DORIGINAL

State Bar Court of California PUBLIC MATTER Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION				
Counsel For The State Bar Erin McKeown Joyce Senior Trial Counsel 1149 South Hill Street Los Angeles, California 90015 (213) 765-1356 Bar # 149946 Counsel For Respondent James Irwin Ham Pansky Markle Ham LLP 1010 Sycamore Avenue Unit 308 South Pasadena, CA 91030	Case Number(s): 12-O-17165 12-O-18059	For Court use only FILED NOV 26 2013 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES		
(213) 626-7300 Bar # 100849 In the Matter of: LINDA LEE SEALS Bar # 129003	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION			
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 June 17, 1987.
- (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 10 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: two (2) billing cycles immediately following the effective date of the Supreme Court Order in this matter. (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 09-O-11191, et al. See pages 7 and 8 of the Attachment to Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition for a further explanation of the facts and circumstances of Respondent's prior imposition of discipline.
 - (b) Date prior discipline effective June 4, 2011
 - (c) Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: Five counts of Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A) (failing to perform with competence), five counts of violation of Rule of Professional Conduct 4-100(B)(4) (failing to promptly pay out), and three counts of Rule of Professional Conduct 4-100(A)(failing to maintain funds in trust).
 - (d) Degree of prior discipline Two years of stayed suspension, two years of probation, and 30 days of actual suspension.
 - (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.
- (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) **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:

Prefiling stipulation - See page 8 of the Attachment to the Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition for a fuller explanation and factual basis for this mitigating circumstance.

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) \square The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) \boxtimes **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) \boxtimes Actual Suspension:

- (a) Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of 60 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 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: Respondent took State Bar Ethics School in Summer 2012 in connection with Case Nos. 09-O-11191, et al. (See Rules Proc. of the State Bar, Rule 5.135(A).
- (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:

(Do not write above this line.)				
	Substance Abuse Conditions		Law Office Management Conditions	
	Medical Conditions		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: Respondent passed the MPRE on November 20, 2012 in connection with Case Nos. 09-O-11191, et al. The protection of the public and the interests of Respondent therefore do not require passage of the MPRE in this case. (See In the Matter of Respondent G. (Review Dept. 1982) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 181).

- (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: LINDA LEE SEALS

CASE NUMBERS: 12-O-17165 and 12-O-18059

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that she is culpable of violating of the specified Rule of Professional Conduct.

Case Nos. 12-O-17165 and 12-O-18059

FACTS:

1. During all times relevant in this matter, Respondent was the sole shareholder of Phoenix Law Group, a law corporation. Respondent operated Phoenix until November 2012, when she dissolved the law corporation. Phoenix's only client was Credigy Receivables.

2. During all times relevant in this matter, Respondent was married to Jay Tenenbaum. Tenenbaum was the part owner of Gryphon Solutions, the collection company which handled Credigy Receivables' collection accounts.

3. Tenenbaum was suspended from the practice of law for three years effective June 4, 2011. Because Tenenbaum failed to comply with California Rule of Court 9.20, Tenenbaum was disbarred effective August 18, 2012.

4. After the effective date of Tenenbaum's suspension from the practice of law, Tenenbaum performed services for Phoenix as an agent for Phoenix in 2011 and 2012, working daily in Phoenix's office, performing clerical and administrative duties.

5. Prior to or at the time Tenenbaum performed services at Phoenix, Respondent did not serve on the State Bar written notice of the employment, required by Rule of Professional Conduct 1-311(D), which was required to include a full description of Tenenbaum's current State Bar membership status. Nor did Respondent provide such notice at any time prior to the dissolution of Phoenix.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

6. By failing to serve the State Bar with written notice of the employment of Tenenbaum prior to or at the time of the employment of Tenenbaum at Phoenix, Respondent willfully violated Rule of Professional Conduct 1-311(D).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES

Prior Record of Discipline (Standard 1.2(b)(i)): Respondent has one prior imposition of discipline, a 30-day actual suspension, two-year stayed suspension and two-year probation, effective June 4, 2011, arising from State Bar Case Nos. 09-O-11191, et al. (Supreme Court Order S190905). In her prior

(failing to perform with competence), five counts of violating Rule of Professional Conduct 4-100(B)(4) (failing to promptly pay out) and three counts of violating Rule of Professional Conduct 4-100(A) (failing to maintain funds in trust.)

In her first discipline, Respondent admitted that she and her husband and law partner, Tenenbaum, operated a law firm from 1990 to 2008. Her husband was the managing partner with primary responsibility for overseeing the administrative side of the firm and the books. Things went smoothly until 2007, when Respondent became debilitated by Hepatitis C - she was unable to work and her husband took over her cases. The couple invested \$525,000 of their money to cover unexplained shortfalls before closing the practice in 2008, when they discovered their bookkeeper's misuse of client funds. Respondent admitted she did not properly supervise the firm's accounts, did not maintain advance costs in a trust account and did not pay out client funds promptly.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

Pre-filing Stipulation: Respondent met with the State Bar trial counsel, admitted her misconduct, and entered this Stipulation fully resolving this matter. Respondent provided her deposition testimony during the investigation. Respondent's cooperation at this early stage has saved the State Bar significant resources and time. Respondent's stipulation to the facts, her culpability, and discipline is a mitigating circumstance. (*Silva-Vidor v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [where mitigating credit was given for entering into a stipulation as to facts and culpability]; *In the Matter of Spaith* (Review Dept. 1996) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 511, 521).

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 of Procedure of State Bar, title IV, Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional 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; standard 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.)

Respondent admits that she failed to serve the State Bar with written notice of the employment of Tenenbaum, her husband who is a disbarred attorney, at Phoenix. Standard 2.10 applies. Pursuant to Standard 2.10, "[c]ulpability of a member [of the State Bar] of a violation of any provision of the Business and Professions Code not specified in these standards or of a wilful violation of any Rule of Professional Conduct not specified in these standards shall result in reproval or suspension according to 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."

Respondent acknowledges the violation of Rule of Professional Conduct 1-311(D). While failing to serve the notice required by Rule 1-311(D) is serious, there is no evidence that Respondent's failure to serve the notice caused any harm to Phoenix's client Credigy Receivables, or any other person or entity.

The aggravating and mitigating circumstances need also to be considered. In aggravation, Respondent has one prior imposition of discipline. Under Standard 1.7(a), "the degree of discipline imposed in the current proceeding shall be greater than that imposed in the prior proceeding unless the prior discipline imposed was so remote in time to the current proceeding and the offense for which it was imposed was so minimal in severity that imposing greater discipline in the current proceeding would be manifestly unjust." That is not the case here.

In mitigation, Respondent cooperated with the State Bar's prosecution of this matter by entering this stipulation at the earliest stages, and admitted her wrongdoing. Accordingly, considering the gravity of the offense, the extent of the harm, and the mitigating circumstances, imposition of a 60 day actual suspension is warranted and will serve the purposes of attorney discipline set forth in Standard 1.3.

EXCLUSION FROM MCLE CREDIT

Pursuant to Rule of Procedure 3201, Respondent may <u>not</u> receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School.

In the Matter of: LINDA LEE SEALS Case number(s): 12-O-17165, 12-O-18059

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.

10 Linda Lee Seals Date spondent's Signature Print Name James Irwin Ham Date odent's **Counsel Signature** Print Name 7-1 11-Erin McKeown Joyce Date Deputy Trial Coursel's Signature Print Name

In the Matter of: LINDA LEE STEALS

Case Number(s): 12-O-17165; 12-O-18059

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.

At the top of page 8, the following is inserted before the first line, "discipline case, Respondent was culpable of five counts of violating Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A)"

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.)

11-25-13

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 November 26, 2013, 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 Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

JAMES IRWIN HAM PANSKY MARKLE HAM LLP 1010 SYCAMORE AVE UNIT 308 SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030

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

ERIN JOYCE, Enforcement, Los Angeles

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

Johnnie Lee Smith Case Administrator State Bar Court