WARREN BROWN, CA Bar #100404 2029 Verdugo Blvd., #775 2 Montrose, CA 91020 Tel (818) 333-6270, Fax (818) 330-4556 3 FEB 03 2014 wbbk@msn.com STATE BAR COURT 4 CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES 5 6 7 STATE BAR COURT 8 HEARING DEPARTMENT-LOS ANGELES 9 10 11 In the Matter of : Case No. 13-0-13943 12 Warren Leon Brown Bar No. 100404 Answer to complaint 13 PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE: 14 A Member of the State Bar. April 4, 2014 15 9:30 A.M. Ctrm. D 16 17 Warren L. Brown answers the complaint of Helen Acosta 18 and Oscar Aleman as follows: 19 20 21 answer 22 23 COUNT ONE 24 FAILURE TO PERFORM WITH COMPETENCE 25 26 I deny the allegation. A hearing was missed. This mistake 27 was not intentional, reckless, or done repeatedly. There was

willful violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The failure to attend the hearing resulted from a calendaring mistake in my office. I did not see the notice of dismissal of the adversary action when it was first filed. During that time period I was having serious health issues. This was the result of both the medical problem and the medications I was prescribed during that time. When the problem was discovered, I attempted to correct it. Bu too much time had passed.

COUNT TWO FAILURE TO REFUND FEES

I Deny the allegation. I was hired to represent Acosta and Aleman in an adversary proceeding to be filed against Diana Beard-Williams in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. The fee agreement indicated that I would be paid at the hourly rate of \$300.00. I received \$3,000.00 initially. My records show that up to the point where the hearing was missed, I had already put 11 hours into the case. Those fees were earned. According to the fee agreement, the initial retainer was earned on receipt, in consideration of me making myself available to represent the clients.

COUNT THREE FAILURE TO RELEASE FILE

I deny the allegation. I sent the file to Ms. Acosta early last year. At first, it was sent to an address where she no longer received mail. She apparently complained about that and it was re-sent to an address that she provided. If she or

 Mr. Aleman says, at this time, that the file was not returned, they are simply lying. It was returned and I have evidence that it was received.

<u>COUNT FOUR</u> FAILURE TO OBEY A COURT ORDER

I deny the allegation. I did not willfully disobey any court order. Business & Professions Code §6103 refers to a wilful disobedience or violation of a court order. Black's Law Dictionary defines willful as proceeding from a conscious motion of the will. That would require a deliberate act. As indicated above, I did not intentionally or deliberately miss the hearing. There is no evidence that this was the case.

COUNT FIVE FAILURE TO OBEY A COURT ORDER

I deny the allegation. I have never been served with any order to appear in the referenced court. i was unaware of any need to appear. Had I been served, I would have done whatever was required of me. Any failure to so appear was no intentional.

COUNT SIX FAILURE TO COOPERATE IN STATE BAR INVESTIGATION

I deny the allegation. I have been dealing with this matter since becoming aware of it. I sent in a written response to a letter I received last year, and spoke with someone from the State Bar on the phone. The first time I

became aware that there were to be charges filed was when I received a certified letter from the State Bar in December of 2013. Dated: January 22, 2014 Member of the State Bar

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

In the Matter of: Warren L. Brown, Case No. 13-0-13943

I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the above action.

On January 30, 2014, I served the following Document: Answer to Complaint, on the following parties:

By USPS Express Mail:

Lara Bairamian
Deputy Trial Counsel
State Bar of California
Office of Chief Trial Counsel
1149 S. Hill St.
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2299

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed at Los Angeles, California on January 30, 2014

Nathan Creeger

FILED STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL JAYNE KIM, No. 174614 NOV 21 2013 CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL STATE BAR COURT 3 JOSEPH R. CARLUCCI, No. 172309 CLERK'S OFFICE DEPUTY CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL LOS ANGELES ALAN B. GORDON, No. 125642 ASSISTANT CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL **PUBLIC MATTER** 5 RIZAMARI C. SITTON, No. 138319 SUPERVISING SENIOR TRIAL COUNSEL 1149 South Hill Street 6 Los Angeles, California 90015-2299 7 Telephone: (213) 765-1364 8 9 STATE BAR COURT HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES 10 11 Case No. 13-O-10628 12 In the Matter of: NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES 13 STEVEN MARK BISHOP, No. 81618, 14 15 A Member of the State Bar 16 17 **NOTICE - FAILURE TO RESPOND!** 18 IF YOU FAIL TO FILE A WRITTEN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN 20 DAYS AFTER SERVICE, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT 19 THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL: 20 (1) YOUR DEFAULT WILL BE ENTERED; (2) YOUR STATUS WILL BE CHANGED TO INACTIVE AND YO 21 WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW; (3) YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER 22 THESE PROCEEDINGS UNLESS YOU MAKE A TIMELY MOTI AND THE DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE, AND; 23 (4) YOU SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPL SPECIFICALLY, IF YOU FAIL TO TIMELY MOVE TO SET AS 24 OR VACATE YOUR DEFAULT, THIS COURT WILL ENTER ORDER RECOMMENDING YOUR DISBARMENT 25 FURTHER HEARING OR PROCEEDING. SEE RULE 5.80 ET RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORN 26

kwiktag*

27

1 The State Bar of California alleges: 2 JURISDICTION 3 1. Steven Mark Bishop ("Respondent") was admitted to the practice of law in the State 4 of California on November 29, 1978, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is 5 currently a member of the State Bar of California. 6 COUNT ONE 7 Case No. 13-O-10628 Business and Professions Code, section 6103 [Failure to Obey a Court Order] 8 9 2. Respondent disobeyed or violated an order of the court requiring Respondent to do or 10 forbear an act connected with or in the course of Respondent's profession which Respondent 11 ought in good faith to do or forbear by failing to comply with the November 2, 2010 Stipulation 12 and Order to Transfer Attorney-Client Trust Funds in In re Marriage of Amy Applebaum and 13 Stephen Applebaum, San Diego County Superior Court Case no. D513145, in willful violation of 14 Business and Professions Code, section 6103. 15 **COUNT TWO** 16 Case No. 13-O-10628 Business and Professions Code, section 6106 17 [Moral Turpitude - Misappropriation] 18 3. On or about November 17, 2010, pursuant to a court order, Respondent received 19 \$84,915.59 of the proceeds from the sale of community property of Amy Applebaum and 20 Stephen Applebaum, and Respondent deposited the funds into a court-ordered segregated bank 21 account. On or about December 20, 2011, Respondent dishonestly or grossly negligently 22 misappropriated for Respondent's own purposes \$3,578.08, from the segregated bank account, 23 and thereby committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful 24 violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106. 25 111 26

27

1 COUNT THREE 2 Case No. 13-O-10628 Business and Professions Code, section 6106 3 [Moral Turpitude – Wrongful Taking of Funds] 4 4. On or about October 8, 2010, Respondent charged Amy Applebaum's credit card and 5 collected \$2,500, without Applebaum's prior knowledge and consent. Respondent dishonestly or, 6 with gross negligence, wrongfully took the funds for his own purposes, and thereby committed 7 an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and 8 Professions Code, section 6106. 9 **NOTICE - INACTIVE ENROLLMENT!** 10 YOU ARE HEREBY FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT IF THE STATE BAR COURT FINDS, PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE 11 SECTION 6007(c), THAT YOUR CONDUCT POSES A SUBSTANTIAL THREAT OF HARM TO THE INTERESTS OF YOUR CLIENTS OR TO THE PUBLIC, YOU MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY ENROLLED AS AN 12 INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR. YOUR INACTIVE ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE 13 RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT. 14 15 **NOTICE - COST ASSESSMENT!** 16 **PROCEDURES EVENT** THESE DISCIPLINE, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING 17 AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND 18 PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10. 19 Respectfully submitted, 20 THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL 21 22 DATED: November // 23 Rizamari C. Sitton 24 Supervising Senior Trial Counsel 25 26 27

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

 $\label{eq:by} \textbf{U.S. FIRST-CLASS MAIL}/\,\textbf{U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL}/\,\textbf{OVERNIGHT DELIVERY}/\,\textbf{FACSIMILE-ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION}$

CASE NUMBER(s): 13-O-10628

	- on the date shown helew 1	caused to be consed a true convert the within decumer	it described as follows:	
succession in the large of the	- On the date shown below, if	caused to be served a true copy of the within documen	IL DESCRIBED AS TOHOWS.	
- commission actorists		NOTICE OF DISCIPLI	NARY CHARGES	
	By U.S. First-Class Mail: (CCP §§ 1013 and 1013(a)) - in accordance with the practice of the State Bar of California for collection and processing of mail, I deposited or placed for collection and mailing in the City and County of Los Angeles. By Overnight Delivery: (CCP §§ 1013(c) and 1013(d)) - I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for overnight delivery by the United Parcel Service ("UPS By Fax Transmission: (CCP §§ 1013(e) and 1013(f)) Based on agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed herein below. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. The original record of the fax transmission is retained on file and available upon request.			
	By Electronic Service: (C Based on a court order or an a addresses listed herein below. unsuccessful.	CCP § 1010.6) greement of the parties to accept service by electronic I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the tra	c transmission, I caused the documents to Insmission, any electronic message or of	b be sent to the person(s) at the electronic ther indication that the transmission was
	(for U.S. First-Class Mail) in	a sealed envelope placed for collection and mai	ling at Los Angeles, addressed to: (see below)
		ealed envelope placed for collection and mailing 7196 9008 9111 6410 1529 at Los	as certified mail, return receipt reque Angeles, addressed to: (see below)	ested,
	(for Overnight Delivery) tog Tracking No.:	ether with a copy of this declaration, in an envelo	ope, or package designated by UPS, addressed to: (see below)	
	Person Served	Business-Residential Address	Fax Number	Courtesy Copy to:
John "Jack" W. Nelson Attorney for Respondent		Weisenberg & Nelson, Inc. 12437 Lewis St Ste 204	Electronic Address	
Attor		Garden Grove, CA 92840		pp
	inter-office mail regularly p	orocessed and maintained by the State Bar of	California addressed to:	
via i	I am readily familiar with the Sint delivery by the United Parcel ia would be deposited with the U	N/A ate Bar of California's practice for collection and proce Service ('UPS'). In the ordinary course of the State Ba Inited States Postal Service that same day, and for over	essing of correspondence for mailing with r of Califomia's practice, correspondence emight delivery, deposited with delivery f	ees paid or provided for, with UPS that same
ovemigh Californi day.	I am readily familiar with the Sint delivery by the United Parcel ia would be deposited with the U	N/A ate Bar of California's practice for collection and proce Service ('UPS'). In the ordinary course of the State Ba Inited States Postal Service that same day, and for over	essing of correspondence for mailing with r of Califomia's practice, correspondence emight delivery, deposited with delivery f	ees paid or provided for, with UPS that same
ovemight Californiday.	I am readily familiar with the Sint delivery by the United Parcel ia would be deposited with the United Parcel is a would be deposited with the United Parcel I am aware that on motion of the of deposit for mailing contained	Processed and maintained by the State Bar of N/A That are Bar of California's practice for collection and proces Service ("UPS"). In the ordinary course of the State Bar Inited States Postal Service that same day, and for own the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cased in the affidavit.	essing of correspondence for mailing with r of California's practice, correspondence emight delivery, deposited with delivery f ancellation date or postage meter date or	ees paid or provided for, with UPS that same the envelope or package is more than one day