		UNUINAL		
State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION				
Counsel For The State Bar R. Kevin Bucher Deputy Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017-2515 (213)765-1630 Bar # 132003 Counsel For Respondent David C. Carr Law Offices of David C. Carr 525 B Street, Suite 1500 San Diego, CA 92101	Case Number(s): 13-0-14164 13-0-14165	For Court use only FILED JUN 18 2014 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES		
	Submitted to: Settlement Judge			
Bar # 124510 In the Matter of:	STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING			
Isileli Tupou Manaia Mataele				
Bar # 266863	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 December 1, 2009.
- (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".

٩

- (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: **three 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.
- (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. See attachment, page 9.
- (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, page 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.
- (13) **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

(Effective January 1, 2014)

Additional mitigating circumstances:

Pre-Filing Stipulation - See attachment, page 9. Financial Difficulties - See attachment, page 9.

D. Discipline:

- (1) X Stayed Suspension:
 - (a) Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of **one 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:
 - (b) The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) \boxtimes **Probation**:

Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of **one year**, 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 **30 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.

- (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.

(Do not write above this line.)				
		No MPRE recommended. Reason:		
(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: ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE

CASE NUMBERS: 13-O-14164; 13-O-14165

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-14164

FACTS:

1. On April 10, 2012, Judge Harry L. Powazek levied a sanction of \$250 against Respondent for arriving late in the morning session and afternoon session of trial that day in *Matter of Richard J. Thompson and Jacqueline A. Thompson*, San Diego County Superior Court case no. DN153009. The sanction was to be paid by May 11, 2012.

2. Respondent failed to pay the sanction in a timely manner. Between April 10, 2012 and June 8, 2012, Respondent did not notify the court of his inability to pay said sanction and did not ask for an extension of time to pay the sanction. On May 18, 2012 Judge Powazek set a hearing on Respondent's failure to pay the sanction.

3. On June 8, 2012, Judge Powazek conducted a hearing regarding Respondent's failure to pay the previously ordered sanction in case no. DN153009. Respondent informed the court that he was having financial difficulties and was unable to pay the sanction. Judge Powazek ordered Respondent to pay sanctions of \$1,000 plus the previously ordered sanctions of \$250. The sanctions were to be paid to the Clerk of the Court in monthly payments of \$50 starting on August 1, 2012.

4. Respondent did not pay the sanctions in a timely manner as ordered by the court. Respondent did pay \$50 toward the sanction in August 2012 and \$200 in December 2012. He did not pay the \$1,000 balance of the sanction until April 1, 2014, after he was aware of the State Bar investigation in the present matter.

5. Respondent did not report the imposition of the judicial sanctions to the State Bar within 30 days of the date the sanctions were ordered. He did ultimately report the sanctions to the State Bar on January 15, 2013.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

6. By failing to comply with the court orders of April 10, 2012, and June 8, 2012, to pay judicial sanctions totaling \$1,250, Respondent disobeyed or violated an order of the court requiring Respondent

to do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of Respondent's profession which Respondent ought in good faith to do or forbear, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6103.

7. By failing to report to the State Bar the \$1,250 sanctions the court imposed on Respondent on or about June 8, 2012, within 30 days, Respondent failed to report to the agency charged with attorney discipline, in writing, within 30 days of the time Respondent had knowledge of the imposition of any judicial sanctions against Respondent, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section, 6068(0)(3).

Case No. 13-0-14165

FACTS:

8. On October 26, 2010, Victor Willis, was sued in case *Moore v Willis*, San Diego Superior Court case no.37-2010-00103125-CU-BC-CTL. Willis failed to file a response and default was entered on April 20, 2011, and the default order was issued May 23, 2011.

9. Respondent was retained by Willis to appear on a motion to set aside default that he had filed in propria persona on February 17, 2012. That motion was denied. Despite adverse rulings on that motion, Respondent prepared and filed a second motion to set aside the default and vacate the default order, arguing that the judgment was void, which motion was heard on November 13, 2012.

10. Plaintiffs opposed the November 13, 2013 motions and asked for sanctions pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §128.7. The court denied the motions and ordered sanctions against Willis and Respondent, jointly and severally, in the amount of \$4,000, to be paid on or before December 4, 2012.

11. Respondent received a copy of the sanctions order. Respondent did not notify the court of his inability to pay said sanction. Respondent did not ask for an extension of time to pay the sanctions. Respondent did file an appeal on Mr. Willis's behalf on January 10, 2013, but that appeal was dismissed on April 3, 2013.

12. Respondent did not pay the sanctions nor did he report the sanctions to the State Bar in a timely manner.

13. He did report the sanctions late on December 17, 2013, but did not pay the sanctions until April 3, 2014 and April 10, 2013, after he was aware of the State Bar investigation of the present matter.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

14. By failing to comply with the court order to pay judicial sanctions totaling \$4,000, Respondent disobeyed or violated an order of the court requiring Respondent to do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of Respondent's profession which Respondent ought in good faith to do or forbear, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6103.

15. By failing to report to the State Bar the \$4,000 sanctions the court imposed on Respondent on or about November 13, 2012, within 30 days, Respondent failed to report to the agency charged with attorney discipline, in writing, within 30 days of the time Respondent had knowledge of the imposition

of any judicial sanctions against Respondent, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section, 6068(0)(3).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Harm (Std. 1.5(f)): Although no client was harmed as a result of Respondent's misconduct, there was harm to the administration of justice arising from his failure to pay sanctions and comply with court orders.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent's failure to comply with court orders and report sanctions in two separate matters demonstrates multiple acts of wrongdoing.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Prefiling Stipulation: Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into a full stipulation prior to the filing of formal charges, thereby saving State Bar Court 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].)

Financial Difficulties: At all times relevant hereto Respondent has suffered extreme financial hardship that was not reasonably foreseeable and that was beyond his control, and which at least partially contributed to his misconduct in failing to pay court ordered sanctions. Respondent has provided extensive, personal records, bank records and statements from his personal bank accounts revealing his income and debts. (See *Grim v. State Bar* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 21, 13; *In the Matter of Ward* (Review Dept. 1992) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 47, 60.)

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).)

The most severe sanction applicable to Respondent's misconduct is found in standard 2.8(a), which provides "disbarment or actual suspension is appropriate for disobedience or violation of a court order related to the members practice of law...." By failing to comply with court orders to pay sanctions, Respondent is subject to discipline under standard 2.8(a).

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).)

In the present case there is no question that by failing to pay the court ordered sanctions, Respondent failed to comply with a court order directly related to Respondent's practice of law. While the misconduct does not appear to have harmed a client, there is harm to the administration of justice. Respondent's lack of prior discipline is not mitigative as he only practiced for 3 years before the current misconduct. Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into a stipulation prior to the filing of charges, and will receive mitigation for suffering financial hardship that affected his ability to pay the court ordered sanctions. Aggravation and mitigation is fairly evenly balanced and there is no justification for deviating from the level of discipline provided for by Standard 2.8(a) (See *Blair v. State Bar, supra,* 49 Cal.3d 762.) A one-year suspension, stayed, with one year of probation with standard conditions, including an actual suspension for the first thirty days, will serve the purpose of protecting the public, the courts and the legal system.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of May 15, 2014, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$3,947. 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 <u>not</u> receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

In the Matter of Case number(s): ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE 13-O-14164; 13-O-14165

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 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

laturel I uport Isileli Mataele Respondent's Signature Print Name David C. Carr

Respondent's Counsel Signature

Print Name

Date

Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

<u>R. Kevin Bucher</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.) In the Matter of	Case number(s):	
ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE	13-0-14164; 13-0-14165	

.

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 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

Date	Respondent's Signature	Isileli Mataele Print Name
Date <u> S</u> ·ZO-H Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature Deputy Trial Counsels Signature	David C. Carr Print Name R. Kevin Bucher Print Name

In the Matter of: ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE Case Number(s): 13-O-14164; 13-O-14165

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.)

JUNE 17, 2014

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 June 18, 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:

 \boxtimes by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

DAVID C. CARR LAW OFFICE OF DAVID CAMERON CARR PLC 525 B ST STE 1500 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

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

> Ronald K. Bucher, Enforcement, Los Angeles TERRIE GOLDADE, Probation, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, or

June 18, 2014.

Johnnie Lee Smith

Case Administrator State Bar Court