

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO

In the Matter of)	Case Nos.: 12-O-13891-LMA
)	(12-O-13892)
SEAN CURTIS HICKEY,)	
)	DECISION AND ORDER OF
Member No. 159116,)	INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE
)	ENROLLMENT
<u>A Member of the State Bar.</u>)	

In this matter, respondent Sean Curtis Hickey (respondent) was charged with two counts of misconduct stemming from two separate disciplinary probation matters. Respondent failed to participate either in person or through counsel, and his default was entered. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California (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

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).)

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 June 8, 1992, and has been a member since then.

Procedural Requirements Have Been Satisfied

On August 31, 2012, the State Bar properly filed and served an NDC on respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, at his membership records address. The NDC notified respondent that his failure to participate in the proceeding would result in a disbarment recommendation. (Rule 5.41.) On September 7, 2012, a return card was received by the State Bar, signed by respondent.

In addition, reasonable diligence was also used to notify respondent of this proceeding. The State Bar made several attempts to contact respondent without success. These efforts included calling him at his membership records telephone number, calling him at a cell phone number he had previously provided to the State Bar, sending an email to him at the email address listed in his membership records, and sending him a facsimile at the fax number listed in his membership records.

Respondent failed to file a response to the NDC. On October 25, 2012, the State Bar filed and properly served a motion for entry of respondent's default. The motion complied with all the requirements for a default, including a supporting declaration of reasonable diligence by the deputy trial counsel declaring the additional steps taken to provide notice to respondent. (Rule 5.80.) 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 November 13, 2012. The order entering the default was served on respondent at his membership records address by certified mail, return receipt requested. 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 July 1, 2013, the State Bar filed the petition for disbarment. As required by rule 5.85(A), the State Bar reported in the petition that: (1) it has had no contact with respondent since the default was entered; (2) respondent has one other disciplinary matter pending; (3) respondent has three prior records of discipline; and (4) the Client Security Fund had a pending claim against respondent, however, no payments resulting from respondent's conduct have been made. 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 July 29, 2013.

Respondent has been disciplined on three prior occasions.³ Pursuant to a Supreme Court order filed on November 9, 2010, respondent was suspended for two years, the execution of which was stayed, and he was placed on probation for three years, including a 30-day period of suspension. In this matter, respondent stipulated to nine counts of misconduct stemming from two client matters, including failing to perform legal services with competence (two counts), failing to respond to client inquiries (two counts), improper withdrawal from representation, failing to return a client file, failing to refund unearned fees, seeking an agreement to withdraw a State Bar complaint, and failing to cooperate in a State Bar investigation.

³ The court takes judicial notice of the pertinent State Bar Court records regarding these prior disciplines, admits them into evidence, and directs the Clerk to include copies in the record of this case.

Pursuant to a Supreme Court order filed on October 19, 2011, respondent was suspended for two years, the execution of which was stayed, and he was placed on probation for three years, including a 60-day period of suspension. In this matter, respondent stipulated to three counts of misconduct stemming from a single client matter, including failing to perform legal services with competence, failing to refund unearned fees, and failing to return a client file.

Pursuant to a Supreme Court order filed on November 19, 2012, respondent was suspended for three years, the execution of which was stayed, and he was placed on probation for three years, including a nine-month period of suspension. In this matter, respondent stipulated to one count of misconduct involving his failure to comply with the conditions of his first disciplinary probation.

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).)

Case Number 12-O-13891

Count One – respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivision (k) (failing to comply with conditions of probation), by failing to comply with probationary conditions, in case no. S185779, requiring that he file quarterly reports, pay and show proof of restitution, attend and complete Ethics School, and attend and complete Client Trust Accounting School.

Case Number 12-O-13892

Count Two – respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivision (k) (failing to comply with conditions of probation), by failing to comply with probationary conditions, in case no. S195368, requiring that he timely submit quarterly reports.

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 is recommended. In particular:

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

(2) reasonable diligence was used to notify respondent of the proceedings prior to the entry of his default, as the State Bar properly served him with the NDC and made various efforts to locate respondent, including: calling him at his membership records telephone number, calling him at a cell phone number he had previously provided to the State Bar, sending an email to him at the email address listed in his membership records, and sending him a facsimile at the fax number listed in his membership records;

(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 recommends disbarment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Disbarment

The court recommends that respondent Sean Curtis Hickey be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of California and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys.

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.

ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

In accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), the court orders that Sean Curtis Hickey, State Bar number 159116, 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: August ____, 2013

LUCY ARMENDARIZ
Judge of the State Bar Court