

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION		
Counsel For The State Bar Shane C. Morrison Deputy Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 765-1000 Bar # 284115	Case Number(s): 14-O-06421; 15-O-12405	For Court use only <div style="text-align: center;"> FILED FEB 03 2016 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div>
In Pro Per Respondent Todd Albert Warshof North Park Bankruptcy 4535 30th St Ste 115 San Diego, CA 92116 (619) 315-3848 Bar # 232227	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	
In the Matter of: TODD ALBERT WARSHOF Bar # 232227 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 **November 16, 2004**.
- (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 **12** 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® 197 148 490



(Do not write above 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) 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: **three billing cycles immediately following the effective date of 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(h) & 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) **Intentional/Bad Faith/Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was dishonest, intentional, or surrounded by, or followed by bad faith.
- (3) **Misrepresentation:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, misrepresentation.
- (4) **Concealment:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, concealment.
- (5) **Overreaching:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, overreaching.
- (6) **Uncharged Violations:** Respondent's conduct involves uncharged violations of the Business and Professions Code, or the Rules of Professional Conduct.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (7) **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.
- (8) **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public, or the administration of justice.
- (9) **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (10) **Candor/Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct, or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations or proceedings.
- (11) **Multiple Acts:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing. See Attachment to Stipulation at p. 9.
- (12) **Pattern:** Respondent's current misconduct demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (13) **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution.
- (14) **Vulnerable Victim:** The victim(s) of Respondent's misconduct was/were highly vulnerable.
- (15) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standards 1.2(i) & 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 likely to recur.
- (2) **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client, the public, or the administration of justice. **See Attachment to Stipulation at p. 9.**
- (3) **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations and proceedings.
- (4) **Remorse:** Respondent promptly took objective steps demonstrating spontaneous 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 objectively 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

(Do not write above this line.)

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:

**No Prior Record of Discipline (see Attachment to Stipulation at p. 9).
Pre-Filing Stipulation (see Attachment to Stipulation at p. 9).**

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 fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general 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 **60 days**.
- i. and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.2(c)(1), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct

(Do not write above this line.)

- 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 present 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 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: .

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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.**
- 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:**

March 3, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150303	Paypal	\$49.27
March 19, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150319	Paypal	\$35.00
March 23, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150323	Paypal	\$2.64
March 27, 2015	Mesh Digital Ltd lat Paypal 150327	Paypal	\$10.17
March 27, 2015	Sparkol Limited lat Paypal 150327	Paypal	\$29.00
March 30, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150329	Paypal	\$62.03
March 30, 2015	Mesh Digital Ltd lat Paypal 150330	Paypal	\$89.99
March 30, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150330	Paypal	\$53.64
April 6, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150404	Paypal	\$5.36
April 16, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150416	Paypal	\$25.11
April 20, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150419	Paypal	\$19.71
April 20, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150419	Paypal	\$35.00
April 22, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150422	Paypal	\$35.99
April 27, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150425	Paypal	\$49.88
April 30, 2015	Paypal Inst Xfer 150430	Paypal	\$159.35
May 1, 2015	Paypal Echeck 150501	Paypal	\$71.00

3. Between June 19, 2014 and May 1, 2015, respondent deposited personal funds in respondent's CTA as follows:

<u>DATE OF DEPOSIT</u>	<u>AMT. DEPOSITED</u>	<u>FORM OF DEPOSIT</u>
June 19, 2014	\$100.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Iben256Brc)
August 26, 2014	\$200.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibeqxsqdll)
September 22, 2014	\$200.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibe8Grs5Lj)
September 23, 2014	\$300.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibe8Gs9W29)
October 27, 2014	\$200.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibetvdpmw9)
November 18, 2014	\$150.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibe5L8V5Ry)
December 1, 2014	\$200.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibe5L8V5Ry)
January 5, 2015	\$60.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibeg9Tnkke)
January 12, 2015	\$100.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibeg9Wsck7)
February 4, 2015	\$100.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibexsdkvq7)
February 12, 2015	\$2,368.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibe8J47Bd8)
February 25, 2015	\$310.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Iben4Fmrsb)
May 1, 2015	\$500.00	Electronic Transfer (Ref #Ibe2Qrdglm)

4. All of the above electronic transfers credited to respondent's CTA were transferred from either a checking, savings, or business checking account, all of which were owned by respondent.

5. There were not any client funds in respondent's CTA between June 18, 2014 and May 1, 2015. The balance in respondent's CTA on June 18, 2014 was \$7.68. All funds deposited into respondent's CTA between June 19, 2014 and May 1, 2015 were respondent's personal funds. Therefore, all payments issued from funds in respondent's CTA for the payment of personal expenses between June 18, 2014 and May 1, 2015 were paid using only respondent's personal funds.

6. On August 25, 2014, September 19, 2014, and February 3, 2015 the balance in respondent's CTA fell below zero as a result of the above payments on those respective dates. Respondent's CTA was assessed an overdraft fee on the day immediately following each of those respective payments and the State Bar was notified by Wells Fargo of insufficient funds activity in respondent's CTA in connection with each of those overdrafts.

7. On May 6, 2015, the State Bar contacted respondent regarding an investigation of the insufficient funds activity in respondent's CTA.

8. All of the insufficient funds activity was due to respondent's CTA having been linked to respondent's personal Paypal account.

9. On May 31, 2015, respondent contacted Paypal and requested respondent's CTA be unlinked from his Paypal account. On June 14, 2015, respondent received confirmation from Paypal that respondent's CTA had been unlinked from his Paypal account. On June 18, 2015, respondent provided such confirmation to the State Bar.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

10. By issuing payments from funds in respondent's CTA for the payment of personal expenses between June 18, 2014 and May 1, 2015, and by depositing funds belonging to respondent into respondent's CTA between June 19, 2014 and May 1, 2015, respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Wrongdoing (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent committed multiple acts of misconduct, namely issuing numerous payments from his CTA for the payment of personal expenses.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Lack of Harm (Std. 1.6(c)): There were no client funds in respondent's CTA at any point during the time period relevant to this misconduct herein, and therefore all CTA funds used to pay respondent's personal expenses were respondent's personal funds. Respondent's misconduct did not result in harm to any of respondent's clients, the public, or the administration of justice.

No Prior Record of Discipline: Respondent has been a member of the State Bar since November 16, 2004. Respondent had practiced law for almost 10 years without a prior record of discipline when the misconduct herein occurred. (*In the Matter of Loftus* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 80, 88.) [10 years of discipline-free practice prior to current misconduct entitled to full credit in mitigation.]

Pre-Filing Stipulation: Respondent is entitled to mitigating credit for entering into this stipulation as to facts, conclusions of law, and disposition, thereby obviating the need for trial, saving State Bar resources, and evidencing recognition of wrongdoing. (*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 sanction most applicable to respondent’s misconduct is found under Standard 2.2(a), which provides: “Actual suspension of three months is the presumed sanction for commingling...”

Standard 1.7(c) provides that, if mitigating circumstances are found, they should be considered alone and in balance with any aggravating circumstances, and if the net effect demonstrates that a lesser sanction is needed to fulfill the primary purposes of discipline, it is appropriate to impose or recommend a lesser sanction than what is otherwise specified in a given Standard. On balance, a lesser sanction is appropriate in cases of minor misconduct; where there is little or no injury to a client, the public, the legal system, or the profession; and where the record demonstrates that the member is willing and has the ability to conform to ethical responsibilities in the future.

Here, while respondent did commit multiple acts of misconduct, none of the instances of commingling involved any client funds and they did not result in harm to any of respondent’s clients, the public, the legal system, or the profession. Respondent’s misconduct is also mitigated by the fact that he had practiced law for almost 10 years without a prior record of discipline when the misconduct herein occurred. Further, upon learning of the State Bar’s investigation in this matter, respondent took objective steps to prevent future misconduct, namely unlinking his CTA from his personal Paypal account. These facts suggest that respondent’s misconduct was aberrational and indicate he is amenable to rehabilitation and conforming to ethical standards in the future.

In light of the applicable Standards, the mitigating circumstances, the limited aggravating circumstances, and respondent’s demonstrated willingness and ability to conform to ethical responsibilities in the

future, a lesser sanction than that called for in standard 2.2(a) should be imposed to fulfill the purposes of attorney discipline. Discipline consisting of one year of stayed suspension and one year of probation with conditions including 60 days of actual suspension is appropriate 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.

Case law also supports a 60 day actual suspension. In *Kelly v. State Bar* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 509, the attorney committed misconduct in two client matters in which he commingled client funds, failed to deposit client funds in trust, misappropriated client funds, and failed to promptly pay out client funds. In mitigation, the attorney had no prior discipline in 13 years of practice at the time of the misconduct, and his actions immediately after the misconduct occurred suggested an absence of deceit or wrongful intent. There were no factors cited in aggravation. The Supreme Court relied heavily on the absence of deceit, that fact that the resulting harm was not significant, and the absence of evidence suggesting a wrongful intent, and imposed a 120-day actual suspension.

Respondent's misconduct is less severe than the misconduct involved in *Kelly* because it did not involve client funds and there was no misconduct beyond commingling. As such, a less severe sanction than that imposed in *Kelly* is appropriate in the present matter.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of December 9, 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 Ethics School ordered as a condition of discipline. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: TODD ALBERT WARSHOF	Case number(s): 14-O-06421; 15-O-12405
---	--

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>1/4/16</u> Date	 Respondent's Signature	<u>Todd Albert Warshof</u> Print Name
<u> </u> Date	<u> </u> Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u> </u> Print Name
<u>1/29/16</u> Date	 Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Shane C. Morrison</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:
TODD ALBERT WARSHOF

Case Number(s):
14-O-06421; 15-O-12405

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.

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.)**

February 2, 2016
Date

Rebecca Meyer Rosenberg
REBECCA MEYER ROSENBERG, JUDGE PRO TEMPORE
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 February 3, 2016, 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:

TODD A. WARSHOF
NORTH PARK BANKRUPTCY
4535 30TH ST STE 115
SAN DIEGO, CA 92116

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

Shane C. Morrison, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on February 3, 2016.



Julieta E. Gonzales
Case Administrator
State Bar Court