




ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles DISBARMENT		
Counsel For The State Bar Charles T. Calix Senior Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 765-1000 Bar # 146853	Case Number(s): 15-O-11758 - YDR 15-O-11759, and 15-H-16109	For Court use only <div style="text-align: center;"> FILED OCT 31 2016  STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div>
In Pro Per Respondent Ronald L. Bartholomew 2400 W. Coast Highway #11-205 Newport Beach, CA 92663 ((949) 466-7582 Bar # 47428	PUBLIC MATTER	
In the Matter of: RONALD LEE BARTHOLOMEW Bar # 47428 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING; ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT DISBARMENT <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	

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 **January 7, 1971**.
- (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 resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of **(13)** 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."

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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 to be awarded to the State Bar.
 - Costs are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs".
 - Costs are entirely waived.
- (9) ORDER OF INACTIVE ENROLLMENT:
The parties are aware that if this stipulation is approved, the judge will issue an order of inactive enrollment under Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), and Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, rule 5.111(D)(1).

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 **12-O-11657**.
 - (b) Date prior discipline effective **October 7, 2014**.
 - (c) Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: **Business and Professions Code section 6068(o)(2) [reportable action] amd 6090.5(a)(2) [attorney/client agreement not to file complaint]**.
 - (d) Degree of prior discipline **public reproof. See Attachment at page 10.**
 - (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) **Lack of Candor/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 at page 10.
- (12) **Pattern:** Respondent's current misconduct demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (13) **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution. See Attachment at page 10.
- (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.
- (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:

Pretrial Stipulation: See Attachment at page 10.

(Do not write above this line.)

D. Discipline: Disbarment.

E. Additional Requirements:

- (1) **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.
- (2) **Restitution:** Respondent must make restitution to _____ in the amount of \$ _____ plus 10 percent interest per year from _____. If the Client Security Fund has reimbursed _____ for all or any portion of the principal amount, respondent must pay restitution to CSF of the amount paid plus applicable interest and costs in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5. Respondent must pay the above restitution and furnish satisfactory proof of payment to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles no later than _____ days from the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this case.
- (3) **Other: Restitution: See Financial Conditions at page 6.**

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Ronald Lee Bartholomew	Case Number(s): 15-O-11758, 15-O-11759, and 15-H-16109
--	--

Financial Conditions

a. Restitution

- Respondent must pay restitution (including the principal amount, plus interest of 10% per annum) to the payee(s) listed below. If the Client Security Fund ("CSF") has reimbursed one or more of the payee(s) for all or any portion of the principal amount(s) listed below, Respondent must also pay restitution to CSF in the amount(s) paid, plus applicable interest and costs.

Payee	Principal Amount	Interest Accrues From
Ronald Gounder	\$70,000	May 31, 2013
Mansour Afram	\$30,000	June 10, 2013

- Respondent must pay above-referenced restitution and provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation not later than **one year**.

b. Installment Restitution Payments

- Respondent must pay the above-referenced restitution on the payment schedule set forth below. Respondent must provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation with each quarterly probation report, or as otherwise directed by the Office of Probation. No later than 30 days prior to the expiration of the period of probation (or period of reprobation), Respondent must make any necessary final payment(s) in order to complete the payment of restitution, including interest, in full.

Payee/CSF (as applicable)	Minimum Payment Amount	Payment Frequency

- 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.

c. Client Funds Certificate

1. If Respondent possesses client funds at any time during the period covered by a required quarterly report, Respondent must file with each required report a certificate from Respondent and/or a certified public accountant or other financial professional approved by the Office of Probation, certifying that:
- Respondent has maintained a bank account in a bank authorized to do business in the State of California, at a branch located within the State of California, and that such account is designated as a "Trust Account" or "Clients' Funds Account";

(Do not write above this line.)

b. Respondent has kept and maintained the following:

- i. A written ledger for each client on whose behalf funds are held that sets forth:
 1. the name of such client;
 2. the date, amount and source of all funds received on behalf of such client;
 3. the date, amount, payee and purpose of each disbursement made on behalf of such client; and,
 4. the current balance for such client.
- ii. a written journal for each client trust fund account that sets forth:
 1. the name of such account;
 2. the date, amount and client affected by each debit and credit; and,
 3. the current balance in such account.
- iii. all bank statements and cancelled checks for each client trust account; and,
- iv. each monthly reconciliation (balancing) of (i), (ii), and (iii), above, and if there are any differences between the monthly total balances reflected in (i), (ii), and (iii), above, the reasons for the differences.

c. Respondent has maintained a written journal of securities or other properties held for clients that specifies:

- i. each item of security and property held;
- ii. the person on whose behalf the security or property is held;
- iii. the date of receipt of the security or property;
- iv. the date of distribution of the security or property; and,
- v. the person to whom the security or property was distributed.

2. If Respondent does not possess any client funds, property or securities during the entire period covered by a report, Respondent must so state under penalty of perjury in the report filed with the Office of Probation for that reporting period. In this circumstance, Respondent need not file the accountant's certificate described above.

3. The requirements of this condition are in addition to those set forth in rule 4-100, Rules of Professional Conduct.

d. **Client Trust Accounting School**

- Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must supply to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School Client Trust Accounting School, within the same period of time, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: RONALD LEE BARTHOLOMEW
CASE NUMBERS: 15-O-11758, 15-O-11759 and 15-H-16109

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Ronald Lee Bartholomew (“Respondent”) admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

Case Nos. 15-O-11758 and 11759 (Complainants: Ronald Gounder and Mansour Afram)

FACTS:

1. Prior to May 29, 2013, Ronald Gounder (“Gounder”) and his business partner Mansour Afram (“Afram”) owned SkySet investments L.L.C. (“SkySet”).
2. On May 29, 2013, Gounder and Afram entered into a business transaction with Metro Global Corporation on behalf of SkySet.
3. On May 30, 2013, Ronald Lee Bartholomew (“Respondent”) agreed to be the escrow agent for the business transaction, to hold the escrow funds paid to him by Gounder and Afram in trust, and to return the funds once the business transaction was completed.
4. On May 31, 2013, Gounder transferred \$70,000 into Respondent’s Chase client trust account (“CTA”).
5. On June 10, 2013, Afram transferred \$30,000 into Respondent’s CTA.
6. Between June 10, 2013 and June 28, 2013, Respondent made numerous withdrawals or disbursements from the escrow funds from his CTA, and on June 28, 2013, the balance of SkySet’s funds dipped to \$102.17. Respondent did not have permission from SkySet to withdraw or disburse the escrow funds.
7. Between June 30, 2013 and April 4, 2014, Gounder, Afram, their agent or their attorney requested that Respondent refund the escrow funds to them, including but not limited to, sending an email to Respondent on February 21, 2014, requesting the return of the \$100,000. Respondent replied in an email to the agent for Gounder and Afram that his client was in control of the funds and expected his client to approve the return of the funds, which Respondent knew was false because he had withdrawn or disbursed \$99,897.83 of SkySet’s funds.
8. On April 20, 2015, the State Bar sent a letter to Respondent requesting that he respond in writing to allegations made by Gounder and Afram. On May 4, 2015, Respondent stated in a letter to the State Bar that no funds were deposited or wired into his client trust account in regard to the escrow agreement, and that Respondent had no dealings with SkySet,

which Respondent knew was false because he had received \$100,000 on behalf of SkySet and then withdrawn or disbursed \$99,897.83 of that amount.

9. Respondent has not refunded any portion of the \$70,000 to Gounder or the \$30,000 to Afram.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

10. By withdrawing or disbursing \$99,897.83 of SkySet's funds from his CTA without SkySet's consent and in violation of the terms of the escrow agreement, Respondent willfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A), which required him to hold those funds in trust in his CTA.

11. By withdrawing or disbursing \$99,897.83 of SkySet's funds from his Chase CTA without SkySet's consent and in violation of the terms of the escrow agreements, Respondent dishonestly or with gross negligence misappropriated the approximate sum of \$99,897.83, and committed an act or acts involving moral turpitude or dishonesty in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.

12. When he sent his email to the agent for Gounder and Afram dated February 21, 2014, stating his client was in control of the funds and he expected his client to approve the return of the funds when he knew or was grossly negligent in not knowing his statement was false because he had withdrawn or disbursed \$99,897.83 of SkySet's funds, Respondent committed an act involving moral turpitude or dishonesty in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.

13. When he sent the letter dated April 20, 2015 the State Bar stating that no funds were deposited or wired into his client trust account in regard to the escrow agreement and that he had no dealings with SkySet, Respondent committed an act involving moral turpitude or dishonesty in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.

Case No. 15-H-16109 (State Bar Investigation)

14. Effective October 7, 2014, Respondent stipulated to a public reproof with conditions including a one year probation, attending Ethics School, and taking and passing the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination in Case No. 12-O-11657.

15. Respondent failed to comply with conditions attached to the public reproof in State Bar Case No. 12-O-11657 as follows:

a. Respondent failed to submit to the State Bar's Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the State Bar's Ethics School and proof of passage of the test given at the end of the session by October 7, 2015; and

b. Respondent failed to submit to the State Bar's Office of Probation satisfactory proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination by October 7, 2015.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

16. By failing failed to comply with conditions attached to his public reproof in State Bar Case No. 12-O-11657, Respondent willfully violated rule 1-110, Rules of Professional Conduct.

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Prior Record of Discipline (Std. 1.5(a)): Effective October 7, 2014, Respondent stipulated to a public reproof with conditions including a one year probation, attending Ethics School, and taking and passing the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination. Respondent stipulated that on November 26, 2013, a judgment for fraud was entered against him, which he did not report to the State Bar in violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068(o)(2), and on July 5, 2012, he had sent a letter to the plaintiff in that matter requesting that the plaintiff withdraw his complaint to the State Bar in violation of Business and Professions Code section 6090.5(a)(2).

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent's failure to maintain, misappropriations, misrepresentations to his clients and the State Bar, and probation violations constitute multiple acts of misconduct.

Failure to Make Restitution (Std. 1.5(m)): Respondent has not paid any restitution of \$100,000 he misappropriated from Gounder and Afram.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Pretrial Stipulation: By entering into this stipulation, Respondent has acknowledged misconduct and is entitled to mitigation for recognition of wrongdoing and saving the State Bar significant resources and time. (*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]; *In the Matter of Spaitth* (Review Dept. 1996) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 511, 521 [where the attorney's stipulation to facts and culpability was held to be a mitigating circumstance].)

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 these matter, Respondent committed five acts of professional misconduct. Standard 1.7(a), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct ("Standards"), 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."

Standard 2.1(a) states that disbarment is the presumed sanction for intentional or dishonest misappropriation of entrusted funds or property, unless the amount misappropriated is insignificantly small or the most compelling circumstances clearly predominate, in which case actual suspension of one year is appropriate. This Standard applies to Respondent's misappropriation of the \$100,000 he held in trust for SkySet.

Respondent's misappropriation is compounded by his failure to reimburse any portion of the funds that he misappropriated, misrepresentations to his clients and the State Bar, and failure to comply with the terms and conditions of his public reproval.

Misappropriation of client funds breaches the high duty of loyalty owed to a client, violates basic notions of honesty, and endangers public confidence in the legal profession. (*Kelly v. State Bar* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 649; *McKnight v. State Bar* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1025.) Misappropriation generally warrants disbarment. (*Kelly, supra*, 45 Cal. 3d 649.) Intentional misappropriation of entrusted funds, even without a prior record of discipline, warrants disbarment in the absence of compelling mitigation. (*Kaplan v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1067, 1071-1073.)

Respondent's misconduct is extremely serious. In *Chang v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 114, an attorney who took almost \$8,000 of his client's funds as fees without the client's knowledge or permission after representing to the client that his services would be free of charge, was disbarred. The fact that Chang had no prior record of discipline and the matter was an "isolated instance of misappropriation" was of no significance to the court. (*Id.* at 128-9.) That was because he had never acknowledged his impropriety, made no effort at reimbursing his client, and displayed a lack of candor. (*Id.*) Those factors made the likelihood he would engage in other misconduct sufficiently high to warrant disbarment. (*Id.*) Respondent has demonstrated no recognition of wrongdoing and that his is willing to make misrepresentations to his former clients to avoid paying restitution and to the State Bar to avoid culpability.

As the Review Department noted in *In the Matter of Kueker* (1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 583, 596 in which an attorney misappropriated \$66,000 along with other misconduct, any showing of rehabilitation less than a full reinstatement hearing, would be insufficient "to protect the public and maintain the integrity of the profession, give the extreme seriousness of the Respondent's offenses..."

The concerns of the court apply in the present case as well. Disbarment is the only appropriate remedy to protect the public and the integrity of the profession.

In light of Respondent's misconduct in this matter, the aggravating factors including harm, multiple acts of misconduct, lack of restitution, and inability to conduct himself in accord with his probation, disbarment is necessary to protect the public, the courts, and the legal profession, help maintain high professional Standards, and preserve public confidence in the profession.

DISMISSALS.

The parties respectfully request the Court to dismiss the following alleged violations in the interest of justice:

<u>Case Nos.</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Alleged Violation</u>
15-O-11758 and 15-O-11759	Three	Business and Professions Code section 6068(a) [Failure to Comply With Laws – Breach of Fiduciary Duty]
15-O-11758 and 15-O-11759	Six	Business and Professions Code section 6068(o)(2) [Failure to Report Judgment for Fraud]

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of October 13, 2016, the prosecution costs in this matter are the approximate sum of \$6,419. 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Ronald Lee Bartholomew	Case number(s): 15-O-11758, 15-O-11759, and 15-H-16109
---	---

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>Oct 19, 2016</u> Date	<u>Ronald L. Bartholomew</u> Respondent's Signature	<u>Ronald L. Bartholomew</u> Print Name
<u>10-19-16</u> Date	<u>[Signature]</u> Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u>Charles T. Calix</u> Print Name
<u>10-19-16</u> Date	<u>[Signature]</u> Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Charles T. Calix</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Ronald Lee Bartholomew	Case Number(s): 15-O-11758, 15-O-11759, and 15-H-16109
---	---

DISBARMENT 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.
- On page 3 of the Stipulation: an "X" is inserted in the box at paragraph B.(8).
 - On page 6 of the Stipulation, at paragraph a.: delete the "X" in the second box requiring payment of restitution within one year.
 - On page 10 of the Stipulation, under "Aggravating Circumstances," "Prior Record of Discipline," line 2: "probation" is deleted, and in its place is inserted "reproval conditions period".
 - On page 10 of the Stipulation, under "Aggravating Circumstances," "Multiple Acts of Misconduct," line 2: "probation violations" is deleted, and in its place is inserted "reproval violations".
 - On page 11 of the Stipulation, sixth full paragraph, line 8: "no recognition of wrongdoing and" is deleted, and "his" is replaced with "he".
 - On page 12 of the Stipulation, first full paragraph, at line 3: "probation" is replaced with "conditions of reproval".

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.)**

Respondent is ordered transferred to involuntary inactive status pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4). Respondent's inactive enrollment will be effective three (3) calendar days after this order is served by mail and will terminate upon the effective date of the Supreme Court's order imposing discipline herein, or as provided for by rule 5.111(D)(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, or as otherwise ordered by the Supreme Court pursuant to its plenary jurisdiction.

Date

10/31/16


DONALD F. MILES
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 October 31, 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:

RONALD LEE BARTHOLOMEW
2400 W COAST HWY # 11-205
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92663

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

Charles T. Calix, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on October 31, 2016.



Angela Carpenter
Case Administrator
State Bar Court