolated incident of misconduct, limited to a single client matter, and did not involve entrusted client funds.

In addition to being a single isolated incident, Respondent’s 37 years of practice and his willingness to entirely resolve this matter prior to trial are significant. Standard 1.3 states that discipline should be imposed with due regard to the purposes of the discipline system, i.e., protection of the public, courts, and legal profession. In this case, a 30 day actual suspension is sufficient to fulfill the purposes of the discipline system and to protect the public.

A 30 day actual suspension is also consistent with case law. For example, in *Bach v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1201, in a single client matter, Respondent was employed to represent a client in a marital dissolution matter. The client paid Respondent \$3,000.00. Thereafter, Respondent repeatedly failed to perform legal services, failed to complete the case in more than two and one half years, failed to communicate with the client, withdrew from representation of the client without the consent of the court or the client, failed to refund any unearned fees to the client despite a binding arbitration award ordering him to do so, and failed to cooperate with the State Bar investigation. The Court imposed discipline consisting of a 1 year stayed suspension, 1 year probation with conditions, including a 30 day actual suspension and until Respondent made restitution of \$2,000.00. In aggravation the court noted with disfavor Respondent's attitude toward the proceedings, that his claims of mitigation were not supported by the facts, and that his attitude was further evidence of why a period of actual suspension was necessary. In mitigation, the court did note that Respondent had no prior record of discipline over approximately 20 years of practice prior to the misconduct.

Therefore, based on the facts, aggravating and mitigating circumstances, standards, and case law, discipline consisting of a two year stayed suspension, two years probation with conditions, and a thirty day actual suspension is appropriate.

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to on page 2, paragraph A(7), was March 15, 2013.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of March 15, 2013, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$3,452.70. 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.

EXCLUSION FROM MCLE CREDIT




Pursuant to rule 3201, Respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of CORNELL JOHN PRICE Member # 62443	Case number(s): 12-O-12451 - DFM
---	--

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.

March 26, 2013 Date	 Respondent's Signature	Cornell John Price Print Name
, 2013 Date	 Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
March 27, 2013 Date	 Senior Trial Counsel's Signature	Michael J. Glass Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of CORNELL JOHN PRICE Member # 62443	Case number(s): 12-O-12451 - DFM
---	--

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.

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.)**

4/2/13 _____
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 Los Angeles, on April 2, 2013, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

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

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:

**CORNELL JOHN PRICE
PO BOX 91773
PASADENA, CA 91109**

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

MICHAEL GLASS, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on April 2, 2013.



Tammy Cleaver
Case Administrator
State Bar Court