

JAN 25 2016

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| In the Matter of |) | Case No.: 14-O-03864-PEM |
| |) | |
| JENNIFER MICHELE BOZEAT, |) | |
| |) | DECISION AND ORDER OF |
| Member No. 197875, |) | INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE |
| |) | ENROLLMENT |
| A Member of the State Bar. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

Respondent Jennifer Michele Bozeat (respondent) was charged with five counts of violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and the Business and Professions Code.¹ She failed to participate, either in person or through counsel, and her default was entered. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel (State Bar) filed a petition for disbarment under rule 5.85 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.²

Rule 5.85 provides the procedure to follow when an attorney fails to participate in a disciplinary proceeding after receiving adequate notice and opportunity. The rule provides that, if an attorney's default is entered for failing to respond to the notice of disciplinary charges

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all further references to section(s) refer to provisions of the Business and Professions Code.

² Unless otherwise indicated, all references to rules are to this source.

(NDC) and the attorney fails to have the default set aside or vacated within 90 days, the State Bar will file a petition requesting the court to recommend the attorney's disbarment.³

In the instant case, the court concludes that the requirements of rule 5.85 have been satisfied and, therefore, grants the petition and recommends that respondent be disbarred from the practice of law.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Respondent was admitted to practice law in California on December 2, 1998, and has been a member since then.

Procedural Requirements Have Been Satisfied

On February 23, 2015, the State Bar properly filed and served the NDC on respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to her membership records address. The NDC notified respondent that her failure to participate in the proceeding would result in a disbarment recommendation. (Rule 5.41.) A courtesy copy of the NDC was also sent to respondent by email and by regular first class mail to her membership records address. The mailings by certified mail and regular mail were returned as undeliverable.

On March 9, 2015, the State Bar telephoned respondent, informing her that an NDC had been filed. During the telephone conference, respondent provided Senior Trial Counsel Erin McKeown Joyce with a new mailing address in Washington State and a new email address. On the same day, the State Bar mailed respondent a copy of the NDC with attachments at respondent's new mailing address and email address.

On March 24, April 8 and April 14, the State Bar advised respondent, by mail and by email, to file a response to the NDC to avoid entry of default and a disbarment recommendation.

³ If the court determines that any due process requirements are not satisfied, including adequate notice to the attorney, it must deny the petition for disbarment and take other appropriate action to ensure that the matter is promptly resolved. (Rule 5.85(F)(2).)

The State Bar also telephoned respondent and left her a message regarding the same. On April 22, the State Bar sent respondent another email, urging her to file a response to the NDC.

Respondent failed to file a response to the NDC. On April 30, 2015, the State Bar properly filed and served a motion for entry of respondent's default. The motion complied with all the requirements for a default, including a supporting declaration of reasonable diligence by the State Bar senior trial counsel declaring the additional steps taken to provide notice to respondent. (Rule 5.80.) The motion also notified respondent that, if she did not timely move to set aside her default, the court would recommend her disbarment.

Respondent did not file a response to the motion, and her default was entered on May 21, 2015. The order entering the default was served on respondent at her membership records address by certified mail, return receipt requested. The court also ordered respondent's involuntary inactive enrollment as a member of the State Bar under Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (e), effective three days after service of the order. She has remained inactively enrolled since that time.

On May 26, 2015, the State Bar urged respondent, by email, to seek relief from her default.

Respondent did not seek to have her default set aside or vacated. (Rule 5.83(C)(1) [attorney has 90 days to file motion to set aside default].)

On July 29, 2015, the State Bar advised respondent, by email and certified mail, of its intent to file a petition for disbarment. On October 1, 2015, the State Bar properly filed and served the petition for disbarment on respondent at her official membership records address. As required by rule 5.85(A), the State Bar reported in the petition that: (1) there has been no contact with respondent since her default was entered; (2) there are no disciplinary matters pending

against respondent; (3) respondent has no record of prior discipline; and (4) the Client Security Fund has not paid any claims as a result of respondent's misconduct.

Respondent has not responded to the petition for disbarment or moved to set aside or vacate the default. The case was submitted for decision on November 3, 2015.

The Admitted Factual Allegations Warrant the Imposition of Discipline

Upon entry of respondent's default, the factual allegations in the NDC are deemed admitted and no further proof is required to establish the truth of such facts. (Rule 5.82.) As set forth below in greater detail, the factual allegations in the NDC support the conclusion that respondent is culpable as charged and, therefore, violated a statute, rule or court order that would warrant the imposition of discipline. (Rule 5.85(F)(1)(d).)

Case Number 14-O-03864 (Metcalf Matter)

Count 1 – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-200(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (charging and collecting an illegal fee) by charging and collecting a fee of \$500 from a client, Tim Metcalfe, when respondent was not entitled to practice law.

Count 2 – Respondent willfully violated rule 3-110(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (failure to perform legal services with competence) by failing to take any action in her client's family law matter.

Count 3 – Respondent willfully violated section 6068, subdivision (m) (failure to respond to reasonable client status inquiries and to inform client of significant development), by failing to respond to her client's status inquiries.

Count 4 – Respondent willfully violated rule 3-700(D)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (failure to return unearned fees) by failing to promptly refund any part of the \$2,500 in unearned fees upon her termination of employment on May 17, 2014.

Count 5 – Respondent willfully violated section 6068, subdivision (i) (failure to cooperate with the State Bar in a disciplinary investigation), by failing to provide a substantive response to the State Bar’s September 9 and October 8, 2014 letters.

Disbarment Is Recommended

Based on the above, the court concludes that the requirements of rule 5.85(F) have been satisfied, and respondent’s disbarment is recommended. In particular:

- (1) The NDC was properly served on respondent under rule 5.25;
- (2) Respondent had actual notice of the proceedings prior to the entry of her default, as she spoke with the State Bar on March 9, 2015; and due diligence was also used to notify respondent of the proceedings prior to and after the entry of her default;
- (3) The default was properly entered under rule 5.80; and
- (4) The factual allegations in the NDC, deemed admitted by the entry of the default, support a finding that respondent violated a statute, rule or court order that would warrant the imposition of discipline.

Despite adequate notice and opportunity, respondent failed to participate in this disciplinary proceeding. As set forth in the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, the court recommends her disbarment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Disbarment

The court recommends that respondent Jennifer Michele Bozeat, State Bar number 197875, be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of California and that her name be stricken from the roll of attorneys.

Restitution

The court also recommends that respondent be ordered to make restitution to Tim Metcalfe in the amount of \$2,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from May 17, 2014.

Any restitution owed to the Client Security Fund is enforceable as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.5, subdivisions (c) and (d).

California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20

The court also recommends that respondent be ordered to comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this proceeding.


Costs

The court further recommends that costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10, such costs being enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

In accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), the court orders Jennifer Michele Bozeat, State Bar number 197875, be involuntarily enrolled as an inactive member of the State Bar of California, effective three calendar days after the service of this decision and order. (Rule 5.111(D).)

Dated: January 25, 2016


PAT McELROY
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 January 25, 2016, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):


DECISION AND ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

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:
- JENNIFER M. BOZEAT
1809 CENTERWOOD DR SE
OLYMPIA, WA 98501
- 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:

Erin M. Joyce, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on January 25, 2016.


George Hue
Case Administrator
State Bar Court