

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles STAYED SUSPENSION		
<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Jamie Kim Deputy Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, CA 90015 (213) 765-1182</p> <p>Bar # 281574</p>	<p>Case Number(s): 13-O-15151 - LMA</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">PUBLIC MATTER</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.5em;">FILED</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">DEC 23 2014</p> <p style="text-align: center;">STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</p>
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>Sharon Arlene Healey Law Offices of Sharon A. Healey 9594 1st Ave. NE, Ste. 225 Seattle, WA 98115 (206) 403-1742</p> <p>Bar # 138002</p>	<p>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p>	
<p>In the Matter of: SHARON ARLENE HEALEY</p> <p>Bar # 138002</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>	<p>STAYED SUSPENSION; NO ACTUAL SUSPENSION</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</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 **December 7, 1988**.
- (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."



(Do not write above this line.)

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

(Do not write above this line.)

- (7) **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. **See Stipulation, page 8.**
- (8) **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution.
- (9) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances

Harm - see Stipulation, page 8.

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.

(Do not write above this line.)

(13) **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances

No Prior Discipline and Pre-Trial Stipulation - see Stipulation, page 9.

D. Discipline:

(1) **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:

The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) **Probation:**

Respondent is 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.)

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: **Because respondent resides outside the State of California, an alternative to Ethics School is set forth below in section F(2).**
- (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:**

As a further condition of probation, because respondent lives out of state, respondent must either 1) attend a session of State Bar Ethics School, pass the test given at the end of that session, and provide proof of same satisfactory to the Office of Probation within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein; or 2) complete six (6) hours of live, in-person Minimum Continuing Legal Education ("MCLE") approved courses in legal ethics offered through a certified MCLE provider in Washington or California and provide proof of same satisfactory to the Office of Probation within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline. If respondent elects to complete six hours of MCLE approved courses in lieu of State Bar Ethics School, the MCLE hours required are in addition to any MCLE hours required by rule or statute in Washington and/or California.

Pursuant to rule 3201, respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of Ethics School or MCLE hours ordered as a condition of discipline. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: SHARON ARLENE HEALEY

CASE NUMBER: 13-O-15151

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that she is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

Case No. 13-O-15151 (Complainants: Robert Simbolon and David Simbolon)

FACTS:

1. On October 18, 2012, respondent was hired by Robert Simbolon and his son, David Simbolon, ("the clients") to file an I-130 petition in Robert Simbolon's immigration case. The clients paid respondent \$1,500 as advanced fees.
2. In December 2012, respondent prepared the I-130 petition, but she failed to file it with the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS").
3. In February and March 2013, David Simbolon e-mailed respondent five times inquiring as to the status of his father's I-130 petition. Respondent received the e-mails. However, despite twice stating in February 2013 that she would check on the status of the matter, respondent did not give the clients a status update. Respondent did not respond to the last three e-mails that David Simbolon sent on February 27, 2013, February 28, 2013 and March 2, 2013.
4. In February 2013, David Simbolon learned from USCIS that the I-130 petition had not been filed. On February 27, 2013, he advised respondent of this and asked for an explanation. Respondent stated that she would go in to her office to check the file. However, respondent did not follow up with the clients to give a status update, even after receiving a second e-mail from David Simbolon on February 27, 2013. Respondent thereafter took no further action on behalf of Robert Simbolon.
5. In March 2013, Robert Simbolon hired new counsel who filed the I-130 petition in April 2013.
6. On May 8, 2013, Robert Simbolon's new counsel e-mailed respondent, notifying her that he was now representing the clients and asking for the release of the client file on behalf of the clients. Respondent did not respond. The clients thereafter hired another attorney to handle the immigration case. In August 2013, she sent two faxes and an e-mail to respondent's office on behalf of the clients requesting the release of Robert Simbolon's file, but respondent did not respond or release the file.
7. In August 2013, Robert Simbolon was deported. His I-130 petition was granted in October 2013.

8. On March 12, 2014, after being contacted by the State Bar in connection with the investigation of the complaint submitted by the clients, respondent sent the clients a check refunding the \$1,500 advanced fee.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

9. By not filing an I-130 petition for Robert Simbolon, respondent failed to perform legal services with competence, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

10. By not giving a status update in response to at least five status inquiries and not responding to David Simbolon's last three communications on February 27, 2013, February 28, 2013 and March 2, 2013, respondent did not respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client in a matter in which she had agreed to provide legal services, in wilful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(m).

11. By not filing an I-130 petition or taking any other action on behalf of Robert Simbolon, even after being notified by David Simbolon on February 27, 2013 that no petition had been filed, respondent constructively terminated her employment, and upon termination of employment, failed to take reasonable steps to avoid reasonably foreseeable prejudice to her client, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2).

12. By not releasing, after termination of respondent's employment in May 2013, all of the client's papers and property following requests for the file on May 8, 2013, August 8, 2013 and August 13, 2013, respondent failed to promptly release the file, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1).

13. By not refunding the \$1,500 paid as advanced fees to the clients until March 12, 2014, after termination of respondent's employment in May 2013, respondent failed to refund promptly any part of a fee paid in advance that had not been earned, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent engaged in multiple acts of misconduct by failing to communicate with the clients on several occasions, failing to perform legal services competently, failing to promptly refund unearned fees and failing to release the original client file. (*Grim v. State Bar* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 21, 34.)

Additional aggravating circumstances:

Harm: As a result of respondent's misconduct, the client hired new counsel to file an I-130 petition. (*Rodgers v. State Bar* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 300, 317 [the attorney's client was compelled to hire a new attorney as a result of the attorney's failure to handle the client's matter competently, which was found to be an aggravating circumstance].) The client also did not have the benefit of an approved I-130 petition before his removal.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Additional mitigating circumstances:

No Prior Discipline: Although respondent's misconduct is serious, she was admitted to the State Bar on December 7, 1988 and has been a member for 26 years without a record of discipline. At the time of the misconduct, respondent had been practicing law for over 24 years and is, therefore, entitled to significant mitigation. (*In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr 41 [attorney's practice of law for more than 17 years considered to be mitigating even when misconduct at issue is serious].)

Pre-trial Stipulation: Respondent admitted to the misconduct and entered into this stipulation fully resolving this matter without the necessity of a trial. Respondent's cooperation will save State Bar resources. Respondent's cooperation is a mitigating factor in this resolution. (*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].)

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).)

Standard 1.7(a) further provides that, "If a member commits two or more acts of misconduct and the Standards specify different sanctions for each act, the most severe sanction must be imposed." Here, respondent has committed five separate acts of misconduct. Standard 2.5(c) provides for a reproof when an attorney fails to perform legal services or properly communicate in a single client matter. The most severe sanction applicable is found in Standard 2.15, which applies to respondent's violations of 3-700(A)(2), 3-700(D)(1) and 3-700(D)(2) and provides that suspension not exceeding three years or reproof is appropriate for violations of the rules in general.

Respondent's misconduct is aggravated by the multiple acts of misconduct, which led to the client's decision to hire a new attorney to render legal services. However, respondent is entitled to significant mitigation for her 24 years in practice with no prior discipline at the time of the misconduct. This, coupled with the fact that respondent has cooperated in entering into this stipulation, thereby demonstrating her acknowledgment of her misconduct, suggests that the current misconduct was aberrational and that respondent is willing to conform to ethical responsibilities in the future. Accordingly, in light of the mitigation present, discipline at the lower end of the range of discipline provided by Standard 2.15 is appropriate. A one-year stayed suspension and a one-year probation with conditions is an appropriate level of discipline to ensure the protection of the public, courts and legal profession; to maintain high professional standards by attorneys; and to preserve public confidence in the legal profession.

The stipulated level of discipline is consistent with Supreme Court case law. In *Van Sloten v. State Bar* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 921, an attorney in a single client matter received a six-month stayed suspension for failing to perform, communicate and properly withdraw. The attorney had failed to appear before the Review Department, which was deemed aggravating, but the Court found there were no serious consequences to the client as a result of the misconduct, and the attorney had practiced law for five and one-half years before committing misconduct.

Like the attorney in *Van Sloten*, respondent failed to render legal services competently and communicate with a client. However, respondent also failed to promptly return the client file and refund unearned fees. Although respondent has many more years in practice without a record of discipline than the attorney in *Van Sloten*, in light of the multiple acts of misconduct, a higher level of discipline is appropriate in this case.

DISMISSALS.

The parties respectfully request the Court to dismiss the following alleged violations in the interest of justice:

<u>Case No.</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Alleged Violation</u>
13-O-15151	Six	Business and Professions Code section 6106
13-O-15151	Seven	Rules of Professional Conduct rule 4-100(B)(3)

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of December 1, 2014, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$3,497.00. Respondent further acknowledges

that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from the stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the cost of further proceedings.

EXCLUSION FROM MCLE CREDIT


Pursuant to rule 3201, respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of MCLE ordered as a condition of discipline. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: SHARON ARLENE HEALEY	Case number(s): 13-O-15151
---	-------------------------------

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.

<u>12/3/14</u> Date	 Respondent's Signature	<u>Sharon A. Healey</u> Print Name
<u>12/5/14</u> Date	 Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Jamie Kim</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: SHARON ARLENE HEALEY	Case Number(s): 13-O-15151
---	-------------------------------

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.)**

12-21-14
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 San Francisco, on December 23, 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:

SHARON A. HEALEY
LAW OFFICE OF SHARON A HEALEY
9594 1ST AVE NE STE 255
SEATTLE, WA 98115

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

JAMIE J. KIM, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on December 23, 2014.



Mazie Yip
Case Administrator
State Bar Court