



FILED

APR 20 2016

**STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES**

PUBLIC MATTER

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

HEARING DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES

In the Matter of)	Case No.: 14-O-06314-YDR
)	
PATRICK BLANCHARD CRAWFORD,)	
)	DECISION AND ORDER OF
Member No. 176013,)	INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE
)	ENROLLMENT
<u>A Member of the State Bar.</u>)	

In this matter, respondent Patrick Blanchard Crawford (Respondent) was charged with seven counts of misconduct stemming from a single client matter. Respondent failed to participate either in person or through counsel, and his default was entered. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California (State Bar) filed a petition for disbarment under rule 5.85 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.¹

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 (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.²

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all references to rules are to this source.

² 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).)

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 this state on March 28, 1995, and has been a member since then.

Procedural Requirements Have Been Satisfied

On August 5, 2015, the State Bar properly filed and served an NDC on Respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, at his membership records address. The NDC notified Respondent that his failure to participate in the proceeding would result in a disbarment recommendation. (Rule 5.41.) The NDC was returned to the State Bar by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable.

In addition, reasonable diligence was used to notify Respondent of this proceeding. These efforts included mailing a copy of the NDC to Respondent at what the State Bar believed to be his home address, emailing a copy of the NDC to Respondent at his membership records email address, and sending a subsequent email to Respondent at his membership records email address.

Respondent failed to file a response to the NDC. On September 17, 2015, the State Bar filed and properly 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 deputy trial counsel declaring the additional steps taken to provide notice to Respondent. (Rule 5.80.) The motion also notified Respondent that if he did not timely move to set aside his default, the court would recommend his disbarment. Respondent did not file a response to the motion, and his default was entered on October 7, 2015. The order entering the default was

served on Respondent at his 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, and he has remained inactively enrolled since that time.

Respondent also did not seek to have his default set aside or vacated. (Rule 5.83(C)(1) [attorney has 90 days to file motion to set aside default].) On January 19, 2016, the State Bar filed the petition for disbarment. As required by rule 5.85(A), the State Bar reported in the petition that: (1) it has had no contact with Respondent since the default was entered; (2) Respondent has no other disciplinary matters pending; and (3) Respondent has no prior record of discipline.³ Respondent did not respond to the petition for disbarment or move to set aside or vacate the default. The case was submitted for decision on February 22, 2016.

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 No. 14-O-06314 – The Lux Medical Corporation Matter

Count One – Respondent willfully violated rule 3-110(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (failure to competently perform legal services) by failing to prepare for trial, negotiate a resolution, or take any subsequent action after filing a petition on his client's behalf.

³ The State Bar failed to indicate whether the Client Security Fund has made any payments resulting from Respondent's misconduct. (See Rule 5.85(A)(4).)

Count Two – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-100(B)(3) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (failing to account) by failing to provide his client with an accounting of the \$5,000 in advanced fees he received.

Count Three – Respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivision (i) (failing to cooperate in a disciplinary investigation) by failing to provide a substantive response to the allegations in a disciplinary investigation after being contacted by the State Bar.

Count Four – Respondent willfully violated rule 3-700(A)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (improper withdrawal) by terminating his employment without adequate notice.

Count Five – Respondent willfully violated rule 3-700(D)(1) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (failure to release file) by failing to promptly turn over his client's papers and property upon his client's request following termination of employment.

Count Six – Respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivision (j) (failure to update membership address), by failing to maintain on the official membership records of the State Bar a current office address or, if no office is maintained, the address to be used for State Bar purposes.

Count Seven – Respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivision (m) (failure to communicate significant developments), by failing to inform his client of the pending trial date.

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) reasonable diligence was used to notify Respondent of the proceedings prior to the entry of his 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 disbarment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Disbarment

The court recommends that respondent Patrick Blanchard Crawford be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of California and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys.⁴

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.

⁴ Based on the limited evidence in the record, it is not clear whether and to what extent restitution is warranted. Accordingly, this court has not included a recommendation of restitution.

ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

In accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), the court orders that Patrick Blanchard Crawford, State Bar number 176013, 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: April 18, 2016


YVETTE D. ROLAND
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 April 20, 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 Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

PATRICK BLANCHARD CRAWFORD
PATRICK CRAWFORD, CRAWFORD TAX LAW GROUP
3500 W OLIVE AVE STE 300
BURBANK, CA 91505

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

Hugh Gerard Radigan, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on April 20, 2016.



Angela Carpenter
Case Administrator
State Bar Court