

(Do not write above this line.)

**State Bar Court of California
Hearing Department
Los Angeles
REPROVAL**

ORIGINAL

<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Jamie Kim Deputy Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 765-1182</p> <p>Bar # 281574</p>	<p>Case Number(s): 15-C-13232-WKM</p> <p>PUBLIC MATTER</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <p>FILED</p> <p>APR 06 2016</p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</p>
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>Douglas Dale Holthaus 419 La Crescentia Dr. San Diego, CA 92106 (619) 225-8353</p> <p>Bar # 74560</p>	<p>Submitted to: Assigned Judge</p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p>PUBLIC REPROVAL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p>	
<p>In the Matter of: DOUGLAS DALE HOLTHAUS</p> <p>Bar # 74560</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (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 **June 28, 1977**.
- (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."



(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):
- Costs are added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline (public reproof).
 - Case ineligible for costs (private reproof).
 - Costs are to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: **three billing cycles 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.
- (9) The parties understand that:
- (a) A private reproof 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 reproof 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 reproof 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) A public reproof 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.

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

(Do not write above this line.)

- (e) If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline".
- (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.
- (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. **See attachment, page 8.**
- (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.
- (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.
- (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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 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.

Additional mitigating circumstances:

**No prior record of discipline, see attachment, page 8.
Pre-trial Stipulation, see attachment, page 8.**

D. Discipline:

- (1) **Private reproof (check applicable conditions, if any, below)**
- (a) Approved by the Court prior to initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (no public disclosure).
- (b) Approved by the Court after initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (public disclosure).

or

- (2) **Public reproof (Check applicable conditions, if any, below)**

E. Conditions Attached to Reproof:

- (1) Respondent must comply with the conditions attached to the reproof for a period of **one year**.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (2) During the condition period attached to the reproof, 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 condition period attached to the reproof. 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 the reproof during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state in each report 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 (thirty) days, that report must be submitted on the next following 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 condition period and no later than the last day of the condition period.

- (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 reproof.
- (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) 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 reproof.
 - No MPRE recommended. Reason:

- (11) The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:

(Do not write above this line.)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| <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:

Additional Reapproval Condition:

Respondent recognizes that a repeat conviction for DUI suggests an alcohol and/or drug problem that needs to be addressed before it affects respondent's legal practice. Respondent agrees to take the steps necessary to control the use of alcohol and/or drugs such that it will not affect respondent's law practice in the future. Respondent's agreement to participate in an abstinence-based self-help group (as defined herein), as a condition of discipline, is part of respondent's efforts to address such concerns.

As a condition of probation and during the period of probation respondent must attend a minimum of two (2) meetings per month of any abstinence-based self-help group of respondent's choosing, including without limitation Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, LifeRing, S.M.A.R.T., S.O.S., etc. Other self-help maintenance programs are acceptable if they include a subculture to support recovery, including abstinence-based group meetings. (See O'Conner v. Calif. (C.D. Calif. 1994) 855 F. Supp. 303 [no First Amendment violation where probationer given choice between AA and secular program.]) Respondent is encouraged, but not required, to obtain a "sponsor" during the term of participation in these meetings.

The program called "Moderation Management" is not acceptable because it is not abstinence-based and allows the participant to continue consuming alcohol.

Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and obtain written approval for the program respondent has selected prior to attending the first self-help group meeting. If respondent wants to change groups, respondent must first obtain the Office of Probation's written approval prior to attending a meeting with the new self-help group.

Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance of the meetings set forth herein with each Quarterly Report submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent may not sign as the verifier of his or her own attendance.

Respondent is encouraged, but is not required, to participate in the Lawyers' Assistance Program, to abstain from alcohol and illegal drugs, and to undergo random urinalysis testing to complement abstinence.

7. At the scene of the collision, a red Mercedes-Benz, driven by respondent, had collided with two parked vehicles, causing damage to both vehicles. Officer Jehl spoke with respondent regarding the accident. Respondent smelled of alcohol.

8. Respondent was unable to pass the field sobriety tests conducted by Officer Jehl. Respondent was thereafter placed under arrest at the scene of the accident for driving under the influence of alcohol. Respondent was taken to the San Diego County jail where a blood sample was taken for chemical testing.

9. Bio-Tox Laboratory conducted tests on respondent's blood sample and determined that respondent tested positive for being under the influence of amitriptyline, diphenhydramine, benzodiazepines and alprazolam. A test of respondent's blood sample resulted in a blood alcohol reading of .05%.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

10. The facts and circumstances surrounding respondent's conviction do not involve moral turpitude, but do involve other conduct warranting discipline.

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Harm (Std. 1.5(j)): Respondent's misconduct caused property damage to two other automobiles.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Discipline: Respondent was admitted to the practice of law on June 28, 1977. At the time of the misconduct, he had been in practice for 37 years without a record of discipline. Although respondent's misconduct is serious, respondent is entitled to significant mitigation for 37 years of discipline free practice. (*Hawes v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 587, 596 [gave attorney significant weight in mitigation for practicing law for over ten years without misconduct].)

Pretrial Stipulation: Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into this stipulation prior to trial, thereby saving State Bar time and resources. (*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].) Respondent has also acknowledged his misconduct by entering into this pretrial stipulation.

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 specified in a given standard, in addition to the factors set forth in the specific standard, consideration is to be given to the primary purpose of discipline; the mitigating and aggravating circumstances; the type of misconduct at issue; whether the client, public, legal system, or profession was harmed; and the respondent’s willingness and ability to conform to ethical responsibilities in the future. Standards 1.7(b) and (c).

The applicable Standard here is Standard 2.16(b), which provides that: “Suspension or reproof is the presumed sanction for final conviction of a misdemeanor not involving moral turpitude but involving other misconduct warranting discipline.” This Standard applies to respondent’s misdemeanor convictions, which did not involve moral turpitude. Driving under the influence of alcohol is not a crime that involves moral turpitude per se; however, driving under the influence has been held to constitute other misconduct warranting discipline. (*In re Kelley* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 487, 494.) In a criminal conviction referral proceeding, “discipline is imposed according to the gravity of the crime and the circumstances of the case.” (*In the Matter of Katz* (Review Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. State Ba Ct. Rptr. 502, 510.) The record of conviction in this matter is conclusive evidence of guilt of the crime of which the respondent was convicted. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6101.) The convicted attorney is conclusively presumed to have committed all of the acts necessary to constitute the offense. (*In re Duggan* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 416, 423.) A plea of guilty is deemed to be a conviction. (*In re Rothrock*, 1994) 25 Cal.3d 588, 589.)

In this matter, respondent pled guilty and was convicted of violating Vehicle Code section 23153(f) driving while under the combined influence of alcohol and drugs, with a prior DUI conviction within 10 years. Additionally, respondent was convicted of a violation of Vehicle Code section 23154(b) for driving with a blood alcohol concentration greater than .01% while on probation for violating Vehicle Code section 23152, a misdemeanor. This is serious misconduct as respondent was previously convicted of an alcohol related crime approximately two years before the present matter, for which he was on probation at the time of the underlying misconduct.

Respondent’s conduct is serious and warrants discipline in light of the fact that this was respondent’s second conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol. (*In re Kelley, supra*, 52 Cal.3d at 494.) Respondent’s conduct was not related to the practice of law, but was nonetheless serious as respondent’s impaired driving posed a threat of danger to him and the public. The misconduct is aggravated by the harm caused to two parked vehicles. Respondent’s misconduct is mitigated by respondent’s 37 years of discipline free practice, which indicates that the underlying misconduct was an aberration not likely to recur. The misconduct is also mitigated by this pretrial stipulation, in which respondent has acknowledged his misconduct, and which saves State Bar time and resources. On balance, the mitigation outweighs the aggravation, warranting a public reproof, which is on the lower end of the range provided for in Standard 1.6(b).

Pursuant to Standard 1.6(b), a public reproof is appropriate to protect the public, courts and legal profession; maintain high professional standards by attorneys; and preserve public confidence in the legal profession. (Std. 1.1.)

Case law supports this level of discipline. In *In re Kelley, supra*, 52 Cal.3d at 487, an attorney was convicted twice of drunk driving within a 31-month period. On the first arrest, the attorney had driven her car into an embankment and was arrested at the scene. While on probation, imposed as a result of her first drunk driving conviction, she was stopped by a police officer while driving home and eventually arrested after failing a field sobriety test. No one was injured in either of her drunken driving offenses. The Court found that the attorney's conduct did not involve moral turpitude, but rather constituted other misconduct warranting disciplinary action. Noting there had been no specific harm caused to the public or the courts, as well as the attorney's significant mitigating evidence, the Court ordered her publicly reproofed and directed her to participate in the State Bar's program on alcohol abuse.

Like the attorney in *Kelley*, respondent has been twice convicted for driving under the influence of alcohol, violated criminal probation and has mitigation. Unlike *Kelley*, respondent's misconduct caused harm to the public. The level of discipline here should be similar to the discipline in *Kelley*.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of March 2, 2016, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$2,507.00. 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, to be ordered as a condition of reproof or suspension. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: DOUGLAS DALE HOLTHAUS	Case number(s): 15-C-13232-WKM
---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------

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>3/11/14</u> Date	<u></u> Respondent's Signature	<u>Douglas Dale Holthaus</u> Print Name
<u></u> Date	<u>N/A - Pro Se / Pro Per</u> Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u></u> Print Name
<u>3/16/16</u> Date	<u></u> Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Jamie Kim</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:
DOUGLAS DALE HOLTHAUS

Case Number(s):
15-C-13232-WKM

REPROVAL ORDER

Finding that the stipulation protects the public and that the interests of Respondent will be served by any conditions attached to the reapproval, 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 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 Department are vacated.

1. On page 2, paragraph (8), the X in the box and the text "Costs are to be paid in equal amounts x x x and payable immediately." are deleted and the following costs provision is added:

"Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment. One-third of the costs must be paid with Douglas Dale Holthaus's membership fees for each of the years 2017, 2018, and 2019. If Douglas Dale Holthaus 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."

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.) **Otherwise the stipulation shall be effective 15 days after service of this order.**

Failure to comply with any conditions attached to this reapproval may constitute cause for a separate proceeding for willful breach of rule 1-110, Rules of Professional Conduct.

Date

April 6, 2016

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 April 6, 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:

DOUGLAS DALE HOLTHAUS
HOLTHAUS & ASSOCIATES
419 LA CRESCENTIA DR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92106

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

Jamie J. Kim, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on April 6, 2016.



Julieta E. Gonzales
Case Administrator
State Bar Court