

(Do not write above this line.)

<b>State Bar Court of California</b> <b>Hearing Department</b> <b>Los Angeles</b> <b>STAYED SUSPENSION</b>		
<b>Counsel For The State Bar</b>  <b>Lara Bairamian</b> <b>Deputy Trial Counsel</b> <b>845 South Figueroa Street</b> <b>Los Angeles, CA 90017</b> <b>(213) 765-1338</b>  <b>Bar # 253056</b>	<b>Case Number(s):</b> <b>13-J-12930</b>	<b>For Court use only</b>  <b>PUBLIC MATTER</b>  <b>FILED</b> <b>JUL 30 2014</b> <b>STATE BAR COURT</b> <b>CLERK'S OFFICE</b> <b>LOS ANGELES</b>
<b>In Pro Per Respondent</b>  <b>Lawrence Joseph McSwiggan</b> <b>PO Box One</b> <b>Newton, MA 02464</b> <b>(617) 299-9110</b>  <b>Bar # 214415</b>	<b>Submitted to: Assigned Judge</b>  <b>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND</b> <b>DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</b>  <b>STAYED SUSPENSION; NO ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</b>	
<b>In the Matter of:</b> <b>LAWRENCE JOSEPH MCSWIGGAN</b>  <b>Bar # 214415</b>  <b>A Member of the State Bar of California</b> <b>(Respondent)</b>		

**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 1, 2001**.
- (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."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".

(Effective January 1, 2014)



BS  
6-12-13

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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):
- ☐ Costs are added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline.
  - ☒ Costs are to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: **two (2) billing cycles following the effective date of the Supreme Court order.** (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 [Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standards 1.2(f) & 1.5]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.**

- (1) ☐ **Prior record of discipline**
- (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 or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline."
- (2) ☐ **Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was intentional, 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. **See Attachment to Stipulation, at page 8.**

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (8) ☐ **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution.
- (9) ☐ **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

**Additional aggravating circumstances**

**C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standards 1.2(g) & 1.6]. 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, the public, or the administration of justice.
- (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 with a good faith belief that was honestly held and reasonable.
- (8) ☐ **Emotional/Physical Difficulties:** At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical or mental 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 the difficulties or disabilities no longer pose a risk that Respondent will commit misconduct.
- (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 extraordinarily 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 subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13) ☐ **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

**Additional mitigating circumstances**

**Prefiling Stipulation - See Attachment to Stipulation, at page 8.**

**No Prior Discipline - See Attachment to Stipulation, at pages 8-9.**

**Recognition of Wrongdoing - See Attachment to Stipulation, at page 9.**

#### **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 1.2(c)(1), 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:

The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) ☒ **Probation:**

Respondent is 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.)

#### **E. Additional Conditions of Probation:**

- (1) ☒ During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (2) ☒ 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.
- (3) ☒ 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.
- (4) ☒ 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.

- (5) ☐ 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (6) ☐ 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.
- (7) ☐ 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 State Bar Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
- ☒ No Ethics School recommended. Reason: **Respondent is domiciled in Massachusetts. In lieu of Ethics School, Respondent is required to provide to the Office of Probation proof that he has completed six (6) hours of MCLE credit within one (1) year of the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter.**
- (8) ☐ 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.
- (9) ☐ 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 within one year. **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) ☐ **Other Conditions:**

**ATTACHMENT TO**  
**STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION**

IN THE MATTER OF:                      LAWRENCE JOSEPH MCSWIGGAN  
CASE NUMBER:                              13-J-12930

**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. 13-J-12930 (Discipline in Other Jurisdiction)**

**PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND IN OTHER JURISDICTION:**

1. On December 30, 2005, Respondent was admitted to the practice law in the State of Massachusetts.
2. On or about April 10, 2013, Respondent entered into a stipulation for discipline with the Office of the Bar Counsel of the Board of Bar Overseers of the State of Massachusetts in case no. C2-12-0007 admitting that Respondent had committed violations of rules 5.5(a) and 8.4(d) of the Massachusetts Rules of Professional Conduct and rule 4:01 §17 (5) and (6) of the Rules of the Supreme Judicial Court.
3. On or about May 8, 2013, the Board of Bar Overseers of the State of Massachusetts approved the stipulation in case no. C2-12-0007 and ordered that Respondent be publicly reprimanded. Thereafter, that order became final.
4. Respondent's culpability as determined by the Board of Bar Overseers of the State of Massachusetts indicates that Respondent's misconduct is equivalent to violations of Business and Professions Code sections 6068(a), 6125 and 6126.
5. The disciplinary proceeding in the State of Massachusetts provided fundamental constitutional protection.

**FACTS FOUND IN OTHER JURISDICTION:**

6. On December 4, 2010, the Board of Bar Overseers of the State of Massachusetts (the "Board") sent Respondent his annual registration statement.
7. Respondent failed to timely pay his 2011 annual registration fees.
8. On May 27, 2011, the Board petitioned the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts (the "Court") to administratively suspend Respondent.

9. On June 30, 2011, the Court entered a judgment ordering Respondent's immediate administrative suspension for Respondent's failure to register with the Board and pay his annual registration fee (the "Order").

10. On July 5, 2011, the Board sent a letter to Respondent notifying him that the Court had administratively suspended him from the practice of law. The Board further notified Respondent that, if he sought reinstatement within thirty (30) days of issuance of the Order, Respondent would not have to comply with Supreme Judicial Court Rule §17 (1), (5) and (6). Respondent received but did not open the letter.

11. Respondent did not seek reinstatement within thirty (30) days of the entry of the Order and did not comply with Supreme Judicial Court Rule §17 (1), (5) and (6).

12. From June 30, 2011 through January 20, 2012, Respondent, while administratively suspended, practiced law in seven (7) client matters.

13. On October 5, 2011, Respondent requested that the Board send him the required paperwork to apply for reinstatement.

14. On January 13, 2012, Respondent sought readmission to practice law. With the reinstatement package, Respondent submitted an affidavit in support of reinstatement in which he admitted that he engaged in the practice of law since June 30, 2011.

15. On January 20, 2012, Respondent was reinstated by the Court to practice law in the State of Massachusetts.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

16. As a matter of law, Respondent's culpability of professional misconduct determined in the proceeding in Massachusetts warrants the imposition of discipline under the laws and rules binding upon Respondent in the State of California at the time Respondent committed the misconduct in the other jurisdiction, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6049.1, subdivision (a).

#### AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)):** In this matter, Respondent held himself out as entitled to practice law and actually practiced law in seven (7) clients matters while on administrative suspension.

#### MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**Prefiling Stipulation:** Respondent stipulated to facts, conclusions of law, and disposition in order to resolve his disciplinary proceedings as efficiently as possible, prior to the filing of charges, thereby avoiding the necessity of a trial and saving the State Bar time and resources. (*Silva-Vidor v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [where mitigative credit was given for entering into a stipulation as to facts and culpability].) By entering into the stipulation, Respondent has acknowledged and accepted responsibility for his misconduct.

**No Prior Record of Discipline:** Although Respondent's misconduct is serious, he has no prior record of discipline in ten (10) years of practice prior to the first act of misconduct herein and is entitled to some



mitigation. (*In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 2013); *In the Matter of Stamper* (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 96, 106, fn. 13.)

**Recognition of Wrongdoing:** Prior to the filing of disciplinary charges in Massachusetts, Respondent voluntarily confessed that he engaged in the practice of law while administratively suspended. Respondent is entitled to reduced weight in mitigation because his confession came at the time of his reinstatement and was, therefore, not an objective step promptly taken spontaneously demonstrating remorse as required by Standard 1.6(g). (*In the Matter of Spaitth* (Review Dept. 1996) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 511, 519.)

#### **AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.**

The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct “set forth a means for determining the appropriate disciplinary sanction in a particular case and to ensure consistency across cases dealing with similar misconduct and surrounding circumstances.” (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.1. All further references to Standards are to this source.) The Standards help fulfill the primary purposes of discipline, which include: protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession; maintenance of the highest professional standards; and preservation of public confidence in the legal profession. (See std. 1.1; *In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 205.)

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.) If a recommendation is at the high end or low end of a Standard, an explanation must be given as to how the recommendation was reached. (Std. 1.1.) “Any disciplinary recommendation that deviates from the Standards must include clear reasons for the departure.” (Std. 1.1; *Blair v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 762, 776, fn. 5.)

In determining whether to impose a sanction greater or less than that specified in a given Standard, in addition to the factors set forth in the specific Standard, consideration is to be given to the primary purposes of discipline; the balancing of all aggravating and mitigating circumstances; the type of misconduct at issue; whether the client, public, legal system or profession was harmed; and the member’s willingness and ability to conform to ethical responsibilities in the future. (Stds. 1.7(b) and (c).)

Although the instant proceeding is a reciprocal jurisdiction proceeding under Business and Professions section 6049.1, subdivision (b), and therefore violations of the California Rules of Professional Conduct and/or the State Bar Act are not directly at issue, in order to determine the appropriate level of discipline in this proceeding, it is constructive to consider Respondent’s ethical violation in Massachusetts in light of the equivalent rule and statutory violations in California, and to apply the applicable standards to the equivalent misconduct. At a time when he was suspended from the practice of law, Respondent held himself out as entitled to practice law and actually practiced law when he was not an active member of the State Bar of Massachusetts which, if committed in California, would have violated Business and Professions Code, sections 6125 and 6126, thereby violating Business and Professions Code, section 6068(a).

Standard 2.6(b) provides that suspension or reproof is appropriate when a member engages in the practice of law or holds himself or herself out as entitled to practice law when he or she is on inactive status or actual suspension for non-disciplinary reasons, such as non-payment of fees or MCLE non-compliance. The degree of sanction depends on whether the member knowingly engaged in the unauthorized practice of law. Standard 2.6(b) applies here.

As discussed above, Respondent admits that he received, but failed to open, the letter from the Board of Bar Overseers notifying him that the Supreme Judicial Court had administratively suspended him from the practice of law. Respondent learned of his suspension and, after requesting a reinstatement package, sought readmission to practice law in the State of Massachusetts.

In evaluating Respondent's misconduct and assessing the level of discipline, Standard 2.6(b) provides a range of sanctions ranging from reproof to suspension. In this matter, Respondent does not have a prior record of discipline, acknowledged and accepted responsibility for his misconduct and entered into this pre-filing stipulation, which mitigates his misconduct. Respondent's misconduct is aggravated by the presence of multiple acts of misconduct.

In light of Respondent's misconduct, the applicable standards, the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, a discipline consisting of a one-year suspension, stayed, and a one-year probation serves the purpose of State Bar discipline to protect the public, the courts and the legal profession, to maintain high professional standards by attorneys, and to preserve public confidence in the legal profession. (Std. 1.3.)

The stipulated level of discipline is in line with case law involving similar misconduct. In *Chasteen v. State Bar* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 586, an attorney with one prior record of discipline committed misconduct including a failure to perform services, commingling, misappropriation and the unauthorized practice of law while under suspension by the Bar for nonpayment of dues. (*Chasteen v. State Bar*, supra, 40 Cal.3d 586 at 592.) In mitigation, the attorney presented evidence that he had marital problems, was an alcoholic, and that he was seeking help including participation in alcohol rehabilitation programs. (*Chasteen v. State Bar*, supra, 40 Cal.3d 586 at 591.) The Supreme Court ordered the attorney suspended for five years, stayed and placed on a five year probation including a two month actual suspension from the practice of law. The court held that the two month suspension adequately took into account the seriousness of his misconduct and the evidence presented in mitigation.

Like *Chasteen*, Respondent committed multiple acts of misconduct when he engaged in the unauthorized practice of law while under suspension by the Board of Bar Overseers for nonpayment of registration fees. However the current matter is not as serious as *Chasteen* and, unlike *Chasteen*, Respondent does not have a prior record of discipline. Therefore a stayed suspension, as outlined herein, is appropriate.

#### **COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.**

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of June 5, 2014, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$2,447. 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 six hours of MCLE credit referred to on page six of this stipulation. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:  
LAWRENCE JOSEPH MCSWIGGAN

Case number(s):  
13-J-12930

### 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.

July 7  
June, 2014  
Date

[Signature]  
Respondent's Signature

Lawrence Joseph McSwiggan  
Print Name

July 16  
June, 2014  
Date

[Signature]  
Respondent's Counsel Signature  
[Signature]  
Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

Print Name

Lara Bairamian  
Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:  
LAWRENCE JOSEPH MCSWIGGAN

Case Number(s):  
13-J-12930

### STAYED 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.)**

Date

7/29/14

Judge of the State Bar Court

**DONALD F. MILES**

## 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 <select city>, on July 30, 2014, 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:

LAWRENCE J. MCSWIGGAN  
CHARLES RIVER LAW GROUP  
PO BOX ONE  
NEWTON, MA 02464

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

LARA BAIRAMIAN, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on July 30, 2014.



Rose M. Luthi  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court