

(Do not write above this line.)

**State Bar Court of California**  
**Hearing Department**  
**Los Angeles**  
**ACTUAL SUSPENSION**

**PUBLIC MATTER**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p><b>William Todd</b><br/> <b>Deputy Trial Counsel</b><br/> <b>845 South Figueroa Street</b><br/> <b>Los Angeles, California 90017</b><br/> <b>213-765-1491</b></p> <p>Bar # <b>259194</b></p> | <p>Case Number(s):<br/> <b>14-O-05179</b></p>   | <p>For Court use only</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.5em;"><b>FILED</b></p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;"><b>JUN 18 2015</b> P.B.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">STATE BAR COURT<br/> CLERK'S OFFICE<br/> LOS ANGELES</p> |
| <p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p><b>Juliet M. Oberding</b><br/> <b>120 Lincoln Drive</b><br/> <b>Sausalito, California 94965</b><br/> <b>415-465-3357</b></p> <p>Bar # <b>144776</b></p>  | <p>Submitted to: <b>Settlement Judge</b></p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND<br/> DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p><b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p> |  |
| <p>In the Matter of:<br/> <b>JULIET MONIQUE OBERDING</b></p> <p>Bar # <b>144776</b></p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California<br/> (Respondent)</p>   |   |  |

**Note: All information required by this form and any additional information which cannot be provided in the space provided, must be set forth in an attachment to this stipulation under specific headings, e.g., "Facts," "Dismissals," "Conclusions of Law," "Supporting Authority," etc.**

**A. Parties' Acknowledgments:**

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted **December 18, 1989**.
- (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."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".

(Effective January 1, 2014)



*16*

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (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: **the two billing cycles immediately following the Supreme Court order in this matter.** (Hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 5.132, Rules of Procedure.) If Respondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified by the State Bar Court, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately.
  - Costs are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs".
  - Costs are entirely waived.

**B. Aggravating Circumstances [Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standards 1.2(f) & 1.5]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.**

- (1)  **Prior record of discipline**
- (a)  State Bar Court case # of prior case
  - (b)  Date prior discipline effective
  - (c)  Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations:
  - (d)  Degree of prior discipline
  - (e)  If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.
- (2)  **Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was intentional, surrounded by, or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3)  **Trust Violation:** Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.
- (4)  **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.
- (5)  **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (6)  **Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (7)  **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. **Please see "Attachment to Stipulation," at page 8.**
- (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:**

Please see "No Prior Discipline" in "Attachment to Stipulation," at page 8.

Please see "Prefiling Stipulation" in "Attachment to Stipulation," at page 8.

**D. Discipline:**

(1)  **Stayed Suspension:**

(a)  Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of **one year**.

i.  and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.2(c)(1) Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.

ii.  and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.

iii.  and until Respondent does the following:

(b)  The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2)  **Probation:**

Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of **one year**, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 9.18, California Rules of Court)

(3)  **Actual Suspension:**

(a)  Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of **30 days**.

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

(Do not write above this line.)

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 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.**

(Do not write above this line.)

---

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:**

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

IN THE MATTER OF: JULIET MONIQUE OBERDING

CASE NUMBER: 14-O-05179

**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.

Case No. 14-O-05179 (Complainant: Amy Berg)

**FACTS:**

1. On March 27, 2012, Amy Berg ("Berg") hired Respondent to complete and file a trademark application with the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") for Berg's business name and logo. Berg paid Respondent \$1,150 for the trademark application service on May 10, 2012.
2. On June 23, 2012, Berg e-mailed Respondent for a status update on the trademark application. Respondent's e-mailed reply claimed, "everything is great." However, Respondent had yet to file Berg's trademark application with the USPTO.
3. On September 18, 2012, Berg called Respondent by telephone and left a voice message. Respondent replied by e-mail as follows: "Thanks for your call. It generally runs 6 to 9 months for a trademark. I'll let you know as soon as I hear anything." However, Respondent had yet to file Berg's trademark application with the USPTO.
4. On May 23, 2013, Berg contacted Respondent via e-mail for a progress update on Berg's trademark. Respondent's reply claimed the "USPTO is taking a lot longer processing trademarks than they (sic) have in the past." However, Respondent had yet to file Berg's trademark application with the USPTO.
5. On March 5, 2014, Berg e-mailed Respondent. Berg's e-mail read as follows:

We are just a few months away from coming up on two years in the trademark process. I'm slightly concerned. Hoping you might be able to put my mind at ease. I know originally you mentioned 6-9 months and it (sic) that lately it's been taking longer than everyone has anticipated. However I've had many others with not this lengthy experience. Wondering what might be the situation. Thanks for your time.
6. On March 6, 2014, Respondent responded to Berg's March 5, 2014 e-mail. Though Respondent had yet to file the trademark application with the USPTO, Respondent claimed the following:

The USPTO has been a lot quicker in the last year. I have trademarks currently clearing at six months. I will make sure that your trademark goes through immediately.

Please bear with me until the end of the month. If your trademark is not finalized by then I will refund your payment minus the USPTO fee.

7. On March 30, 2014, Respondent filed Berg's trademark application, the same application she had agreed to file more than two years prior.

8. On May 23, 2014, Berg reviewed the USPTO website and confirmed that Respondent filed Berg's trademark application on March 30, 2014. Berg then called the USPTO, who advised her that the March 30, 2014 filing by Respondent was a new filing that an attorney would review within three months, with approval granted within the following year.

9. On April 14, 2015, the USPTO officially registered Berg's trademark.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

10. By failing to file Berg's trademark application in the two years after Berg hired Respondent, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

11. By leading Berg to believe that Berg's trademark application was being processed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office when Respondent knew she had not yet filed the application, Respondent committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

#### AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)):** Respondent engaged in multiple acts of misconduct by failing to file Amy Berg's trademark application in a timely fashion and later misrepresenting the status of Berg's trademark application.

#### MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**No Prior Discipline:** Respondent has no prior record of discipline in the 23 years of law practice that preceded her misconduct in this matter, though the weight in mitigation is limited because the misconduct at issue is serious. (See *In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41, 49 [attorney's practice of law for more than 17 years considered to be mitigating circumstance even the misconduct at issue is serious].)

**Prefiling Stipulation:** Respondent has agreed to a pre-filing stipulation as to facts and conclusions of law, and thus has accepted responsibility for her actions while conserving State Bar Court time and resources. (See *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 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 admits to committing two 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 is Standard 2.7, which applies to Respondent’s violation(s) of Business and Professions Code section 6106. Standard 2.7 states that disbarment or suspension is appropriate for an act of moral turpitude. The precise level of discipline is dependent upon the magnitude of the misconduct and the harm to the victim.

Respondent’s misconduct here is her failure to perform by failing to file the trademark application within the two years after Berg hired Respondent. Respondent followed this by misrepresenting the status of Berg’s trademark application. However, Respondent’s misconduct is limited to a single client matter, and though Respondent did cause significant delays to Berg’s trademark application process, those delays are the extent of the harm here. Meanwhile, the absence of a prior record of discipline and Respondent’s agreement to enter a pre-filing stipulation are both mitigating factors. Therefore, the appropriate level of discipline will include a one-year suspension, stayed, with a one-year probation on condition of a 30-day actual suspension with standard conditions including Respondent’s attendance at Ethics School. Respondent must take and pass the MPRE as well. This level of discipline is consistent with the purposes of attorney discipline, which include protection of the public, the courts, and the legal profession.

Case law supports the stipulated level of discipline. In *Bach v. State Bar* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 848, the attorney made false statements to a judge by denying both knowledge of, and existence of, a lawful judicial order. The Supreme Court suspended the attorney for one year, stayed, and placed the attorney on probation for three years with actual suspension for the first 60 days of his probation.

In *In the Matter of Regan* (Review Dept. 2005) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 844, the Review Dept. held the attorney culpable for pursuing an appeal contrary to the wishes of his clients, misleading the appellate court about his clients' wishes, failing to communicate with his clients and failing to return his client's file upon request. Aggravation included multiple acts of misconduct, conduct in bad faith, significant harm to clients and a lack of insight into his misconduct, while mitigation included the attorney's 17 years of practice without prior misconduct. The court ultimately ordered 75 days of actual suspension.

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

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of May 15, 2015, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$3,066. 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:<br><b>JULIET MONIQUE OBERDING</b> | Case number(s):<br>14-O-05179 |
|---|-------------------------------|

**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.

|                             |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <u>June 4, 2015</u><br>Date | <u></u><br>Respondent's Signature         | <u>Juliet Monique Oberding</u><br>Print Name |
| <u>June 9, 2015</u><br>Date | <u></u><br>Respondent's Counsel Signature | <u>William Todd</u><br>Print Name            |
| <u>        </u><br>Date     | <u>        </u><br>Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature  | <u>        </u><br>Print Name                |

(Do not write above this line.)

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| In the Matter of:<br>JULIET MONIQUE OBERDING | Case Number(s):<br>14-O-05179 |
|--|-------------------------------|


### 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.
1. On page 1 of the Stipulation, in the bottom box on the right, "Submitted to: Settlement Judge" is deleted and in its place is inserted "Submitted to: Assigned Judge";
  2. On page 7 of the stipulation, in the first paragraph under "Facts and Conclusions of Law", "he is culpable" is deleted, and in its place is inserted "she is culpable".

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.)**

June 18, 2015  
Date

  
W. KEARSE MCGILL  
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 June 18, 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:


**JULIET M. OBERDING  
OBERDING LAW  
120 LINCOLN DR  
SAUSALITO, CA 94965**

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

**William S. Todd, Enforcement, Los Angeles**

**Terrie Goldade, Probation, Los Angeles**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on June 18, 2015.



---

Paul Barona  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court