## State Bar Court of California Hearing Department PUBLIC MATTER Los Angeles STAYED SUSPENSION For Court use only Counsel For The State Bar Case Number(s): 14-0-03018 Timothy G. Byer **Deputy Trial Counsel** 845 S. Figueroa Street FILED Los Angeles, CA 90017-2515 (213) 765-1325 JAN 08 2015 STATE BAR COURT Bar # 172472 CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES In Pro Per Respondent Gary A. Jackson 3950 Long Beach Blvd., Ste. 201 Long Beach, CA 90807 (562) 572-9253 Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND Bar # 168947 **DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING** in the Matter of: **GARY ALAN JACKSON** STAYED SUSPENSION; NO ACTUAL SUSPENSION PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED Bar # 168947 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 13, 1993.
- (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."

M



(Do	not wri	e above this line.)			
(5)		Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".			
(6)	Th "St	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: (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.				
Mis		luct, standards 1.2(f) & 1.5]	andards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional . Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are		
(1)		Prior record of discipline			
	(a)	☐ State Bar Court case # of pri	or case		
	(b)	☐ Date prior discipline effective	•		
	(c)	Rules of Professional Condu	ct/ State Bar Act violations:		
	(d)	Degree of prior discipline			
	(e)	If Respondent has two or mo attachment entitled "Prior Dis	re incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate scipline.		
(2)		<b>Dishonesty:</b> 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)		<b>Trust Violation:</b> 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)	$\boxtimes$	Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct. See Attachment, page 8			
(6)		<b>Lack of Cooperation:</b> 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 wri	te above this line.)				
(7)	$\boxtimes$	Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. See Attachment, page 8				
(8)		Restitution: Respondent failed to make restitution.				
(9)		No aggravating circumstances are involved.				
Ado	lition	al aggravating circumstances				
C. I	Mitig cum:	pating Circumstances [see standards 1.2(g) & 1.6]. Facts supporting mitigating stances are required.				
(1)		<b>No Prior Discipline:</b> 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)		<b>Candor/Cooperation:</b> Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings.				
(4)		<b>Remorse:</b> 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)		<b>Restitution:</b> Respondent paid \$ on in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.				
(6)		<b>Delay:</b> 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)		<b>Emotional/Physical Difficulties:</b> 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)		<b>Severe Financial Stress:</b> 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)		<b>Family Problems:</b> 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)		<b>Good Character:</b> 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)		<b>Rehabilitation:</b> 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: See Attachment, page 8 Prefiling stipulation: See Attachment, page 8	

(Do not write above this line.)				
D. Discipline:				
(1)	$\boxtimes$	Stay	ed Su	spension:
	(a)	$\boxtimes$	Res	condent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of 1 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	he above-referenced suspension is stayed.		
(2)	$\boxtimes$	Prol	oation	<b>:</b>
	Res Sup	spond oreme	ent is Court	placed on probation for a period of <b>2 years</b> , which will commence upon the effective date of the order in this matter. (See rule 9.18 California Rules of Court.)
E. <i>F</i>	Addi	tiona	al Co	nditions of Probation:
(1)	$\boxtimes$	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.		
				to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.
(5)		cond Durin in ad	itions o g the dition t	nt must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and post probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance, period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must fully with the probation monitor.

(Do n	ot write	above	this line.)			
(6)	$\boxtimes$	inqui direc	ries of the Office of Probation an	d any probation in writing relatir	dent must answer fully, promptly a monitor assigned under these co ng to whether Respondent is com	nditions which are
(7)	$\boxtimes$	Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the State Bar Ethics School, and passage of test given at the end of that session.			ride to the Office of and passage of the	
			No Ethics School recommende	d. Reason:	•	
(8)		must	ondent must comply with all con so declare under penalty of perj obation.	iditions of proba jury in conjunction	tion imposed in the underlying cri on with any quarterly report to be	minal matter and filed with the Office
(9)		The	ollowing conditions are attached	I hereto and inco	orporated:	
			Substance Abuse Conditions		Law Office Management Condi	tions
			Medical Conditions		Financial Conditions	
F. C	Othe	r Cor	nditions Negotiated by the	e Parties:		
(1)		the Cor res Ru	Multistate Professional Responsiference of Bar Examiners, to the	sibility Examinat e Office of Proba out further hea & (E), Rules of	ion: Respondent must provide p ion ("MPRE"), administered by the ation within one year. Failure to ring until passage. But see rule Procedure.	e National  pass the MPRE
(2)		Oth	er Conditions:			

#### ATTACHMENT TO

## STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

GARY ALAN JACKSON

CASE NUMBER:

14-O-03018

#### 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.

#### **FACTS:**

- 1. On December 20, 2010, Jodie Hope hired Respondent to represent her in a Workers Compensation case. On May 26, 2011, Respondent filed her application with the Workers Compensation Appeals Board ("Board"), in the case entitled *Jodie Hope v. State of California Department of Justice, et al.*, Workers Compensation Appeals Board case no. ADJ 7810019.
- 2. Respondent filed Hope's application on May 26, 2011, and attended a deposition with her on June 9, 2011. Respondent did nothing further thereafter to prosecute her case.
- 3. In 2012 Hope moved to the Sacramento, California, area, and requested that Respondent find her a doctor closer to her new address. Respondent found a physician and sent Hope the information, and offered to make an appointment for her. Hope told Respondent she approved of this doctor and asked him to make her an appointment, but Respondent failed to do so.
- 4. Instead of making an appointment with the doctor as he had offered to do, Respondent instructed his staff to designate her as a "sub out" [former] client in his office computer records and to stop forwarding mail concerning her matter to him. In fact, no substitution of attorney had been executed and mail from the Board and opposing counsel continued to be sent to Respondent.
- 5. On July 5, 2013, Hope's employer filed a Petition for Dismissal of her case and served a copy on Respondent. Respondent's office staff received it, but did not forward it to Respondent because Hope had been designated as a "sub out" client. As a consequence, there was no communication of this development to Hope.
- 6. On September 10, 2013, the Board filed a Notice of Intention to Dismiss Case in Hope's matter and served a copy on Respondent. Respondent's office staff received it, but did not forward it to Respondent because Hope had been designated as a "sub out" client. As a consequence, there was no communication of this development to Hope.
- 7. On October 21, 2013, the Board dismissed Hope's case and served a copy of the "Order Dismissing Application" on Respondent. Respondent's office staff received it, but did not forward it to Respondent because Hope had been designated as a "sub out" client. As a consequence, there was no communication of this development to Hope.

- 8. In November 2013, Hope learned that her case had been dismissed (without prejudice) due to Respondent's inactivity. Hope emailed Respondent to complain about his inattention, and Respondent sent her an email in response in which he said "as you should recall you told me to not do any further work on your case a very long time ago and that you were getting new attorney in Sacramento. Sincerely, Gary Jackson, Esq."
- 9. After Hope complained to Respondent about the dismissal of her case, Respondent did not take any steps to seek reinstatement of her case, until December 4, 2014, approximately 13 months later.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

- 10. By taking no action to prosecute Hope's application after appearing with her at her deposition on June 9, 2011; by not making an appointment for Hope with a physician in the Sacramento, California area, after telling Hope he would do so; by not executing a Substitution of Attorney prior to designating Hope as a "sub out" case in his office computer records; by not responding to the Petition for Dismissal filed by Hope's employer on July 5, 2013; by not responding to the Notice of Intention to Dismiss Case served on Respondent by the Board on September 10, 2013; and by not petitioning the Board to return Hope's application to active status upon becoming aware of the dismissal of the matter, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform with competence, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).
- 11. By failing to inform Hope that her employer had filed a Petition for Dismissal on July 5, 2013; that the Board had served on Respondent a Notice of Intention to Dismiss Case on September 10, 2013; and that the Board had dismissed her case on October 21, 2013, Respondent failed to inform his client of significant developments, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

#### AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Indifference (Std. 1.5(g)): When his client Hope informed him that his inaction had resulted in the dismissal of her matter, Respondent's response neither accepted responsibility for that result nor offered to seek to reinstate it as an active matter, but simply said "as you should recall you told me to not do any further work on your case a very long time ago and that you were getting new attorney in Sacramento. Sincerely, Gary Jackson, Esq." Respondent's email was dismissive. And, even after learning of his own responsibility for the dismissal, Respondent took no steps to rectify his errors until approximately 13 months later.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent has committed numerous acts in violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), and of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

#### MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

# Additional Mitigating Circumstances:

No Prior Discipline (Std. 1.6(a)): Although Respondent's misconduct is serious, he is entitled to mitigation for having practiced law for almost 21 years without a prior record of discipline. (In the Matter of Riordan (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41, 49.)

**Prefiling 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. (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).)

The most severe sanction applicable to Respondent's misconduct is found in Standard 2.5(c), which applies to Respondent's violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), and Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m). Standard 2.5(c) provides that reproval is appropriate for failing to perform legal services or properly communicate in a single client matter.

Respondent's reply to his client, however, when she complained that her case had been dismissed without any notice by Respondent to her of that fact, was dismissive and demonstrated indifference on his part. Because his response when Hope apprised him of the dismissal of her case (without notice to her either before or after the fact) demonstrated "indifference toward rectification or atonement for the consequences of the misconduct," an increase in the level of discipline to stayed suspension is justified.

This disposition is also in accord with case law. In *In the Matter of Riordan* (Rev. Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41), an attorney had failed to perform by not timely filing an appeal of his client's sentence, but instead filed a ninth request for an extension despite having been informed after the eighth that none further would be granted. After the attorney failed to file the appeal, the Supreme Court held him in contempt for disobeying the Court's order that he timely file the appeal, and sanctioned him \$1,000, a sanction the attorney failed to report to the State Bar. Although the Respondent in that matter

was found culpable of violating Business and Professions Code, section 6103, in addition to Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A) and Business and Professions Code, section 6068(o)(3), the court found that there was no client harm, and that his good character testimony, cooperation with the State Bar, and almost 18 years of practice without prior discipline made the lower range of the applicable standard (then-current std. 2.6) appropriate, and imposed six months of stayed suspension.

Respondent here has committed analogous misconduct by his inattention to his client's matter, and he has a similarly lengthy period of practice without a prior disciplinary record. In this case, rather than stayed suspension constituting the lower end of the applicable range per the standard, his level of discipline should exceed the level provided in Standard 2.5(c) in order to reflect the added aggravating factor of his indifference.

### COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of December 15, 2014, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$2,992.00. 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 <u>not</u> receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School ordered as a condition of reproval or suspension. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)						
In the Matter of: GARY ALAN JACKSON	Case number(s): 14-O-03018					

## 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 Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Disposition.

12/09/2014 Date	Respondent's Signature	Gary A. Jackson Print Name	
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name	,
12.16.14		Timothy G. Byer	
Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name	

(Do not write al	bove this line.)	
In the Matt	er of: LAN JACKSON	Case Number(s): 14-O-03018
<del></del>	STAYED	SUSPENSION ORDER
Finding the requested d	stipulation to be fair to the parties and the ismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GF	nat it adequately protects the public, IT IS ORDERED that the RANTED without prejudice, and:
Ø	The stipulated facts and disposition a Supreme Court.	re APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED to the
	The stipulated facts and disposition a DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to	re APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the the Supreme Court.
	All Hearing dates are vacated.	
within 15 da	ys after service of this order, is granted See rule 5.58(E) & (F). Rules of Proced	d unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved lure.) The effective date of this disposition is the effective date days after file date. (See rule 9.18(a), California Rules of
Date	- 7-15	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 January 8, 2015, 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 Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

GARY A. JACKSON JACKSON & JACKSON 3950 LONG BEACH BLVD STE 201 LONG BEACH, CA 90807

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

Timothy G. Byer, Enforcement, Los Angeles Terrie Goldade, Office of Probation, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on January 8, 2015.

ulieta E. Gonzales

Case Administrator

State Bar Court