



ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department San Francisco ACTUAL SUSPENSION		
<b>Counsel For The State Bar</b>  <b>Jonathan Ceseña</b> <b>Deputy Trial Counsel</b> <b>180 Howard Street</b> <b>San Francisco CA 94105</b> <b>(415) 538-2183</b>  <b>Bar # 289721</b>	<b>Case Number(s):</b> <b>13-O-17393-PEM</b>	<b>For Court use only</b>  <b>PUBLIC MATTER</b>  <b>FILED</b>  <b>NOV 14 2014</b>  <b>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE</b> <b>SAN FRANCISCO</b>
<b>In Pro Per Respondent</b>  <b>Steven Randall Cummings</b> <b>470 E. Herndon Ave #109</b> <b>Fresno, CA 93720</b> <b>(559) 439-9900</b>  <b>Bar # 150518</b>	<b>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</b>  <b>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND</b> <b>DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</b>  <b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</b>	
<b>In the Matter of:</b> <b>STEVEN RANDALL CUMMINGS</b>  <b>Bar # 150518</b>  <b>A Member of the State Bar of California</b> <b>(Respondent)</b>		

**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 5, 1990**.
- (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 **13** 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)



22

- (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: **two billing cycles from 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 **04-O-10426**
  - (b) ☒ Date prior discipline effective **February 23, 2005. See Attachment at page 10.**
  - (c) ☒ Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: **Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A); Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2); Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m); and Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).**
  - (d) ☒ Degree of prior discipline **Public reproof.**
  - (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (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 at page 10.**
- (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.

**Additional mitigating circumstances:**

**Pre-trial Stipulation. See Attachment at page 11.**

**D. Discipline:**

(1) ☒ **Stayed Suspension:**

(a) ☒ Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of **two 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 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 **six months**.

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:
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Law Office Management Conditions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Conditions         | <input checked="" 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 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:

- (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:**

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: <b>STEVEN RANDALL CUMMINGS</b>	Case Number(s): <b>13-O-17393-PEM</b>
---	--

## Financial Conditions

### a. Restitution

- ☐ Respondent must pay restitution (including the principal amount, plus interest of 10% per annum) to the payee(s) listed below. If the Client Security Fund ("CSF") has reimbursed one or more of the payee(s) for all or any portion of the principal amount(s) listed below, Respondent must also pay restitution to CSF in the amount(s) paid, plus applicable interest and costs.

Payee	Principal Amount	Interest Accrues From

- ☐ Respondent must pay above-referenced restitution and provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation not later than

### b. Installment Restitution Payments

- ☐ Respondent must pay the above-referenced restitution on the payment schedule set forth below. Respondent must provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation with each quarterly probation report, or as otherwise directed by the Office of Probation. No later than 30 days prior to the expiration of the period of probation (or period of reprobation), Respondent must make any necessary final payment(s) in order to complete the payment of restitution, including interest, in full.

Payee/CSF (as applicable)	Minimum Payment Amount	Payment Frequency

- ☐ 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.

### c. Client Funds Certificate

- ☐ 1. If Respondent possesses client funds at any time during the period covered by a required quarterly report, Respondent must file with each required report a certificate from Respondent and/or a certified public accountant or other financial professional approved by the Office of Probation, certifying that:
- Respondent has maintained a bank account in a bank authorized to do business in the State of California, at a branch located within the State of California, and that such account is designated as a "Trust Account" or "Clients' Funds Account";

b. Respondent has kept and maintained the following:

- i. A written ledger for each client on whose behalf funds are held that sets forth:
  1. the name of such client;
  2. the date, amount and source of all funds received on behalf of such client;
  3. the date, amount, payee and purpose of each disbursement made on behalf of such client; and,
  4. the current balance for such client.
- ii. a written journal for each client trust fund account that sets forth:
  1. the name of such account;
  2. the date, amount and client affected by each debit and credit; and,
  3. the current balance in such account.
- iii. all bank statements and cancelled checks for each client trust account; and,
- iv. each monthly reconciliation (balancing) of (i), (ii), and (iii), above, and if there are any differences between the monthly total balances reflected in (i), (ii), and (iii), above, the reasons for the differences.

c. Respondent has maintained a written journal of securities or other properties held for clients that specifies:

- i. each item of security and property held;
- ii. the person on whose behalf the security or property is held;
- iii. the date of receipt of the security or property;
- iv. the date of distribution of the security or property; and,
- v. the person to whom the security or property was distributed.

2. If Respondent does not possess any client funds, property or securities during the entire period covered by a report, Respondent must so state under penalty of perjury in the report filed with the Office of Probation for that reporting period. In this circumstance, Respondent need not file the accountant's certificate described above.

3. The requirements of this condition are in addition to those set forth in rule 4-100, Rules of Professional Conduct.

d. **Client Trust Accounting School**

- ☒ Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must supply to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School Client Trust Accounting School, within the same period of time, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.



**ATTACHMENT TO**  
**STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION**

IN THE MATTER OF:                      STEVEN RANDALL CUMMINGS

CASE NUMBER:                              13-O-17393-PEM

**FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.**

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that the facts and circumstances surrounding the offense for which he was convicted involved misconduct warranting discipline.

Case No. 13-O-17393 (State Bar Investigation)

**FACTS:**

1.        During the relevant times herein, and including the period from June 3, 2013 and until December 31, 2013, respondent maintained a client trust account at Bank of the West ("Bank of the West CTA"), account number xxxxx6860. Respondent was using his Bank of the West CTA as a personal bank account. Respondent was depositing and hiding his personal funds in his Bank of the West CTA account.
2.        Between June 3, 2013 and November 7, 2013, respondent issued, or caused to be issued, 24 electronic withdrawals, totaling approximately \$13,290, eight personal payroll deposits for services, totaling approximately \$13,143, and 64 checks, totaling approximately \$47,282, from respondent's CTA, for the payment of personal expenses, totaling 96 separate transactions.
3.        On September 27, 2013, respondent debited \$550, from his Bank of the West CTA, however respondent's Bank of the West CTA balance at the time of the insufficient funds transaction was \$330.53. This transaction resulted in an insufficient amount of \$219.47.
4.        On October 1, 2013, respondent issued check number 702 in the amount of \$200, drawn on his Bank of the West CTA, however respondent's Bank of the West CTA balance at the time of the insufficient funds transaction was \$15.03. This transaction resulted in an insufficient amount of \$184.97.
5.        On October 4, 2013, respondent attempted to debit \$550, from his Bank of the West CTA, however respondent's Bank of the West CTA balance at the time of the insufficient funds transaction was \$356.79. This transaction resulted in an insufficient amount of \$193.21.
6.        On October 7, 2013, respondent attempted to debit \$800, from his Bank of the West CTA, however respondent's Bank of the West CTA balance at the time of the insufficient funds transaction was \$321.79. This transaction resulted in an insufficient amount of \$478.21.

7. On October 11, 2013, respondent attempted to debit \$550, from his Bank of the West CTA, however respondent's Bank of the West CTA balance at the time of the insufficient funds transaction was \$485.66. This transaction resulted in an insufficient amount of \$314.34.

8. On October 30, 2013, a State Bar complaint analyst sent a letter to respondent, at his membership records address, requesting a response to the NSF items dated September 27, 2013 and October 1, 2013. Respondent did not respond.

9. On January 2, 2014, the State Bar investigator sent an initial investigative letter to respondent regarding his client trust fund activities. Respondent did not respond.

10. On January 21, 2014, the State Bar investigator sent a second investigative letter to respondent regarding his client trust fund activities. Respondent did not respond. Neither letter was returned as undeliverable.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

11. By repeatedly overdrawing his Bank of the West CTA, knowing that there was insufficient funds in the CTA to pay them, respondent committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

12. By using his Bank of the West CTA 96 times to pay personal expenses, respondent deposited or commingled funds belonging to respondent in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or words of similar import in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).

13. By failing to respond to the State Bar's letters of January 2, 2014 and January 21, 2014, respondent failed to cooperate with a State Bar Investigation, in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

#### ADDITIONAL FACTS RE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**Multiple Acts of Misconduct (standard 1.5(b)):** Respondent's conduct evidences multiple acts of misconduct. Respondent made four debits and drew one check from his Client Trust Account which resulted in five insufficient funds transactions. Respondent committed 96 instances of commingling. This demonstrates multiple acts of misconduct.

**Prior Record of Discipline (Std. 1.5(a)):** Respondent has been a member of the State Bar since December 5, 1990, and has been disciplined on one prior occasion. On February 23, 2005, respondent received a public reproof, in State Bar case number 04-O-10426, for failing to perform legal services with competence when he failed to file and pursue a wrongful discrimination lawsuit, for failing to respond to reasonable status inquiries from a client, for failing to properly withdraw from his client's case, and for failing to cooperate with a State Bar Investigation, in a single client matter.

#### ADDITIONAL FACTS RE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**Pre-trial Stipulation:** Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into a full stipulation with the Office of Chief Trial Counsel prior to trial, thereby saving State Bar Court time and resources. (*In the Matter of Downey* (Review Dept. 2009) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 151, 156; *In the Matter of Van Sickie* (Review Dept. 2006) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 980, 993-994.)

#### **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 Silvertown* (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).)

In this matter, respondent committed three acts of professional misconduct. Standard 1.7(a) requires that where a respondent “commits two or more acts of misconduct and the Standards specify different sanctions for each act, the most severe sanction must be imposed.” The most severe sanction applicable to respondent’s misconduct for presenting transactions against insufficient funds is found in Standard 2.7. Specifically, standard 2.7 provides that “Disbarment or actual suspension is appropriate for an act of moral turpitude, dishonesty, fraud, corruption or concealment of a material fact. The degree of sanction depends on the magnitude of the misconduct and the extent to which the misconduct harmed or misled the victim and related to the member’s practice of law.”

Standard 1.8(a) also applies based on respondent’s prior record of discipline. Standard 1.8(a) provides that “the sanction to be imposed in the instant matter must be greater than the previously imposed sanction unless the prior discipline was so remote in time and the misconduct was not serious enough that imposing greater discipline would be manifestly unjust.” Respondent’s prior discipline is not remote and involved client harm making the imposition of greater discipline appropriate in the instant matter.

Here, between June 3, 2013 and November 7, 2013, respondent presented one check and four debits against insufficient funds in his Bank of the West Client Trust Account and committed 96 instances of commingling demonstrating a misuse and mismanagement of his client trust account. However, there is no evidence to suggest that respondent misappropriated client funds, used client funds to pay his expenses or that a client was harmed as a result of respondent's misuse of his client trust account as a personal bank account. Thus, a period of actual suspension is appropriate under standard 2.7. In aggravation, respondent has a prior record of discipline and committed multiple acts of misconduct for his repeated mishandling of his client trust account. In mitigation, respondent has entered into this pretrial stipulation.

Accordingly, a two year stayed suspension and a two year probation with conditions including a six month actual suspension and client trust accounting school to ameliorate respondent's client trust account mismanagement, is appropriate to protect the public, the courts, and the legal profession.

#### **COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.**

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of November 7, 2014, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$7,252. 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 State Bar Ethics School. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)



(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:  
STEVEN RANDALL CUMMINGS

Case Number(s):  
13-O-17393

### 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

Nov. 14, 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 November 14, 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:  
  
STEVEN R. CUMMINGS  
470 E HERNDON AVE # 109  
FRESNO, CA 93720
- ☐ by certified mail, No. , with return receipt requested, through the United States Postal Service at , California, addressed as follows:
- ☐ by overnight mail at , California, addressed as follows:
- ☐ by fax transmission, at fax number . No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.
- ☐ By personal service by leaving the documents in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or a person having charge of the attorney's office, addressed as follows:
- ☒ by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

Jonathan Cesena, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on November 14, 2014.

  
George Hue  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court