



ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

<b>State Bar Court of California</b> <b>Hearing Department</b> <b>Los Angeles</b> <b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b>		
<b>Counsel For The State Bar</b>  <b>Agustin Hernandez</b> <b>Senior Trial Counsel</b> <b>845 South Figueroa Street</b> <b>Los Angeles, CA 90017</b> <b>(213) 765-1713</b>  <b>Bar # 161625</b>	<b>Case Number(s):</b> <b>15-O-10312</b>	<b>For Court use only</b>   <div style="text-align: center;"> <b>FILED</b>  <b>MAY 04 2016</b>  <b>STATE BAR COURT</b>  <b>CLERK'S OFFICE</b>  <b>LOS ANGELES</b> </div>
<b>In Pro Per Respondent</b>  <b>LISA FAYE COLLINS</b> <b>2601 W. Martin Luther King Jr., Blvd. #B</b> <b>Los Angeles, CA 90008</b> <b>(323) 290-6650</b>  <b>Bar # 176655</b>	<b>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</b>  <b>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</b>  <b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	
<b>In the Matter of:</b> <b>LISA FAYE COLLINS</b>  <b>Bar # 176655</b>  <b>A Member of the State Bar of California</b> <b>(Respondent)</b>		

**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 12, 1995**.
- (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".

- (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: **two billing cycles following the effective date of the Supreme Court order.** (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 **00-O-13079; 01-O-04641. See Attachment to Stipulation at page 8.**
  - (b) ☒ Date prior discipline effective **September 3, 2004.**
  - (c) ☒ Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: **Rules 3-110(A) and 3-700(D)(2), Rules of Professional Conduct; and Business and Professions Code sections 6106, 6068(a), and 6068(m) [two counts].**
  - (d) ☒ Degree of prior discipline **two-year stayed suspension and three years of probation.**
  - (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 page 8.
- (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.
- (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

(Do not write above this line.)

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. **See Attachment to Stipulation at page 8.**
- (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:**

**Prefiling Stipulation - See 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 **two years**.
- 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 **three years**, 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:**

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

IN THE MATTER OF:                      LISA FAYE COLLINS

CASE NUMBER:                          15-O-10312

**FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.**

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that she is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

Case No. 15-O-10312 (Complainant: Muayad Yasin)

**FACTS:**

1. On May 14, 2014, Muayad Yasin ("Yasin") employed Respondent to represent him in a pending marital dissolution matter.
2. On July 25, 2014, Respondent signed Yasin's name on a declaration purportedly under penalty of perjury wherein Yasin purported to attest to the truthfulness of the contents of the declaration ("declaration"). In fact, Respondent signed Yasin's name on the declaration and Yasin did not attest to the truthfulness of the contents of the declaration.
3. On July 29, 2014, Respondent filed with the court on behalf of Yasin a response to a request for domestic violence restraining order ("response") that incorporated the declaration as an attachment. Respondent filed the response and declaration in anticipation of a hearing that was scheduled for July 31, 2014.
4. On July 29, 2014, Respondent served the response and declaration on opposing counsel.
5. At no time did Respondent advise the court or opposing counsel that Yasin had not signed the declaration.
6. On July 31, 2014, the parties entered into a full settlement agreement, and the dissolution matter was resolved without the court reviewing or relying on the declaration.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

7. By signing a declaration under penalty of perjury on behalf of a client that misrepresented that the client attested to the truthfulness of the information contained in the declaration, and by serving the declaration on opposing counsel, when Respondent knew that the client had not signed the declaration, Respondent committed an act involving moral turpitude and dishonesty, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.
8. By filing a declaration with the court on behalf of a client wherein Respondent misrepresented that the client had signed the declaration under penalty of perjury attesting to the truthfulness of the

information contained therein, when in fact Respondent had signed the client's name on the declaration, Respondent sought to mislead the judge or judicial officer by an artifice or false statement of fact or law, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(d).

### **AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**

**Prior Record of Discipline (Std. 1.5(a)):** Respondent was admitted to the practice of law on June 12, 1995, and has one imposition of prior discipline that became effective on September 3, 2004 (Case Nos. 00-O-13079 and 01-O-04641). Respondent received discipline consisting of a two-year stayed suspension with three years of probation and no actual suspension. Respondent committed misconduct in two client matters. In one case, Respondent was grossly negligent in filing several documents with the court that contained inaccurate information because Respondent failed to first conduct an appropriate inquiry as to whether the information contained these documents was true, in violation of Business and Professions Code sections 6106 and 6068(a). In another case, Respondent failed to file an answer to a complaint on behalf of a client resulting in a judgment being entered against the client. Respondent failed to perform legal services with competence, failed to inform client of significant events, failed to respond to a client's reasonable status inquiries, and failed to refund \$250 in unearned fees, in violation of rules 3-110(A) and 3-700(D)(2), Rules of Professional Conduct, and Business and Professions Code section 6068(m) (two counts). There were no aggravating circumstances. In mitigation, Respondent had no record of prior discipline, did not harm his clients, demonstrated candor and cooperation, acted in good faith, and her good character was attested to by a wide range of references.

**Multiple Acts of Wrongdoing (Std. 1.5(b)):** Respondent committed multiple acts of misconduct including signing a declaration under penalty of perjury on behalf of a client, serving the declaration on opposing counsel, and filing the declaration with the court.

### **MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**

**Extraordinary Good Character (Std. 1.6(f)):** Respondent has provided character reference letters from nine individuals who attest to Respondent's extraordinary good character. These nine individuals represent a wide range of references in the legal and general communities and they are all aware of Respondent's misconduct.

**Prefiling Stipulation:** Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into this stipulation prior to filing a notice of disciplinary charges, thereby preserving 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 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).)

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 found in Standard 2.12(a), which applies to Respondent’s violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(d). Standard 2.12(a) provides that actual suspension or disbarment is the presumed sanction when a member seeks to mislead a judge or judicial officer by an artifice or false statement of fact or law.

In addition to seeking to mislead the judge, Respondent committed an act of moral turpitude by signing a declaration under penalty of perjury on behalf of a client.

In this matter, actual suspension at the lower end of Standard 2.12(a) is appropriate. Respondent’s prior record of discipline and multiple acts of misconduct are aggravating circumstances. Respondent’s extraordinary good character and entering into a stipulation prior to filing a notice of disciplinary charges are each a mitigating factor entitled to mitigation. In consideration of the applicable Standards, the aggravating circumstances, and the mitigating circumstances, it is appropriate to follow Standard 2.12(a) and impose a two-year stayed suspension and three years of probation with conditions including 60 days of actual suspension.

The level of discipline is also consistent with case authority. In *Drociak v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1085, an attorney received discipline consisting of a one-year stayed suspension and two years of probation with conditions including 30 days of actual suspension for using a pre-signed verification when responding to discovery on behalf of a client. In aggravation, the Court found that Drociak demonstrated a pattern of misconduct because he had previously used pre-signed verifications with other clients. The Court also found that he demonstrated dishonesty and concealment, and showed no remorse for his actions. The Court also found that the pre-signed verifications posed a threat to the administration of justice. In mitigation, Drociak did not have a record of prior discipline.

Although the misconduct in this case differs from *Drociak*, the case is instructive in determining the appropriate level of discipline. In the instant case, Respondent signed the declaration at issue, while in *Drociak*, the client actually signed the verification. However, the gravamen of the misconduct is similar

in that what is at issue is the presentation of a document purportedly signed under penalty of perjury and inaccurately attesting to the truthfulness of their contents. Courts and parties to an action must be able to rely on the integrity and accuracy of documents signed under penalty of perjury. In this case and in *Drociak*, the respondents undermined the court's and public's ability to rely on the integrity and accuracy of documents signed under penalty of perjury.

This case warrants more discipline than *Drociak*. The significant difference in the two cases that supports additional discipline is that Respondent has a prior record of discipline whereas Drociak did not have a record of prior discipline. It is also significant that the prior imposition of discipline included acts of moral turpitude and it involved filing a document with the court that was inaccurate or false, like here.

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

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of March 30, 2016, 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 to be ordered as a condition of suspension. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:  
**LISA FAYE COLLINS**

Case number(s):  
**15-O-10312**

### 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.

4/20/16 Lisa Faye Collins Lisa Faye Collins  
Date Respondent's Signature Print Name

April 25, 2016 [Signature] Agustin Hernandez  
Date Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: LISA FAYE COLLINS	Case Number(s): 15-O-10312
--	-------------------------------

### 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 stipulation improperly finds aggravation based on multiple acts of misconduct. (*In the Matter of Shalant* (Review Dept. 2005) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 829, 839 [two counts of misconduct involving a single client matter do not establish aggravation on account of multiple acts of misconduct].) Thus:

1. On page 3 of the stipulation, in paragraph B(11) (Multiple Acts), the "X" in the box and the second sentence, which begins "See Attachment," are DELETED.
2. On page 8 of the stipulation, under the heading Aggravating Circumstances, the second paragraph, which begins: "Multiple Acts," is DELETED.
3. On page 9 of the stipulation, in the sixth paragraph, the second sentence, which begins: "Respondent's prior," is MODIFIED to read as follows: "Respondent's prior record of discipline is an aggravating circumstance."

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.)**

May 4, 2016

Date

W. Kearse McGill

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 May 4, 2016, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSION 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:

LISA F. COLLINS  
2601 MLK BLVD #B  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90008


Courtesy copy:

LISA FAYE COLLINS  
2601 W. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD. #B  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90008

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

Agustin Hernandez, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on May 4, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Julieta E. Gonzales  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court