

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES

In the Matter of) Case No.: **12-R-10128-RAP**
)
) **DECISION**
)
WILLIAM ALLEN GLOVER,)
)
)
)
Petitioner for Reinstatement.)

Petitioner William Allen Glover seeks to be reinstated as a member of the State Bar of California. He filed a petition for reinstatement to the practice of law on January 10, 2012. Petitioner represented himself. The State Bar was represented by Deputy Trial Counsel Anthony Garcia and Anand Kumar of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel.

In a response to the petition filed on May 29, 2012, the State Bar informed the court that it submits this matter to the court on the pleadings and does not require a hearing. On May 31, 2012, the parties filed a stipulation as to undisputed facts. The petitioner waived his right to a hearing on June 11, 2012, and submitted a declaration to be admitted into evidence on June 13, 2012.¹ The matter was submitted for decision on June 13, 2012.

Petitioner has demonstrated, by clear and convincing evidence, that he has satisfied the requirements for reinstatement to the practice of law. Therefore, the court recommends that petitioner be reinstated to the practice of law in California.

///

¹ The court orders this declaration admitted into evidence.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. Petitioner's Background

Petitioner was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on December 16, 1980, and was a member of the State Bar until he resigned *without charges pending* on April 5, 2007.

Petitioner indicated that the reason he resigned his license stemmed exclusively from his acceptance of a position with the Superior Court of California, County of Orange, to develop and implement an Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) and a Civil Mediation Program, where membership in the State Bar of California was not required.

Since July 2011, petitioner has served as an assistant facilitator in the Family Law Facilitator's Office, where he has been receiving both training and experience in this area of the law, and where he will become an Attorney/Assistant Facilitator upon reinstatement to the State Bar of California.

B. California Rules of Court, Rule 9.10(f) and Rule 5.445(B), Rules of Procedure of the State Bar

To be reinstated to the practice of law, a petitioner who resigned without charges pending must establish by clear and convincing evidence that he has passed a professional responsibility examination, has present moral qualifications for reinstatement and has present ability and learning in the general law. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.10(f); Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.445(B).)

C. Professional Responsibility Examination

Petitioner has complied with California Rules of Court, rule 9.10(f), by taking and passing the November 2011 Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination.

D. Moral Qualifications

As to moral qualifications, the question before the court is "whether Petitioner is a fit and proper person to practice law at this time." (*Pacheco v. State Bar* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1041.) Petitioner has proven by clear and convincing evidence the requisite good moral character for reinstatement to the practice of law. He has demonstrated that he is fit to practice law in

California in view of his blemish-free 27-year career as an attorney prior to his resignation and because his continued employment with the Orange County Superior Court.

The court notes that Petitioner made two mistakes in his reinstatement process. First, Petitioner failed to list on his petition a consumer debt for an automobile lease. The automobile loan was for a motor vehicle leased for petitioner's daughter, who makes all the lease payments. Second, petitioner failed to list a credit card account on his petition. Petitioner and his wife applied for the credit card and his wife prepared the application, which the petitioner reviewed. The credit card application incorrectly listed petitioner's occupation.

Petitioner mistakenly omitted the consumer debt for an automobile lease and the credit card account from his petition. These omissions were simply an oversight and not intentional.

In addition, petitioner recognizes that he should have been more careful when he reviewed the credit card application prepared by his wife before he signed the credit application.

Petitioner's failure to list a consumer debt and credit card account on his petition and his failure to properly review his credit card application before he signed the application does not affect his fitness to practice to law.

E. Present Learning and Ability in the General Law

The court finds by clear and convincing evidence that petitioner possesses present learning and ability in the general law as required for reinstatement. Petitioner was not required to provide proof that he had taken and passed the Attorney's Examination administered by the Committee of Bar Examiners. (Rule 5.445(B)(3).)

Post resignation, petitioner has been employed by the Orange County Superior Court and has developed and implemented an Early Neutral Evaluation and Civil Mediation Program.

In addition, on August 27 and 28, 2011, petitioner attended 11 hours of family law courses. On September 6-9, 2011, petitioner attended 15.5 hours of child support training.

III. RECOMMENDATION

For the foregoing reasons, the court concludes that petitioner has sustained his burden by clear and convincing evidence by establishing: (1) that he passed the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination; (2) that he possesses present moral qualifications for reinstatement;

and (3) that he has present learning and ability in the general law for reinstatement to the practice of law in California. Accordingly, the court **GRANTS** the petition for reinstatement, and recommends that petitioner, **WILLIAM ALLEN GLOVER**, be reinstated as a member of the State Bar of California upon payment of fees and taking the oath required by law.

Dated: June 15, 2012.

RICHARD A. PLATEL
Judge of the State Bar Court