

1 MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS LLP  
Susan L. Margolis, No. 104629  
2 Arthur L. Margolis, No. 057703  
Attorneys at Law  
3 2000 Riverside Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90039-3758  
4 Susan@margolisandmargolis.com  
5 (323) 953-8996  
6 Counsel for Respondent

**FILED**  
**APR 04 2016**  
STATE BAR COURT  
CLERK'S OFFICE  
LOS ANGELES

7  
8  
9 **THE STATE BAR COURT**  
10 **OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES**

12 **In the Matter of** ) **Case No. 15-C-14994-WKM**  
13 )  
14 **HOLLY ANNE-HUBLOU STAMM,** ) **RESPONSE TO NOTICE**  
**No. 156729** ) **OF HEARING ON CONVICTION**  
15 )  
16 **A Member of the State Bar** )

17 Respondent, HOLLY ANNE-HUBLOU STAMM, by and through her counsel, SUSAN  
18 L. MARGOLIS, responds to the Notice of Hearing on Conviction filed March 14, 2016 as  
19 follows:

20 The facts and circumstances surrounding the violations of Vehicle Code, section 23152,  
21 subdivisions (a) and (b), and Penal Code section 273a, subdivision b, involve neither moral  
22 turpitude nor other misconduct warranting discipline.

23 Respondent's violation of Vehicle Code 23152 was her first DUI, as well as her first  
24 conviction of any kind, since her admission to practice law in California on December 16, 1991.



1 In addition, Respondent has no record of prior discipline with the State Bar. The State Bar  
2 traditionally has not referred first offense misdemeanor DUI convictions for recommendation of  
3 discipline. *In the Matter of Respondent I* (Review Dept. 1993) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 260,  
4 266, n. 6. Respondent's accompanying conviction of Penal Code section 273a(b) arose solely  
5 from the fact that her child was in the car when she was stopped. The violation was unrelated to  
6 the practice of law, and her child was unharmed.

7 Respondent has assumed full responsibility for her actions and has undergone substantial  
8 rehabilitation. The violations were an aberrational, one-time occurrence. The conduct has been  
9 adequately addressed by the criminal court and, under the circumstances, does not  
10 rise to the level of misconduct warranting professional discipline in order to protect the public.  
11 *In the Matter of Jensen* (Review Dept. 2013) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 283, 288.

12 In the event it is determined that Respondent's conduct is disciplinable, then this  
13 matter should be resolved by the imposition of an admonition pursuant to Rule 5.126 of  
14 the Rules of Procedure.

15  
16 **MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS LLP**

17  
18 **March 31, 2016**

19 **By:**

  
**SUSAN L. MARGOLIS**  
**Counsel for Respondent**

