PUBLIC MATTER

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSE JAYNE KIM, No. 174614 CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL JOSEPH R. CARLUCCI, No. 172309 DEPUTY CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL ALAN B. GORDON, No. 125642 ASSISTANT CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL WILLIAM TODD, No. 259194 DEPUTY TRIAL COUNSEL 845 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, California 90017-2515 Telephone: (213) 765-1491	FILED MAR 05 2014 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES			
9	STATE BAR COURT				
10	HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES				
11	·				
12	In the Matter of:) Case Nos. 13-O-14229, 13-O-14297,			
13	CHRISTOPHER SCOTT HAMMATT,) 13-O-14390)			
14	No. 222209,) NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES)			
15	A Member of the State Bar.				
16	NOTICE - FAI	LURE TO RESPOND!			
17 18	IF YOU FAIL TO FILE A WRITTEN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN 20 DAYS AFTER SERVICE, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL:				
19	(1) YOUR DEFAULT WILL BE ENTERED;				
20	WILL NOT BE PERMITTED	TTED TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN LESS YOU MAKE A TIMELY MOTION			
21	THESE PROCEEDINGS UNI				
22	AND THE DEFAULT IS SET (4) YOU SHALL BE SUBJECT OF THE POPULATION OF THE P	CT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPLINE.			
23	OR VACATE YOUR DEFAU	IL TO TIMELY MOVE TO SET ASIDE ULT, THIS COURT WILL ENTER AN			
24	ORDER RECOMMENDING YOUR DISBARMENT WITHOUT FURTHER HEARING OR PROCEEDING. SEE RULE 5.80 ET SEQ., RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA.				
25	RULES OF FROCEDURE OF	THE STATE BAK OF CALIFORNIA.			
26					
27					
28		kwiktag* 048 621 074			

kwiktag 048 62 1 074

·] -

The State Bar of California alleges:

JURISDICTION

1. Christopher Scott Hammatt ("Respondent") was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on December 3, 2002, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.

COUNT ONE

Case No. 13-O-14229
Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2)
[Improper Withdrawal from Employment]

2. Respondent failed, upon termination of employment, to take reasonable steps to avoid reasonably foreseeable prejudice to Respondent's client, Kathleen Nelson, by constructively terminating Respondent's employment March 8, 2013 by failing to take any action on the client's behalf after appearing at a March 8, 2013 hearing, and thereafter failing to inform the client that Respondent was withdrawing from employment, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2).

COUNT TWO

Case No. 13-O-14229
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m)
[Failure to Respond to Client Inquiries]

3. Respondent failed to respond promptly to multiple telephonic reasonable status inquiries made by Respondent's client, Kathleen Nelson, between March 8, 2013 and July 19, 2013 that Respondent received in a matter in which Respondent had agreed to provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

COUNT THREE

Case No. 13-O-14229
Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1)
[Failure to Release File]

4. Respondent failed to release promptly, after termination of Respondent's employment on or about July 19, 2013, to Respondent's client, Kathleen Nelson, all of the client's papers and property following the client's request for the client's file on July 19, 2013, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1).

COUNT FOUR

Case No. 13-O-14229
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i)
[Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

5. Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent by failing to provide a substantive response to the State Bar's letters of August 15, 2013 and September 10, 2013, which Respondent received, that requested Respondent's response to the allegations of misconduct being investigated in case no. 13-O-14229, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

COUNT FIVE

Case No. 13-O-14297
Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2)
[Improper Withdrawal from Employment]

6. Respondent failed, upon termination of employment, to take reasonable steps to avoid reasonably foreseeable prejudice to Respondent's clients, Keith and Joy Klintworth, by constructively terminating Respondent's employment May 18, 2013 by failing to take any action on the clients' behalf after May 18, 2013, and thereafter failing to inform the clients that Respondent was withdrawing from employment, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2).

COUNT SIX

Case No. 13-O-14297
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m)
[Failure to Respond to Client Inquiries]

7. Respondent failed to respond promptly to multiple e-mail and written reasonable status inquiries made by Respondent's clients, Keith and Joy Klintworth, between May 18, 2013 and July 25, 2013, that Respondent received in a matter in which Respondent had agreed to provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

__

COUNT SEVEN

Case No. 13-O-14297 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1) [Failure to Release File]

8. Respondent failed to release promptly, after termination of Respondent's employment on or about September 10, 2013, to Respondent's clients, Keith and Joy Klintworth, all of the clients' papers and property following the clients' request for the clients' file on September 10, 2013, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1).

COUNT EIGHT

Case No. 13-O-14297 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2) [Failure to Refund Unearned Fees]

9. On or about May 8, 2013, Respondent received advanced fees of \$2,000 from a clients, Keith and Joy Klintworth, for representation in a civil matter. Respondent performed no services of value on behalf of the clients and therefore earned none of the advanced fees paid. Respondent failed to refund promptly, upon Respondent's termination of employment on or about July 25, 2013 any part of the \$2,000 fee, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

COUNT NINE

Case No. 13-O-14297 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i) [Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

10. Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent by failing to provide a substantive response to the State Bar's letters of August 15, 2013 and September 10, 2013, which Respondent received, that requested Respondent's response to the allegations of misconduct being investigated in case no. 13-O-14297, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

COUNT TEN 1 Case No. 13-O-14390 2 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2) [Improper Withdrawal from Employment] 3 11. Respondent failed, upon termination of employment, to take reasonable steps to avoid 4 reasonably foreseeable prejudice to Respondent's client, Linda Barker, by constructively 5 6 terminating Respondent's employment April 18, 2013 by failing to take any action on the 7 client's behalf after April 18, 2013, and thereafter failing to inform the client that Respondent was withdrawing from employment, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-8 9 700(A)(2). COUNT ELEVEN 10 Case No. 13-O-14390 11 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m) [Failure to Respond to Client Inquiries] 12 12. Respondent failed to respond promptly to five telephonic and two written reasonable 13 14 status inquiries made by Respondent's client, Linda Barker, between May 23, 2013 and June 25, 15 2013 that Respondent received in a matter in which Respondent had agreed to provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m). 16 **COUNT TWELVE** 17 Case No. 13-O-14390 18 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1) [Failure to Release File] 19 20 13. Respondent failed to release promptly, after termination of Respondent's employment 21 on or about April 18, 2013, to Respondent's client, Linda Barker, all of the client's papers and 22 property following the client's request for the client's file on June 25, 2013, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1). 23 COUNT THIRTEEN 24 25 Case No. 13-O-14390 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i) 26 [Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation] 27 14. Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending

against Respondent by failing to provide a substantive response to the State Bar's letters of

28

September 9, 2013, which Respondent received, that requested Respondent's response to the 1 2 allegations of misconduct being investigated in case no. 13-O-14390, in willful violation of 3 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i). 4 **NOTICE - INACTIVE ENROLLMENT!** 5 YOU ARE HEREBY FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT IF THE STATE BAR COURT FINDS, PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE 6 SECTION 6007(c), THAT YOUR CONDUCT POSES A SUBSTANTIAL THREAT OF HARM TO THE INTERESTS OF YOUR CLIENTS OR TO 7 THE PUBLIC, YOU MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR. YOUR INACTIVE ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE 8 RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT. 9 10 **NOTICE - COST ASSESSMENT!** THESE PROCEDURES RESULT IN PUBLIC 11 EVENT DISCIPLINE, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS 12 INCURRED BY THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND 13 PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10. 14 Respectfully submitted, 15 THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL 16 17 18 DATED: March 5, 2014 Bv: William Todd 19 Deputy Trial Counsel 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

U.S. FIRST-CLASS MAIL / U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL / OVERNIGHT DELIVERY / FACSIMILE-ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

CASE NUMBER(s): 13-O-14229, 13-O-14297, 13-O-14390

I, the undersigned, am over the California, 845 S. Figueroa Street, Los A	e age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the wi Angeles, Califomia 90017, declare that:	thin action, whose business address an	d place of employment is the State Bar of		
- on the date shown below, I	caused to be served a true copy of the within docume	ent described as follows:			
et valutente supportue i est habet i hobitation de la seguitation de la side de la seguitation designation de la seguitation designation designation designation designation designation designa	NOTICE OF DISCIPI	LINARY CHARGES	·····································		
(CCC circles 1995) (CCC circles					
By U.S. First-Class Mail: - in accordance with the pra of Los Angeles.	(CCP §§ 1013 and 1013(a)) ctice of the State Bar of California for collection and p	By U.S. Certified Ma processing of mail, I deposited or placed	til: (CCP §§ 1013 and 1013(a)) If for collection and mailing in the City and County		
By Overnight Delivery: (- I am readily familiar with the	CCP §§ 1013(c) and 1013(d)) se State Bar of California's practice for collection and	processing of correspondence for over	night delivery by the United Parcel Service ('UPS').		
Based on agreement of the n	CCP §§ 1013(e) and 1013(f)) arties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed th The original record of the fax transmission is retain	e documents to the persons at the fax ed on file and available upon request.	numbers listed herein below. No error was		
By Electronic Service: (nic transmission. I caused the documen	nts to be sent to the person(s_ at the electronic dication that the transmission was unsuccessful.		
(for u.s. First-Class Mail) in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing at Los Angeles, addressed to: (see below) (for Certified Mail) in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing as certified mail, return receipt requested,					
		s Angeles, addressed to: (see below			
(for Overnight Delivery) tog	gether with a copy of this declaration, in an enve	elope, or package designated by U addressed to: (see below)	PS,		
Person Served	Business-Residential Address	Fax Number	Courtesy Copy to:		
CHRISTOPHER SCOTT HAMMATT	Law Offc Christopher S. Hammatt 41877 Enterprise Cir N Ste 211 Temecula, CA 92590	Electronic Address			
via inter-office mail regularly prod	cessed and maintained by the State Bar of Cali N/A				
	NA				
ayomisht delivery by the United Parcel	State Bar of California's practice for collection and pro Service ('UPS'). In the ordinary course of the State Is United States Postal Service that same day, and for o	Bar of California's practice, corresponde	ence collected and processed by the State Bar of		
I am aware that on motion of after date of deposit for mailing contain	the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal ed in the affidavit.	cancellation date or postage meter dat	e on the envelope or package is more than one day		
I declare under penalty of	perjury, under the laws of the State of California	a, that the foregoing is true and cor	rect. Executed at Los Angeles,		
California, on the date shown below.					
DATED: March 5, 2014	Signe	o: Jaura	W		
		LAURAJETT Declarant	/		