State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angele UBLIC MATTER REPROVAL

	REPROVAL	
Counsel For The State Bar	Case Number(s): 14-0-03140	For Court use only
Erin McKeown Joyce		
Senior Trial Counsel		
845 S. Figueroa Street		
Los Angeles, California 90017 (213) 765-1397		
(210) 100-1001		FILED
		JAN 05 2015 PB
Bar # 149946		JAN 05 2015 1 D
In Pro Per Respondent		STATE BAR COURT
III FIO FEI NESPONGEN		CLERK'S OFFICE
Sheen Myong Na		LOS ANGELES
Nah Law Group APC		
1605 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 505 Los Angeles, California 90015		
(213) 384-0535		
(210, 001 0000	Submitted to: Settlement J	udge
	STIDI II ATION DE FACTS	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND
Bar # 106541	DISPOSITION AND ORDER	
In the Matter of:		
SHEEN MYONG NA		
	PUBLIC REPROVAL	
Dor # 406644	☐ PREVIOUS STIPULATION	ON REJECTED
Bar # 106541		·
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 3, 1982**.
- (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 **9** 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."

kwiktag * 183 822 061

(Do	not wri	te abo	ve 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)			t of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & (Check one option only):		
		re Ca bi (H Re Ca	osts are added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline (public proval). ase ineligible for costs (private reproval). osts are to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: three lling cycles immediately following the effective date of the Supreme Court Order in this matter. ardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 5.132, Rules of Procedure.) If espondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified by the State Bar ourt, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately. osts are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs".		
(0)	The				
(9)	ıne	part	ies understand that:		
	(a)		A private reproval imposed on a respondent as a result of a stipulation approved by the Court prior to initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, but is not disclosed in response to public inquiries and is not reported on the State Bar's web page. The record of the proceeding in which such a private reproval was imposed is not available to the public except as part of the record of any subsequent proceeding in which it is introduced as evidence of a prior record of discipline under the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.		
	(b)		A private reproval imposed on a respondent after initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.		
	(c)	\boxtimes	A public reproval imposed on a respondent is publicly available as part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.		
Mis	lggr cond uired	duct	ing Circumstances [Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional, standards 1.2(f) & 1.5]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are		
(1)	\boxtimes	Prio	r record of discipline		
	(a)	\boxtimes	State Bar Court case # of prior case nos. 12-O-12734 and 12-O-13042		
	(b)	\boxtimes	Date prior discipline effective June 19, 2013		
	(c)	\boxtimes	Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: Respondent stipulated to two counts of violating Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A), for failing to perform with competence in two separate immigration matters.		
	(d)	\boxtimes	Degree of prior discipline Private Reproval		

(Do not write above this line.)					
	(e)	☐ If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate			
	(0)	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.			
(7)		Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.			
(8)		Restitution: Respondent failed to make restitution.			
(9)		No aggravating circumstances are involved.			
Addi	itiona	al aggravating circumstances:			
	_	ating Circumstances [see standards 1.2(g) & 1.6]. Facts supporting mitigating stances 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.			

(Do n	ot wri	te above this line.)			
(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.			
(13)		No mitigating circumstances are involved.			
Addi	ition	al mitigating circumstances:			
Disp	ositi	stipulation - See page 7 of the Attachment to the Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law and on for a fuller explanation and factual basis for this mitigating circumstance.			
(1)		Private reproval (check applicable conditions, if any, below)			
	(a)	Approved by the Court prior to initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (no public disclosure).			
<u>or</u>	(b)	Approved by the Court after initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (public disclosure).			
(2)	\boxtimes	Public reproval (Check applicable conditions, if any, below)			
E. C	ond	litions Attached to Reproval:			
(1)	\boxtimes	Respondent must comply with the conditions attached to the reproval for a period of one year.			
(2)	\boxtimes	During the condition period attached to the reproval, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.			
(3)	\boxtimes	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)	\boxtimes	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.			

(Do 1	not wri	te abov	e this line.)		
(5)	⊠	July Resp Profe mus Bar (less	10, and October 10 of the condition period condent must state whether Respondent he essional Conduct, and all conditions of the talso state in each report whether there are Court and if so, the case number and current.	I attach as con reprov e any l ent stat	he Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, ned to the reproval. Under penalty of perjury, applied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of all during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent proceedings pending against him or her in the State us of that proceeding. If the first report would cover and on the next following quarter date, and cover the
		In active twen	ty (20) days before the last day of the con-	, conta dition p	ining the same information, is due no earlier than eriod and no later than the last day of the condition
(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 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 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 conditions attached to the reproval.			
(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.			
		\boxtimes	No Ethics School recommended. Reason	n:	
Res _l (See	ond Rule	ent co es Pro	ompleted State Bar Ethics School on Ma c. of the State Bar. Rule 5.135(A)).	ry 1, 20	014 in connection with Case No. 12-O-12734, et al.
(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)		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 of the effective date of the reproval.			
		⊠ı	No MPRE recommended. Reason:		
No. 1 MPR there	2-0- E ha: efore	12734 s beei do no	l, et al., since he has failed to pass the t n extended to April 30. 2015. The prote	est on ction o	of time to pass the MPRE, in connection with Case several occasions. His deadline to pass the of the public and the interests of Respondent See in the Matter of Respondent G. (Review Dept.
(11)		The f	ollowing conditions are attached hereto an	d inco	porated:
			Substance Abuse Conditions		Law Office Management Conditions
			Medical Conditions		Financial Conditions

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

SHEEN MYONG NA

CASE NUMBER:

14-0-3140

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violating the specified statute.

Case No. 14-O-3140 (Complainant: Gregorio Callejas)

- 1. In March 2009, complainant Gregorio Callejas hired Respondent for legal services related to an application for an adjustment of immigration status. Callejas paid attorney fees of \$3,500 to Respondent during the time period from March 2009 until February 2010.
- 2. Sometime in 2012, Callejas went to Respondent's office to obtain a status report on his legal matter and was told that the employee who was responsible for Callejas' matter was no longer working there. Respondent was dismissive of Callejas at the meeting, and did not provide Callejas a time table for completing the work for which he was originally hired.
 - 3. After that meeting, Callejas made no effort to contact Respondent for over 18 months.
- 4. In March 2014, Callejas returned again to Respondent's office to obtain a status report on his legal matter. At that meeting, Respondent was again dismissive of Callejas. By that point, while Respondent had ordered records related to Callejas' criminal conviction from the 1990s, he had not filed any application for an adjustment of Callejas' immigration status.
 - 5. After the March, 2014 meeting, Callejas filed a State Bar complaint against Respondent.
- 6. On September 6, 2014, after receiving the letter from the State Bar investigator in summer 2014, Respondent met with Callejas and discussed a plan to complete the legal services for which he was hired. The plan satisfied Callejas.
- 7. During their September 6, 2014 meeting, Respondent entered into a written agreement with Callejas in which Respondent secured his agreement to complete the legal services for Callejas in exchange for Callejas' agreement to withdraw his State Bar complaint.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By entering into the September 6, 2014 agreement with Callejas, whereby Callejas would withdraw this State Bar complaint in exchange for legal services, Respondent entered into an a agreement that a client would withdraw a disciplinary complaint, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 6090.5(a)(2).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Prior Discipline: Respondent has a private reproval, effective June 19, 2013, in case nos. 12-O-12734 and 12-O-13042, for two counts of violating Rule of Professional Conduct 3-110(A), failing to perform with competence, in two separate immigration matters. Respondent successfully petitioned twice for an extension of time to pass the MPRE, since he has failed the test on several occasions. His deadline to pass the MPRE has been extended to April 30, 2015.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Pre-filing Stipulation: Respondent has agreed to resolve this matter prior to the filing of formal charges. Respondent's cooperation at this early stage has saved the State Bar significant resources and time. Respondent's stipulation to the facts, culpability, and discipline is properly considered a mitigating circumstance. (*In the Matter of Spaith* (Review Dept. 1996) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 511, 521; Silva-Vidor v. State Bar (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [where mitigating 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 level of discipline for Respondent's violation of Business and Professions Code section 6090.5 (seeking an agreement to withdraw a State Bar complaint) is covered by the catch-all provision of Standard 2.15. Under Standard 2.15, "[s]uspension not to exceed three years or reproval is appropriate for a violation of a provision of the Business and Professions Code . . . not specified in these Standards."

Under Standard 1.8(a), "[i]f a member has a single prior record of discipline, the sanction must be greater than the previously imposed sanction unless the prior discipline was so remote in time and the previous misconduct was not serious enough that imposing greater discipline would be manifestly unjust." Respondent's prior private reproval is recent. Imposition of a public reproval in this matter is warranted, since the second discipline has to be greater than the first discipline, which was a private reproval.

There is no harm that can be attributed to Respondent's entry of the September 6, 2014 agreement with Callejas to withdraw his State Bar complaint.

A public reproval will be sufficient to protect the public, the courts and the legal profession; to maintain high professional standards by attorneys and to preserve public confidence in the legal profession, the primary purposes of the attorney discipline system. (Std. 1.1).

(Do not write above this line.)				
In the Matter of: SHEEN MYONG NA	Case number(s): 14-O-03140	· ·		
	SIGNATURE OF THE P	PARTIES		
By their signatures below recitations and each of the	v, the parties and their counsel, as applicable he terms and conditions of this Stipulation R	e, signify their agreement with each of the e Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Disposition.		
12/15/14	Muhi	Sheen Myong Na		
Date	Respondent's Signature	Print Name		
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name		
121514		Erin McKeown Joyce		
Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name		

, ,				
(Do not write a	above this line.)			
In the Mat SHEEN M	ter of: MYONG NA	Case Number(s): 14-O-03140		
		REPROVAL ORDER		
Finding that attached to prejudice, a	the reproval, IT IS ORDERED that	and that the interests of Respondent will be served by any conditions the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED withou		
	The stipulated facts and disposit	tion are APPROVED AND THE REPROVAL IMPOSED.		
	The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the REPROVAL IMPOSED.			
	All court dates in the Hearing De	epartment are vacated.		
within 15 day	ys after service of this order, is gra See rule 5.58(E) & (F), Rules of Pr	proved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed inted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved rocedure.) Otherwise the stipulation shall be effective 15 days after		
	omply with any conditions attacl for willful breach of rule 1-110, f	hed to this reproval may constitute cause for a separate Rules of Professional Conduct.		
1-	5-15	Janga Mott		
Date		GEORGE E. SCOTT, JUDGE PRO TEM Judge of the State Bar Court		

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on January 5, 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:

SHEEN MYONG NA
NAH LAW GROUP APC
1605 W OLYMPIC BLVD STE 505
LOS ANGELES, CA 90015

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

Erin M. Joyce, Enforcement, Los Angeles

Terrie Goldade, Probation, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on January 5, 2015.

Paul Barona

Case Administrator

State Bar Court