1

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department San Francisco ACTUAL SUSPENSION					
Counsel For The State Bar Robin Brune Senior Trial Counsel	Case Number(s): 15-0-11184-LMA	For Court use only PUBLIC MATTER			
180 Howard Street San Francisco, California 94105 (415) 538-2218		FILED			
Bar # 149481		OCT - 7 2015			
Counsel For Respondent Mary Grace Guzman Fishkin Slatter LLP 1575 Treat Blvd. Suite 215 Walnut Creek, California 94598		STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO			
(925) 944-5600	Submitted to: Settlement Judge				
Bar # 269214	STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION				
In the Matter of: MARILYN DINA WEINSTEIN					
Bar # 183748		ON REJECTED			
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 25, 1996.
- (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 **10** 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."

(Effective July 1, 2015)



- (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: (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.
- (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, p. 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) Ulinerable 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. See Attachment, p. 8.
- (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. See Attachment, p. 8.
- (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 convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13) **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances:

Prefiling Stipulation, See Attachment, p. 8.

D. Discipline:

- (1) X 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) \square **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) \boxtimes Actual Suspension:

- (a) Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of **thirty 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
 - 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:

(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.

Π

(10) The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:

Substance Abuse Conditions

Law Office Management Conditions

<u>(Do</u>	not write	above	e this line.)		
			Medical Conditions		Financial Conditions
F. (Other	· Cor	nditions Negotiated by the Parties	s:	
(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)		Cali	fornia Rules of Court, and perform the act	s speci	must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20 , fied in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 a date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
(3)		day: perf	s or more, he/she must comply with the rea	quireme and (c)	If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 ents of rule 9.20 , California Rules of Court, and of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days, Court's Order in this matter.
(4)		perie	dit for Interim Suspension [conviction r od of his/her interim suspension toward the mencement of interim suspension:	eferral e stipula	cases only]: Respondent will be credited for the ated period of actual suspension. Date of
(5)		Oth	er Conditions:		

-

.

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF:

MARILYN DINA WEINSTEIN

CASE NUMBER: 15-0-11184

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-11184 (State Bar Investigation)

FACTS:

1. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code, section 6070 and Rules of the State Bar, rules 2.50 - 2.93 respondent was required to complete 25 hours of minimum continuing legal education ("MCLE") between 2/1/11 and 1/31/14 ("compliance period").

2. On June 16, 2014, respondent reported to the State Bar under penalty of perjury that she had completed all required hours of MCLE within the compliance period. This statement was false and respondent knew it was false at the time she made it. Respondent had not actually completed any MCLE hours during the required compliance period.

3. On July 7, 2014, the State Bar notified the respondent via letter that she was selected for an audit and gave respondent until August 21, 2014 to submit proof of her MCLE compliance.

4. On August 29, 2014, the State Bar sent respondent a second letter, advising respondent that she was not in compliance and that no proof of compliance had been received by the August 21, 2014 deadline. The State Bar notified respondent she would be enrolled inactive if no proof of compliance was received by October 31, 2014.

5. On October 30, 2014, respondent provided proof of compliance of 25 hours of MCLE credit to the State Bar. Respondent's proof of compliance consisted of 25 hours of MCLE credit that she completed after the compliance period.

6. Respondent provided no explanation for her false assertion of compliance, but readily admitted to it through counsel.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

7. By falsely reporting, under penalty of perjury, to the State Bar, that she had fully complied with her MCLE requirements when respondent knew that she had failed to complete the MCLE requirements, respondent committed an act involving moral turpitude, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

7

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Harm (Std. 1.5(f)): There is significant harm to the administration of justice when an attorney lies under oath.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Discipline (Std. 1.6(a)): Respondent has been practicing law for 19 years and has no prior discipline.

Candor/Cooperation (Std. 1.6(e)): Respondent readily admitted to her misconduct.

Additional Mitigating Circumstances

Prefiling Stipulation: Respondent has entered into a stipulation as to facts and culpability prior to the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges in the above-entitled disciplinary matter, thereby saving the State Bar Court 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].)

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 applicable to respondent's misconduct is found in Standard 2.11, which provides for disbarment or actual suspension for an act of moral turpitude. Here, respondent lied under penalty of

perjury to the State Bar, stating she had completed 25 hours of MCLE when she had in fact completed none. Respondent completed the 25 hours of MCLE credit after receiving notification of the adverse audit and prior to suspension for failure to comply. In mitigation, respondent readily admitted her misconduct, has nineteen years of practice without discipline, and entered into a stipulation prior to the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. In aggravation, the public is harmed when attorneys lie under oath. "Knowingly giving false testimony on a material factual issue is a serious breach of basic standards of honesty as well as a violation of an attorney's oath of office and his duties as an attorney. Affirmative representations made with intent to deceive, even though no harm results, are grounds for discipline." Barreiro v. State Bar (1970) 2 Cal. 3d. 912, at 923. In a recent disciplinary case, the Review Department imposed a public reproval for an attorney who falsely reported her MCLE compliance. (In the Matter of Yee (2014) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 330.) In Yee, the attorney affirmed her compliance with the MCLE requirements upon the mistaken belief that she had taken a bundle of on-line classes. The attorney in Yee failed to verify her records before submitting the compliance card. The Court found that the attorney committed gross negligence arising to moral turpitude for her failure to verify her records before attesting to the MCLE compliance. The Court found no aggravation and five factors in mitigation. As distinguished from Yee, in the present case the attorney is culpable of intentional misconduct and has three, not five, mitigating factors. A one year suspension, stayed, with one year of probation, including thirty days of actual suspension, is necessary to protect the public.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of August 3, 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 <u>not</u> receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School ordered as a condition of reproval or suspension. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

9

Case number(s): 15-O-11184	
-	

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.

glulis march	Marilyn Dina Weinstein
Date Respondent's Signature	Print Name
9/11/15	Mary Grace Guzman
Date Respondent Counsel Signature	Print Name
10/5/2015 KG tome	Robin Brune
Date Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name

.

In the Matter of:	Case Number(s):
MARILYN DINA WEINSTEIN	15-O-11184

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.

Z

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.)

7,2015 Date

LUCY ARMENDARIZ

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 San Francisco, on October 7, 2015, 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 San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

MARY G. GUZMAN FISHKIN & SLATTER, LLP 1575 TREAT BLVD STE 215 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598

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

ROBIN BRUNE, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on October 7, 2015.

Mazie Yip Case Administrator State Bar Court