

ORIGINAL

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

Counsel For The State Bar Nada M. Alnajafi Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 S. Hill St. Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299 (213)765-1336 Bar # 267621	Case Number(s): 12-O-14323 12-O-15918 12-O-16054 12-O-17190	For Court use only FILED MAR 26 2013 <i>Yrc</i> STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES
Counsel For Respondent Zachary D. Wechsler, Esq. Law Offices of Zachary D. Wechsler 6100 Center Drive, Suite 600 Los Angeles, CA 90045 (310)642-4600 Bar # 198354	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING	
In the Matter of: Sameer A. Qadri  Bar # 276011 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	ACTUAL SUSPENSION <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	

PUBLIC MATTER

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 16, 2011.
- (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: (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.
- (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. See attachment.
- (8) ☐ **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

None.

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:

D. Discipline:

(1) ☒ **Stayed Suspension:**

- (a) ☒ Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of one (1) year.
- 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 one (1) year, 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 ninety (90) 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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: .
- (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:

- (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: Sameer A. Qadri

CASE NUMBER(S): 12-O-14323; 12-O-15918; 12-O-16054; 12-O-17190

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.

Facts Relevant to All Matters
(Case nos. 12-O-14323; 12-O-15918; 12-O-16054; 12-O-17190)

1. Respondent is the owner of State Law Group and Accredited Law Group, two law firms located in California that were, at all times pertinent herein, engaged in providing home mortgage loan modification legal services to consumers.
2. Respondent is not licensed to practice law in any states other than in the states of California and Nevada.

The Millers Matter (Case no. 12-O-14323)

FACTS:

3. On July 24, 2011, Gary and Donnell Miller ("the Millers") employed Respondent to perform home mortgage loan modification services in exchange for a \$2,300 advanced fee.
4. On August 3, 2011 and September 3, 2011, the Millers paid Respondent advanced fees in two payment installments totaling \$1,750. As of September 3, 2011, Respondent had not completed each and every service he had contracted to perform or otherwise represented he would perform for the Millers.
5. Although the Millers sent Respondent all financial documentation required for a loan modification, Respondent failed to submit the required financial documentation to the lender, which resulted in the denial of the Millers' loan modification application.
6. On January 12, 2012, Respondent withdrew from employment by the Millers. The Millers requested a full refund of the \$1,750 advanced fees. Respondent did not provide a refund to the Millers until November 2012, and only after the Millers complained to the State Bar.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

7. By negotiating, arranging or offering to perform a home mortgage loan modification for a fee paid by a borrower, and demanding, charging, collecting and receiving fees from the Millers

prior to fully performing each and every service he had contracted to perform or represented that he would perform, Respondent violated subsection (a)(1) of Section 2944.7 of the Civil Code, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.3.

8. By not submitting the Millers' required financial documentation to the lender, thereby resulting in a denial of the Millers' loan modification application, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

The DiSpigno Matter (Case no. 12-O-15918)

FACTS:

9. On January 25, 2012, Dominick DiSpigno ("DiSpigno"), a New York state resident, employed Respondent as a lawyer to perform mortgage loan modification services for his home in New York. DiSpigno paid Respondent a total of \$2,000 in advanced fees.
10. Pursuant to New York Judiciary Law Section 478, it is unlawful for anybody to "hold himself out to the public as being entitled to practice law ... without having first been duly and regularly licensed and admitted to practice law in the courts of record of this state[.]" Respondent is not now and never has been licensed to practice law in the courts of record of New York.
11. Respondent sent advertisements of his legal services to DiSpigno at his New York residence, agreed to provide legal services to DiSpigno, and otherwise held himself out as licensed to practice law in New York. As a result, Respondent led DiSpigno to believe that Respondent was authorized to practice in New York when, in fact, he was not.
12. On February 22, 2012, less than one month after the date of employment, DiSpigno terminated Respondent's employment and requested a full refund of the \$2,000 advanced fee. Respondent did not provide a refund to DiSpigno until October 2012, and only after DiSpigno complained to the State Bar.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

13. By agreeing to provide legal services to DiSpigno in New York when Respondent was not admitted in nor otherwise authorized to practice law in that state, and by otherwise holding himself out as entitled to practice law in New York, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly practiced law in a jurisdiction where to do so is a violation of the regulations of the profession in that jurisdiction, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 1-300(B).
14. By charging and collecting advanced fees for performing legal services in a state where he was not authorized to practice law, Respondent entered into an agreement for, charged or collected an illegal fee, in willful violation on Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-200(A).

The Roots Matter (Case no. 12-O-16054)

FACTS:

15. In December 2011, Ada and Kenneth Roots ("the Roots"), residents of Virginia, employed Respondent as a lawyer to perform mortgage loan modification services for their home in Virginia. The Roots paid Respondent a total of \$2,400 in advanced fees.
16. Pursuant to Virginia State Bar Association, Rule 5.5 of the Rules of Professional Conduct, a foreign lawyer, or one who is licensed in another jurisdiction but not in Virginia, shall not hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the foreign lawyer is admitted to practice in Virginia. A foreign lawyer must also disclose in writing to the client and interested third parties the following: (a) that the lawyer is not admitted to practice in Virginia; (b) the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed to practice; and (c) the lawyer's office address in the foreign jurisdiction. Respondent is not now and never has been licensed to practice law in Virginia and was, therefore, a foreign lawyer under Virginia law.
17. Respondent agreed to provide legal services to the Roots, did not provide the requisite disclosures to the Roots, and otherwise held himself out as authorized to practice law in Virginia. As a result, Respondent led the Roots to believe that Respondent was authorized to practice law in Virginia when, in fact, he was not.
18. On February 2, 2012, Respondent withdrew from employment by the Roots. The Roots requested a full refund of the \$2,400 advanced fee. Respondent did not provide a refund to the Roots until January 2013, and only after the Roots complained about Respondent to the State Bar.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

19. By charging and collecting advanced fees for performing legal services in a state where he was not authorized to practice law, Respondent entered into an agreement for, charged or collected an illegal fee, in willful violation on Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-200(A).
20. By agreeing to provide legal services to the Roots in Virginia and holding himself out as authorized to practice in Virginia when Respondent was not admitted in nor otherwise authorized to practice law in that state, Respondent practiced law in a jurisdiction where to do so is a violation of the regulations of the profession in Virginia, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 1-300(B).

The Garman Matter (Case no. 12-O-17190)

FACTS:

21. In March 2012, Cheryl Garman ("Garman") employed Respondent to perform home mortgage loan modification services in exchange for a \$2,500 advanced fee.

22. On March 21, 2012 and April 13, 2012, Garman paid advanced fees to Respondent in two payment installments totaling \$2,500. As of April 13, 2012, Respondent had not completed each and every service he had contracted to perform or otherwise represented he would perform for Garman.
23. Although Garman provided to Respondent all financial documentation required for a loan modification, Respondent failed to submit the required financial documentation to the lender, which resulted in the denial of Garman's loan modification application.
24. In June 2012, Garman terminated Respondent's employment and requested a full refund of the \$2,500 advanced fees. Respondent did not provide a refund to Garman until January 2013, and only after Garman complained to the State Bar.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

25. By negotiating, arranging or offering to perform a home mortgage loan modification for a fee paid by a borrower, and demanding, charging, collecting and receiving fees from Garman prior to fully performing each and every service he had contracted to perform or represented that he would perform, Respondent violated subsection (a)(1) of Section 2944.7 of the Civil Code, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.3.
26. By not submitting Garman's required financial documentation to the lender, thereby resulting in the denial of Garman's loan modification application, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Harm: Respondent has caused significant harm to all four clients by failing to promptly refund the illegal advanced fees. While Respondent did refund all four clients, the refunds took place at least eight (8) months after the date of termination and only after each of the clients complained about Respondent to the State Bar. (See Std 1.2(b)(iv).)

Multiple Acts: Respondent engaged in multiple acts of misconduct, involving eight (8) separate violations of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct in four client matters. (See Std. 1.2(b)(ii).)

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 multiple acts of professional misconduct in four client matters. 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 2.10, pursuant to which a violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.3, Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), rule 3-700(D)(2), Rule 1-300(B), or rule 4-200(A), should result in reproof or suspension in accordance with the gravity of the harm.

Respondent is the owner of two California law firms that provide home mortgage loan modification services. In two client matters, Respondent engaged in the unauthorized practice of law by providing legal services to out-of-state clients in states where he was not licensed to practice and by holding himself out as eligible to practice law in those states. In the other two client matters, Respondent illegally charged and collected advanced fees in exchange for loan modification services.

In all four client matters, Respondent committed serious misconduct and caused significant harm. The need for public protection is especially inherent in cases involving illegal loan modification practices because of the frequent vulnerability and financial hardship of homeowner clients. Thus, neither private nor public reproof would sufficiently protect the public.

The stipulated level of discipline falls within the Standards. Further, the stipulated level of discipline is in line with the reported cases involving similar misconduct and involving respondents who do not have substantial mitigation. (See *In the Matter of Copren* (Review Dept. 2005) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 861 [60 days actual where respondent failed to refund unearned fee and perform in one client matter, but no substantial mitigation]; *Matthew v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 784 [60 days actual suspension where respondent abandoned and failed to refund unearned fees to two clients and failed to perform to third client, but no substantial mitigation].)

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(7), was February 5, 2013.

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: Sameer A. Qadri	Case number(s): 12-O-14323; 12-O-15918; 12-O-16054; 12-O-17190
--------------------------------------	---

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.

February¹², 2013
Date


Respondent's Signature

Sameer A. Qadri
Print Name

February¹⁹, 2013
Date


Respondent's Counsel Signature

Zachary D. Wechsler, Esq.
Print Name

February²⁷, 2013
Date


Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

Nada M. Alnajafi
Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Sameer A. Qadri	Case Number(s): 12-O-14323; 12-O-15918; 12-O-16054; 12-O-17190
--------------------------------------	--

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. On page 4 of the stipulation under part D(1)(a), the period of stayed suspension is increased to two (2) years.
2. On page 4 of the stipulation under part D(2), the period of probation is increased to two (2) years.

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.)**

3-26-13
Date



GEORGE E. SCOTT, JUDGE PRO TEM
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 March 26, 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:

**ZACHARY D. WECHSLER
LAW OFFICES OF ZACHARY D WECHSLER
6100 CENTER DR STE 600
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045**

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

NADA ALNAJAFI, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on March 26, 2013.



Tammy Cleaver
Case Administrator
State Bar Court