

(Do not write above this line.)

**State Bar Court of California
Hearing Department
San Francisco
ACTUAL SUSPENSION**

<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Tammy M. Albertsen Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2527</p> <p>Bar # 154248</p>	<p>Case Number(s): 13-O-12145-PEM</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <p>PUBLIC MATTER</p> <p>FILED</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i></p> <p>AUG 11 2014</p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</p>
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>William Jake Sun Wong 331 Egret Place Pittsburg, CA 94565 (415) 433-3771</p> <p>Bar # 75571</p>	<p>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p>	
<p>In the Matter of: WILLIAM JAKE SUN WONG</p> <p>Bar # 75571</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>		

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 **September 27, 1977**.
- (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 **11** 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)



80

(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):
- 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: **Costs are to be paid in equal amounts over the three billing cycles 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 [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 **10-O-02633 (see attachment, page 8.)**
 - (b) Date prior discipline effective **June 18, 2011**
 - (c) Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: **Rules of Professional Conduct rule 4-100(A); Business and Professions Code section 6068(i)**
 - (d) Degree of prior discipline **Two years' stayed suspension, two years' probation with conditions including 30 days' actual suspension**
 - (e) If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.
- (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.

- (7) **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. **See, attachment, pages 8-9.**
- (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 convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.

(Do not write above this line.)

(13) No mitigating circumstances are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances:

Pretrial Stipulation; see attachment, page 9

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 1.2(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:

(b) The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) **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) **Actual Suspension:**

(a) Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of **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 1.2(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:

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 1.2(c)(1), 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.

(Effective January 1, 2014)

Actual Suspension

- (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:
 - 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: .

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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: WILLIAM JAKE SUN WONG

CASE NUMBER: 13-O-12145-PEM

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-O-12145-PEM (Violations of Conditions of Probation)

Facts:

1. On January 5, 2011, the State Bar Court approved a stipulation between respondent and the State Bar and issued an order recommending two (2) year stayed suspension, two (2) years' probation and 30 days' actual suspension in State Bar case number 10-O-02633.
2. On May 19, 2011, the Supreme Court issued an order imposing discipline as set forth in the stipulation. Respondent received a copy of the order.
3. The Supreme Court order took effect on June 18, 2011 and remained in full force and effect until June 18, 2013.
4. Pursuant to the Supreme Court Order, respondent was required to comply with the following conditions of probation:
 - a. Within 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 the terms and conditions of probation;
 - b. Submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on October 10, 2011, January 10, 2012, April 10, 2012, July 10, 2012, October 10, 2012, January 10, 2013 and April 10, 2013;
 - c. Submit his final report to the Office of Probation on June 18, 2013;
 - d. Attend and submit proof of completion of State Bar Client Trust Accounting school to the Office of Probation by June 18, 2012;
 - e. Attend and submit proof of completion of State Bar Ethics School to the Office of Probation by June 18, 2012; and
 - f. Take and provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility

Exam to the Office of Probation by June 18, 2012.

5. Respondent failed to schedule a meeting with the probation deputy within 30 days from the effective date of discipline. Respondent belatedly scheduled a meeting on December 15, 2011.
6. Respondent failed to timely submit the quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on October 10, 2011, January 10, 2012, April 10, 2012, July 10, 2012, October 10, 2012, January 10, 2013 and April 10, 2013.
7. Respondent failed to timely submit his final report on June 18, 2013. Respondent belatedly filed the final report on July 1, 2013.
8. Respondent failed to timely attend and submit proof of completion of State Bar Client Trust Accounting school by the due date of June 18, 2012. Respondent belatedly provided proof of his March 16, 2013 attendance on July 1, 2013.
9. Respondent failed to attend and submit proof of completion of State Bar Ethics School by the due date of June 18, 2012. Respondent belatedly completed State Bar Ethics School on June 21, 2012 and belatedly provided proof of completion on July 1, 2013.
10. Respondent failed to take and provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam by the due date of June 18, 2012. Respondent belatedly took the Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam on August 10, 2012 and belatedly provided poof of passage on September 24, 2012.

Conclusion Of Law:

11. By failing to timely submit quarterly reports, by failing to timely submit a final report, by failing to schedule a meeting with the Office of Probation within 30 days from the effective date of discipline, by failing to timely attend and submit proof of completion of Client Trust Accounting and Ethics Schools and by failing to take and pass the Multistate Professional responsibility examination by their respective due dates, respondent willfully failed to comply with conditions of probation in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(k).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Prior Record of Discipline (Std. 1.5(a)): Effective June 18, 2011, respondent was disciplined in case number 10-O-02633-PEM for violating Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A) and Business and Professions Code section 6068(i). Respondent's discipline included two (2) years' suspension, stayed, two (2) years' probation and 30 days' actual suspension. Respondent's misconduct in that case between October, 2009 and April, 2010 included his issuing NSF checks from his Client Trust Account ("CTA"), using his CTA for personal purposes/commingling and failing to cooperate/participate in a State Bar investigation.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent's current misconduct includes failing to timely submit eight (8) separate reports to the Office of Probation. Respondent also failed to timely submit a final report and to schedule a meeting with the Probation Deputy. In addition, respondent failed to

timely complete and provide proof of passage of Ethics School and Client Trust Account School. Furthermore, respondent failed to timely take and provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination. Each of these probation conditions had its own date for when compliance was due. Each of the failures to timely comply is a separate instance of misconduct. Together, these numerous failures amount to multiple acts of misconduct.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Pretrial Stipulation: Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into a full stipulation with the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel prior to trial, thereby saving the State Bar Court time and resources. (*Silva-Zidor v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [where mitigative credit was given for entering into a stipulation as to facts and culpability].)

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).)

Std. 2.10 applies to respondent’s violations of the conditions of his probation and provides: “Actual suspension is appropriate for failing to comply with a condition of discipline. The degree of sanction depends on the nature of the condition violated and the member’s unwillingness or inability to comply with disciplinary orders.”

Std. 1.8 is also applicable since respondent has a prior record of discipline. Std. 1.8 provides: “If a member has a single prior record of discipline, the sanction must be greater than the previously imposed

sanction unless the prior discipline was so remote in time and the previous misconduct was not serious enough that imposing greater discipline would be manifestly unjust." Respondent's prior discipline was not remote in time and his misconduct was serious. In this case, discipline to include greater than 30 days' actual suspension is not manifestly unjust. Because respondent has suffered a prior record of discipline at a level that included 30 days' actual suspension, the current sanction must be greater than the previously imposed sanction; i.e. more than 30 days' actual suspension.

"When an attorney commits multiple violations of the same probation condition, the gravity of each successive violation increases. Also, it demonstrates indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of one's misconduct." (*In the Matter of Tiernan* (Review Dept. 1996) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 523, 531.)

Here, respondent violated twelve (12) conditions of his disciplinary probation, eight (8) of which were repeated failures to timely submit quarterly reports. Respondent's misconduct is serious.

In aggravation, respondent has a prior record of discipline and committed multiple acts of misconduct. The only mitigating factor is that respondent is entering a pretrial stipulation. It is noted that respondent has come into compliance and therefore has an ability to confirm his conduct. On balance, a 90-day actual suspension with probation conditions for two years will serve the purposes of attorney discipline.

The requested level of discipline is also consistent with case law. In *Conroy v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 799, an attorney had received a private reproof with a condition that he take the PRE within one year. The attorney inexplicably failed to take the PRE within the year, although he did ultimately take it outside the due date. In upholding the recommendation of discipline including 60 days' actual suspension, the Supreme Court noted the several serious aggravating circumstances surrounding this misconduct, including the attorney's prior record of discipline, his failure to participate in the subsequent proceedings and his failure to appreciate the gravity of his earlier misdeeds.

On balance, discipline to include actual suspension of 90 days is appropriate. In light of respondent's misconduct, the applicable standards, the aggravating and mitigating circumstances and applicable case law, discipline including a two years' suspension, stayed, with two years' additional probation and 90 days of actual suspension is necessary and appropriate in order to accomplish the purposes of attorney discipline as delineated in Standard 1.1.

EXCLUSION FROM MCLE CREDIT

Pursuant to rule 3201, respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School, State Bar Client Trust Accounting School, and/or any other educational course(s) to be ordered as a condition of reproof or suspension]. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of July 24, 2014, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$ 5,418.00. Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from the stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase because of the cost of further proceedings.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: WILLIAM JAKE SUN WONG	Case number(s): 13-O-121345-PEM
---	---

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.

7/28/2014 William Jake Sun Wong William Jake Sun Wong
Date Respondent's Signature Print Name

7/29/2014 Tammy M. Albertsen Tammy M. Albertsen
Date Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: WILLIAM JAKE SUN WONG	Case Number(s): 13-O-12145-PEM
--	-----------------------------------

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.

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

Aug 11, 2014



Judge of the State Bar Court

LUCY ARMENDARIZ

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 San Francisco, on August 11, 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 San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

WILLIAM JAKE SUN WONG
331 EGRET PL
PITTSBURG, CA 94565

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

TAMMY A. ALBERTSEN, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on August 11, 2014.



Bernadette C.O. Molina
Case Administrator
State Bar Court