

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department San Francisco DISBARMENT		
Counsel For The State Bar Hans I. Moore Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2183 Bar # 309685	Case Number(s): 16-N-16922-PEM PUBLIC MATTER	For Court use only FILED <i>[Signature]</i> JUL 18 2017 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO
Counsel For Respondent Scott A. Galati, Esq. 2501 Capitol Ave., Ste 201 Sacramento, CA 95816 (916) 441-6574 Bar # 170111	Submitted to: Assigned Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING; ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT DISBARMENT <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	
In the Matter of: CARY LEE PETERSEN Bar # 173406 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 **December 12, 1994**.
- (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 (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."
- (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 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 **15-O-11281-LMA [15-O-11398] (S233917). See Attachment, pages 7-8.**
- (b) ☒ Date prior discipline effective **July 23, 2016.**
- (c) ☒ Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: **Rules of Professional Conduct, rules 3-110(A), 3-700(A)(2), 3-700(D)(1), and 3-700(D)(2); Business & Professional Code section 6068(m).**
- (d) ☒ Degree of prior discipline **90-day actual suspension.**
- (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. **See Attachment, page 8.**
- (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, page 8.
- (12) ☐ **Pattern:** Respondent's current misconduct demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (13) ☒ **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution. See Attachment, page 8.
- (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, page 8.

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 **Rachael Bortolamedi** in the amount of **\$ 950** plus 10 percent interest per year from **December 24, 2014**. If the Client Security Fund has reimbursed **Rachael Bortolamedi** 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 **90 days** from the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this case.
- (3) ☒ **Other:** Respondent must make restitution to **Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru** in the amount of **\$1,500** plus 10 percent interest per year from **October 24, 2014**. If the Client Security Fund has reimbursed **Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru** for all or any portion of the principal amount, respondent must pay restitution to CSF of the amount paid plus applicable interest and costs. Restitution payments and satisfactory proof thereof shall be made to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles no later than **90 days** from the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this case.

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: Cary Lee Petersen

CASE NUMBER: 16-N-16922-PEM

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. 16-N-16922-PEM (Violation of Probation)

FACTS:

1. On March 3, 2016, respondent entered into a Stipulation of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Disposition in Case Nos. 15-O-11281-LMA and 15-O-11398. On March 3, 2016, the State Bar Court filed an Order Approving Stipulation that included the following conditions: a) pay restitution to Rachael Bortolamedi in the amount of \$950 and Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru in the amount of \$1,500, in monthly installments amounts of \$50 and \$100, respectively; b) contact the Office of Probation within 30 days from the effective date of discipline; c) notify the Membership Records Office and the Office of Probation of the State Bar of any office address or telephone number change, within 10 days of any change; d) submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10, asserting compliance with the State Bar Act, Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation; e) submit lab reports to ensure abstinence from alcohol and/or drugs; f) provide medical waivers and access to all of respondent's medical records; and g) provide the Office of Probation with monthly satisfactory proof of attendance at self-help group meetings.
2. On June 23, 2016, the Supreme Court issued an order in Case No. S233917 (hereinafter "9.20 Order"), effective July 23, 2016, ordering respondent to comply with the conditions of probation, and comply with Rule 9.20 of the Rules of Court. Specifically, respondent was required to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of the 9.20 Order. Respondent received the 9.20 Order.
3. On February 28, 2015, respondent closed his practice located at 312 Natoma Street, Suite 11, Folsom California. Thereafter, respondent failed to update his address with Membership Services of the State Bar of California.
4. On July 7, 2016, July 11, 2016, July 22, 2016, and July 26, 2016, respondent's probation deputy sent respondent courtesy e-mails reminding him of his obligation to update his mailing and e-mail addresses and telephone number with Membership Services. Respondent received the e-mails but did not update his address or telephone number with Membership Records Office.

5. On August 10, 2016, respondent submitted a non-compliant lab report to the Office of Probation. On August 11, 2016, respondent's probation deputy e-mailed respondent notifying him that the report submitted was non-compliant with the probation requirements. Respondent received the e-mail, but failed to submit a compliant report. Respondent failed to pay restitution or to file quarterly proof of restitution payments to Ms. Borola and Ms. Lemos-Sticlaru, as required by the conditions of probation. To date, respondent has not complied with these conditions.

6. Respondent was required to file a rule 9.20 compliance declaration with the State Bar Court by September 1, 2016. On September 16, 2016, respondent's probation deputy sent an email and a letter to respondent notifying him of the 9.20 requirements. Respondent received the letter, but failed to file the 9.20 compliance declaration. It was not until January 19, 2017, that respondent filed his 9.20 compliance declaration.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

7. By failing to update his official member address with Membership Records Office of the State Bar of California within 10 days of moving his office on February 28, 2015, respondent failed to comply with the requirement of section 6002.1 that he notify the State Bar of a change of address within 30 days of any change, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(j).

8. By failing to update his address with Membership Records Office of the State Bar of California upon moving his office on February 28, 2015, by failing to pay restitution to his clients, Rachael Bortolamedi and Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru, by failing to file proof of payment in his quarterly reports, and by failing to file lab reports in compliance with the probation conditions, respondent willfully violated the conditions attached to his disciplinary probation in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(k).

9. By failing to file a declaration in compliance with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20 in conformity with the requirements of 9.20(c) with the clerk of the State Bar Court by September 1, 2016, as required by Supreme Court order in case no. S233917, respondent failed to file a compliance declaration, in willful violation of rule 9.20.

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES

Prior Record of Discipline (Std. 1.5(a)): Respondent has one prior record of discipline in Case Nos. 15-O-11281-LMA [15-O-11398], effective July 23, 2016 (S233917). Respondent stipulated to an actual suspension of 90 days for the following violations: In Case No. 15-O-11281, 1) failure to perform with competence, in violation of rule 3-110(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 2) improper withdrawal from employment, in violation of rule 3-700(A)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 3) failure to refund unearned fees, in violation of rule 3-700(D)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 4) failure to inform client of significant developments, in violation of section 6068(m) of the Business and Professions Code; In Case No. 15-O-11398, 5) failure to perform with competence, in violation of rule 3-110(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 6) improper withdrawal from employment, in violation of rule 3-700(A)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 7) failure to refund unearned fees, in violation of rule 3-700(D)(2) of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 8) failure to inform client of significant developments, in violation of section 6068(m) of the Business and Professions Code; and, 9) failure to release a client file, in violation of rule 3-700(D)(1) of the Rules of Professional Conduct. In mitigation,

respondent had no prior record of discipline and entered into a pretrial stipulation. In aggravation, respondent committed multiple acts of misconduct and failed to make restitution.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent's separate acts of misconduct represent multiple acts of misconduct.

Indifference Toward Rectification or Atonement for the Consequences of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(k)): Respondent's continued failure to update his address or come into compliance with his probation conditions demonstrates indifference toward rectification.

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE 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. (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]; *In the Matter of Spaith* (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 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 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 failed to comply with multiple conditions of probation and violated rule 9.20. Standard 2.14 states that “[a]ctual suspension is the presumed sanction for failing to comply with a condition of discipline.” Standard 1.8(a) also applies because respondent has one prior record of discipline. Standard 1.8(a) states that “[i]f a member has single prior record of discipline, the sanction must be greater than the previously imposed sanction unless the prior discipline was so remote in time and the previous misconduct was not serious enough that imposing greater discipline would be manifestly unjust.” Because respondent’s prior misconduct was serious and recent, discipline higher than a 90-day actual suspension is warranted.

To determine the appropriate level of discipline, consideration must also be given to the aggravating and mitigating circumstances. In aggravation, respondent has a prior record of discipline. Additionally, respondent committed multiple acts of misconduct and demonstrated indifference toward rectification or atonement for the consequences of misconduct. Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into a pretrial settlement.

Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court states in pertinent part: “A suspended member’s willful failure to comply with the provisions of this rule constitutes a cause for disbarment or suspension.”

Disbarment is the appropriate sanction for a violation of rule 9.20. (See *Barnham v. State Bar* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 104, 111 [Disbarment is warranted when an attorney demonstrates an “unwillingness or inability” to comply with professional standards]; *Bercovich v. State Bar* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 116, 131 [“...disbarment is generally the appropriate sanction for a willful violation of rule 955 [now 9.20].”]; see generally, *Lydon v. State Bar* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1181, 1187; *Powers v. State Bar* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 337 [Attorneys are typically disbarred merely for *passively* failing to file a rule 9.20 compliance declaration even when there are no clients to notify].)

In light of the respondent’s ongoing misconduct, aggravation and lack of compelling mitigation, disbarment is appropriate.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of June 2, 2017, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$2,629. 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 costs of further proceedings.




(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:
CARY LEE PETERSEN

Case number(s):
16-N-16922-PEM

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.

6/22/17		Cary Lee Petersen
Date	Respondent's Signature	Print Name
6/28/17		Scott A. Galati, Esq.
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
7/5/17		Hans I. Moore
Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: Cary Lee Petersen	Case Number(s): 16-N-16922-PEM
--	-----------------------------------

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.

1. On p. 2, par. B. (1)(d) Degree of prior discipline: Add "one-year stayed suspension, three-year probation, and" to "90-day actual suspension."

2. On p. 6, first paragraph, first line:

- Change "she" to "he";
- Delete "the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct" and place in its stead "California Rules of Court, rule 9.20."

3. On p. 6, delete the heading "(Violation of Probation)" as this is not a probation violation matter. It is an "N" proceeding (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rules 5.330-5.337). Accordingly, the nature of this special proceeding involves solely on respondent's failure to comply with the California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and not his probation violations.

4. On p. 7, under Conclusions of Law, delete paragraphs 7 and 8, regarding respondent's violations of Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivisions (j) and (k). These two charges are hereby dismissed without prejudice because they are inapplicable in an N proceeding.

5. On p. 9, first paragraph, delete:

- "failed to comply with multiple conditions of probation and";
- The sentence beginning Standard 2.14 since this is inapplicable.

(Do not write above this line.)

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 Cary Lee Peterson 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

July 18, 2017

PAT E. MCELROY
Judge of the State Bar Court

S233917

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

**SUPREME COURT
FILED**

En Banc

JUN 23 2016

In re CARY LEE PETERSEN on Discipline

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

Deputy

The court orders that Cary Lee Petersen, State Bar Number 173406, is suspended from the practice of law in California for one year, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and he is placed on probation for three years subject to the following conditions:

1. Cary Lee Petersen is suspended from the practice of law for the first 90 days of probation;
2. Cary Lee Petersen must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on March 3, 2016; and
3. At the expiration of the period of probation, if Cary Lee Petersen has complied with all conditions of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

Cary Lee Petersen must also take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order and provide satisfactory proof of such passage to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles within the same period. Failure to do so may result in suspension. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.10(b).)

Cary Lee Petersen must also comply with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, 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 this order. Failure to do so may result in disbarment or suspension.

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 his membership fees for each of the years 2017, 2018, and 2019. If Cary Lee Petersen 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.

I, Frank A. McGuire, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of California, do hereby certify that the preceding is a true copy of an order of this Court as shown by the records of my office.

Witness my hand and the seal of the Court this

day of JUN 23 2016 20
Clerk

By: 

CANTIL-SAKAUYE

Chief Justice

EXHIBIT

tabbies

244 688 700



ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department San Francisco ACTUAL SUSPENSION		
Counsel For The State Bar Robert A. Henderson Supervising Senior Trial Counsel 180 Howard St. San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2385 Bar # 173205	Case Number(s): 15-O-11281-LMA 15-O-11398	For Court use only PUBLIC MATTER FILED MAR 03 2016 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO
Counsel For Respondent Scott A. Galati DayZen LLC 2501 Capitol Ave., Suite 201 Sacramento, CA 95816 (916) 441-6574 Bar # 170111	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	
In the Matter of: CARY LEE PETERSEN Bar # 173406 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 December 12, 1994.
- (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 15 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):
- ☐ 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: **three billing cycles following the effective date of the discipline.** (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.

(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 p. 13.
- (12) ☐ **Pattern:** Respondent's current misconduct demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (13) ☒ **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution. See Attachment to Stipulation at p. 13.
- (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 convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13) ☐ **No mitigating circumstances are involved.**

Additional mitigating circumstances:

Pre-trial Stipulation - See Attachment to Stipulation at p. 13.

No Prior Record of Discipline - See Attachment to Stipulation at p. 13.

D. Discipline:

- (1) ☒ **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) ☒ **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 **90-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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Law Office Management Conditions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Conditions | <input checked="" 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:**

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: CARY LEE PETERSEN	Case Number(s): 15-O-11281-LMA 15-O-11398
---	---

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
Rachael Bortolamedi	\$960	December 24, 2014
Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru	\$1,500	October 24, 2014

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

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
Rachael Bortolamedi	\$50	Monthly
Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru	\$100	Monthly

- ☒ 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: CARY LEE PETERSEN	Case Number(s): 15-O-11281-LMA 15-O-11398
---	---

Substance Abuse Conditions

- a. ☒ Respondent must abstain from use of any alcoholic beverages, and shall not use or possess any narcotics, dangerous or restricted drugs, controlled substances, marijuana, or associated paraphernalia, except with a valid prescription.
- b. ☒ Respondent must attend at least four meetings per month of:

- ☒ Alcoholics Anonymous
- ☐ Narcotics Anonymous
- ☐ The Other Bar
- ☐ Other program

As a separate reporting requirement, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance during each month, on or before the tenth (10th) day of the following month, during the condition or probation period.

- c. ☒ Respondent must select a license medical laboratory approved by the Office of Probation. Respondent must furnish to the laboratory blood and/or urine samples as may be required to show that Respondent has abstained from alcohol and/or drugs. The samples must be furnished to the laboratory in such a manner as may be specified by the laboratory to ensure specimen integrity. Respondent must cause the laboratory to provide to the Office of Probation, at the Respondent's expense, a screening report on or before the tenth day of each month of the condition or probation period, containing an analysis of Respondent's blood and/or urine obtained not more than ten (10) days previously.
- d. ☒ Respondent must maintain with the Office of Probation a current address and a current telephone number at which Respondent can be reached. Respondent must return any call from the Office of Probation concerning testing of Respondent's blood or urine within twelve (12) hours. For good cause, the Office of Probation may require Respondent to deliver Respondent's urine and/or blood sample(s) for additional reports to the laboratory described above no later than six hours after actual notice to Respondent that the Office of Probation requires an additional screening report.
- e. ☒ Upon the request of the Office of Probation, Respondent must provide the Office of Probation with medical waivers and access to all of Respondent's medical records. Revocation of any medical waiver is a violation of this condition. Any medical records obtained by the Office of Probation are confidential and no information concerning them or their contents will be given to anyone except members of the Office of Probation, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel, and the State Bar Court who are directly involved with maintaining, enforcing or adjudicating this condition.

Other:

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: CARY LEE PETERSEN

CASE NUMBERS: 15-O-11281-LMA [15-O-11398]

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

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 No. 15-O-11281 (Complainant: Rachael Bortolamedi)

FACTS:

1. In 2014, respondent suffered some memory loss and sought medical attention. He was diagnosed with "trans global amnesia" which was triggered by high blood pressure. He was also suffering from depression. Respondent was taking antidepressant medications and self-medicating with alcohol. By October 2014, respondent's medical and alcohol issues were acute and prevented him from providing legal services.
2. On December 24, 2014, Rachael Bortolamedi ("Bortolamedi") hired respondent to represent her in dissolution of marriage. At this time Bortolamedi paid respondent \$950 in advance fees.
3. Between December 24, 2014 and January 20, 2015, Bortolamedi made multiple attempts to communicate with respondent, regarding the dissolution, by text and voicemail. Respondent received these messages, but did not respond in any way.
4. As of January 20, 2015, respondent had abandoned Bortolamedi's matter. Respondent did not provide Bortolamedi any notice that he had acute medical and alcohol abuse issues, which prevented him from performing legal services. As of January 20, 2015, respondent had effectively abandoned Bortolamedi's matter.
5. In February 2015, respondent closed his practice at 312 Natoma Street, Suite 11, Folsom California. Respondent did not notify Bortolamedi that he had closed his practice, nor did he provide her with new contact information.
6. In October 2015, Bortolamedi demanded a full refund of the fees paid, which was sent to the last known address for respondent.
7. Respondent did not provide any legal service to Bortolamedi and has earned none of the advanced fees.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

8. By failing to file a petition for dissolution of marriage on behalf of Bortolamedi and by failing to take any legal action whatsoever on behalf of Bortolamedi, respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

9. By constructively terminating respondent's employment on January 20, 2015 without notifying Bortolamedi, and by vacating his law office in February 2015 without providing Bortolamedi new contact information, respondent willfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2).

10. By failing to refund the \$950 to Bortolamedi, respondent failed to refund promptly, upon respondent's termination of employment the unearned fees, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

11. By failing to inform Bortolamedi that he had serious issues which precluded his working on the dissolution of marriage, that he had not filed the dissolution of marriage and that he had moved his office, respondent willfully failed to inform his client of significant developments in a matter in which respondent had agreed to provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

Case No. 15-O-11398 (Complainant: Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru)

FACTS:

12. In 2014, respondent suffered some memory loss and sought medical attention. He was diagnosed with "trans global amnesia" which was triggered by high blood pressure. He was also suffering from depression. Respondent was taking antidepressant medications and self-medicating with alcohol. By October 2014, respondent's medical and alcohol issues were acute and prevented him from providing legal services.

13. On October 24, 2014, Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru ("Lemos-Sticlaru") hired respondent to represent her in a limited scope family law issue and paid respondent \$1,500 in advance fees. Specifically, respondent was to file child custody and visitation documents with the court in *In the matter of Sticlaru*, Siskiyou County Superior Court case no. SC CV FL 11-0000139. Lemos-Sticlaru provided respondent with her family law file, up to that date, for use in the child custody and visitation issue.

14. Between October 24, 2014 and January 9, 2015, Lemos-Sticlaru made multiple attempts to communicate with respondent, regarding the dissolution, by text and voicemail. Respondent received these messages, but did not respond in any way.

15. From October 24, 2014 to January 9, 2015, respondent failed to take any action on the family law matter.

16. On January 9, 2015, Lemos-Sticlaru sent a text and also wrote a letter to respondent, terminating respondent's services and requesting her file and a full refund. Respondent received these messages, but did not reply.

17. As of January 9, 2015, respondent had abandoned Lemos-Sticlaru's matter. Respondent did not provide Lemos-Sticlaru any notice that he had acute medical and alcohol abuse issues, which prevented him from performing legal services. As of January 9, 2015, respondent had effectively abandoned Lemos-Sticlaru's matter.

18. On January 19, 2015, Lemos-Sticlaru sent a 2nd letter to respondent requesting her file and a full refund. Respondent received this letter, but did not reply.

19. In February 2015, respondent closed his practice at 312 Natoma Street, Suite 11, Folsom California. Respondent did not notify Lemos-Sticlaru that he had closed his practice, nor did he provide her with new contact information.

20. On April 23, 2015, respondent admitted that Lemos-Sticlaru was owed a full refund. To date no refund of the advance fees has been made.

21. The file was returned to Lemos-Sticlaru sometime after May 6, 2015.

22. Respondent did not provide any legal service to Lemos-Sticlaru and has earned none of the advanced fees.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

23. By failing to file child custody and visitation documents with the court in *In the matter of Sticlaru*, Siskiyou County Superior Court case no. SC CV FL 11-0000139 and by failing to take any legal action whatsoever on behalf of Lemos-Sticlaru, respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

24. By constructively terminating respondent's employment on January 9, 2015 without notifying Lemos-Sticlaru, and by vacating his law office in February 2015 without providing Lemos-Sticlaru new contact information, respondent willfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2).

25. By failing to refund the \$1,500 to Lemos-Sticlaru, respondent failed to refund promptly, upon respondent's termination of employment the unearned fees, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

26. By failing to inform Lemos-Sticlaru that he had serious issues which precluded his working on the dissolution of marriage, that he had not filed the child custody and visitation documents and that he had moved his office, respondent willfully failed to inform his client of significant developments in a matter in which respondent had agreed to provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

27. By failing to return the client file to Lemos-Sticlaru until sometime after May 6, 2015, respondent failed to promptly return a client file after termination of employment in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent's nine violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and State Bar Act represent multiple acts of misconduct.

Failure to Make Restitution (Std. 1.5(i)): Respondent's failure to refund the unearned fees is an aggravating factor.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Discipline: Respondent was admitted to practice in December 1994, and has no prior record of discipline. Respondent is entitled to mitigation credit for no prior discipline, even where the underlying conduct is found to be serious or significant. (*In the Matter of Stamper* (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 96, 106, fn.13; *In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41, 49.)

Pretrial Stipulation: Respondent has entered into a full stipulation. Respondent is entitled to mitigation for cooperating with the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel prior to trial, thereby saving the State Bar Court time and resources. In addition, by entering into this stipulation, respondent has acknowledged his misconduct and accepted responsibility for his actions. (*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 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 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 has committed multiple 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 violation(s) of 3-110(A) and 3-700, is found in Standard 2.7, which states:

(b) Actual suspension is the presumed sanction for performance, communication, or withdrawal violations in multiple client matters, not demonstrating habitual disregard of client interests.

Therefore an actual suspension is suggested.

Case law supports an actual suspension. In *Harris v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 1082, the Supreme Court suspended an attorney for 90 days for abandoning a single client. The Court noted that: "In cases involving the failure to perform services diligently, we have not hesitated to impose an actual suspension even greater than that recommended in this case." (*Layton v. State Bar, supra*, 50 Cal.3d at p. 904, and cases cited therein.)" (*Harris v. State Bar, supra* 51 Cal.3d 1082, at p. 1088.)

In the current matter, respondent has abandoned two clients has the aggravating factors of failure to pay restitution and multiple acts and is currently entitled to minimal mitigation for having no prior record of discipline and entering into a pretrial stipulation. On balance the need to protect respondent's clients requires a 90 day actual suspension.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of February 19, 2016, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$4,572. 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, State Bar Client Trust Accounting School, and/or any other educational course(s) 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:
CARY LEE PETERSEN

Case number(s):
15-O-11281-LMA
15-O-11398

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>2/23/2016</u>		Cary L. Petersen
Date	Respondent's Signature	Print Name
<u>2/23/2016</u>		Scott A. Galati
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
<u>2/26/16</u>		Robert A. Henderson
Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:
CARY LEE PETERSEN

Case Number(s):
15-O-11281-LMA
(15-O-11398)

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.

1. On page one of the Stipulation, in the lower right box, "Submitted to: Settlement Judge" is deleted and in its place is inserted "Submitted to: Assigned Judge."

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.)

March 3, 2016
Date


LUCY ARIZENDARIZ
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 San Francisco, on March 3, 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 San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

SCOTT A. GALATI
DAYZEN LLC
2501 CAPITOL AVE
STE 201
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

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

ROBERT A. HENDERSON, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on March 3, 2016.



Bernadette Molina
Case Administrator
State Bar Court

FILED

FEB 08 2016

**STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO**

1 Scott A. Galati, No. 170111
2 2501 Capitol Avenue, Suite 201
3 Sacramento, California 95816

4 (916) 441-6574

5 Attorney for Respondent Cary Lee Petersen

6 **RECEIVED**

7 **JAN 25 2016**

8 **STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
9 SAN FRANCISCO**

STATE BAR COURT

HEARING DEPARTMENT - SAN FRANCISCO

10 In the Matter of:

Case Nos.: 15-O-11281 [15-O-11398]

11 CARY LEE PETERSEN,
12 No. 173406,

**RESPONDENT CARY LEE PETERSEN
PROPOSED ANSWER TO NOTICE OF
DISCIPLINARY CHARGES**

13 A Member of the State Bar

14 COMES NOW the Respondent, Cary Lee Petersen, for himself alone and in answering the
15 allegations of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges on file herein, affirms, denies, and alleges as
16 follows:
17


18 Respondent Cary Lee Petersen admits to each and every allegation of Paragraph 1 of the
19 Notice of Disciplinary Charges.

20 With respect to Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and Counts One, Two, Three, Four,
21 Five Six, Seven, Eight, and Nine of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges, Respondent Cary Lee
22 Petersen, based on information and belief, denies, both generally and specifically, each, every and all
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 and each and every Count
2 contained therein.

3
4 WHEREFORE, Respondent Cary Lee Petersen prays the Notice of Disciplinary Charges be
5 dismissed.
6

7
8 DATED: January 21, 2016

9 
Scott A. Galati, Attorney For Respondent

10
11 **VERIFICATION**

12 I, Cary Lee Petersen, am the Respondent in the above-entitled action. I have read the
13 foregoing and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those
14 matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be
15 true.
16

17
18 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this
19 declaration was executed at Sacramento, California.
20

21
22
23
24 Dated: January 21, 2016

25 By: 
Respondent Cary Lee Petersen
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action.

I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurred; my business/residence address is: ADDRESS OF PERSON SERVING PAPERS.

On January 21, 2016 I served the foregoing document(s) described as: **NOTICE OF MOTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF CARY LEE PETERSEN and EXHIBIT A**, to the following parties:

**State Bar of California
Office of Chief Trial Counsel
Robert A. Henderson
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, California 94105-1639**

☒ (By U.S. Mail) I deposited such envelope in the mail at Sacramento, California with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ (By Personal Service) I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand via messenger service to the address above;

☐ (By Facsimile) I served a true and correct copy by facsimile during regular business hours to the number(s) listed above. Said transmission was reported complete and without error.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: January 21, 2016


Scott A. Galati

PUBLIC MATTER

FILED

NOV 16 2015

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
JAYNE KIM, No. 174614
CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
JOSEPH R. CARLUCCI, No. 172309
DEPUTY CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
GREGORY P. DRESSER, No. 136532
ASSISTANT CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
ROBERT A. HENDERSON, No. 173205
SUPERVISING SENIOR TRIAL COUNSEL
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, California 94105-1639
Telephone: (415) 538-2385

STATE BAR COURT

HEARING DEPARTMENT - SAN FRANCISCO

In the Matter of:

CARY LEE PETERSEN,
No. 173406,

A Member of the State Bar.

Case Nos.: 15-O-11281 [15-O-11398]

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

NOTICE - FAILURE TO RESPOND!

**IF YOU FAIL TO FILE A WRITTEN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE
WITHIN 20 DAYS AFTER SERVICE, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT
THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL:**

- (1) YOUR DEFAULT WILL BE ENTERED;**
- (2) YOUR STATUS WILL BE CHANGED TO INACTIVE AND YOU
WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW;**
- (3) YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN
THESE PROCEEDINGS UNLESS YOU MAKE A TIMELY MOTION
AND THE DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE, AND;**
- (4) YOU SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPLINE.
SPECIFICALLY, IF YOU FAIL TO TIMELY MOVE TO SET ASIDE
OR VACATE YOUR DEFAULT, THIS COURT WILL ENTER AN
ORDER RECOMMENDING YOUR DISBARMENT WITHOUT
FURTHER HEARING OR PROCEEDING. SEE RULE 5.80 ET SEQ.,
RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA.**

The State Bar of California alleges:

//

1
2 JURISDICTION

3 1. Cary Lee Petersen ("respondent") was admitted to the practice of law in the State of
4 California on December 12, 1994, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is
5 currently a member of the State Bar of California.

6 COUNT ONE

7 Case No. 15-O-11281

8 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A)
9 [Failure to Perform with Competence]

10 2. On or about December 24, 2014, Rachael Bortolamedi ("Bortolamedi") employed
11 respondent to perform legal services, namely respondent to represent her in dissolution of
12 marriage, which respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform with
13 competence, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), by:

14 (A) Failing to file a petition for dissolution of marriage on behalf of Bortolamedi and by
15 failing to take any legal action whatsoever on behalf of Bortolamedi.

16 COUNT TWO

17 Case No. 15-O-11281

18 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2)
19 [Improper Withdrawal from Employment]

20 3. Respondent failed, upon termination of employment, to take reasonable steps to avoid
21 reasonably foreseeable prejudice to respondent's client, Rachael Bortolamedi ("Bortolamedi"),
22 by constructively terminating respondent's employment on January 20, 2015 by failing to take
23 any action on the client's behalf between on or about December 24, 2014 through on or about
24 January 20, 2015, and thereafter vacating his law office without providing Bortolamedi new
25 contact information and failing to inform the client that respondent was withdrawing from
26 employment, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2).

27 COUNT THREE

28 Case No. 15-O-11281

Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2)
[Failure to Refund Unearned Fees]

4. On or about December 24, 2014, respondent received advanced fees of \$950 from a
client, Rachael Bortolamedi ("Bortolamedi"), for legal services, namely to represent Bortolamedi
in a dissolution of marriage action. Respondent failed to file the dissolution of marriage, or

1 perform any legal services for the client, and therefore earned none of the advanced fees paid.
2 Respondent failed to refund promptly, upon respondent's termination of employment on or about
3 January 20, 2015 any part of the \$950 advance fee to the client, in willful violation of Rules of
4 Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

5 COUNT FOUR

6 Case No. 15-O-11281

7 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m)
8 [Failure to Inform Client of Significant Development]

9 5. Respondent failed to keep respondent's client, Rachael Bortolamedi ("Bortolamedi"),
10 reasonably informed of significant developments in a matter in which respondent had agreed to
11 provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m),
12 by failing to inform the client of the following:

- 13 (A) That respondent had serious issues which precluded his working on the dissolution of
14 marriage;
15 (B) That respondent had not filed the dissolution of marriage; and
16 (C) That respondent had moved out of his law office.

17 COUNT FIVE

18 Case No. 15-O-11398

19 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A)
20 [Failure to Perform with Competence]

21 6. On or about October 24, 2014, Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru ("Lemos-Sticlaru") employed
22 respondent to perform legal services, namely to represent her in a limited scope family law issue,
23 which respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform with competence, in
24 willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), by:

- 25 (A) Failing to file child custody and visitation documents with the court in *In the matter*
26 *of Sticlaru*, Siskiyou County Superior Court case no. SC CV FL 11-0000139.

27 COUNT SIX

28 Case No. 15-O-11398

Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(A)(2)
[Improper Withdrawal from Employment]

7. Respondent failed, upon termination of employment, to take reasonable steps to avoid
reasonably foreseeable prejudice to respondent's client, Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru ("Lemos-
Sticlaru"), by constructively terminating respondent's employment on or about January 9, 2015,

1 by failing to take any action on the client's behalf between on or about October 24, 2014 through
2 on or about January 9, 2015, and thereafter vacating his law office without providing Lemos-
3 Sticlaru new contact information and failing to inform the client that respondent was
4 withdrawing from employment, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-
5 700(A)(2).

6 **COUNT SEVEN**

Case No. 15-O-11398

Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2)

7 [Failure to Refund Unearned Fees]

8 8. On or about October 24, 2014, respondent received advanced fees of \$1,500 from a
9 client, Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru ("Lemos-Sticlaru"), to represent her in a limited scope family law
10 issue, namely a child custody and visitation matter. Respondent failed to file any legal
11 documents for the child custody and visitation matter, or perform any legal services for the
12 client, and therefore earned none of the advanced fees paid. Respondent failed to refund
13 promptly, upon respondent's termination of employment on or about January 9, 2015, any part of
14 the \$1,500 advance fee to the client, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-
15 700(D)(2).

16 **COUNT EIGHT**

Case No. 15-O-11398

Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m)

17 [Failure to Inform Client of Significant Development]

18 9. Respondent failed to keep respondent's client, Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru ("Lemos-
19 Sticlaru"), reasonably informed of significant developments in a matter in which Respondent had
20 agreed to provide legal services, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section
21 6068(m), by failing to inform the client of the following:

- 22 (A) That respondent had serious issues which precluded his working on the child custody
23 and visitation issue;
24 (B) That respondent had not filed the paperwork for the child custody and visitation
25 issue; and
26 (C) That respondent had moved out of his law office.

26 //

27 //

28 //

COUNT NINE

Case No. 15-O-11398

Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1)
[Failure to Release File]

10. Respondent failed to release promptly, after termination of respondent's employment on or about January 9, 2015, to respondent's client, Chelsea Lemos-Sticlaru ("Lemos-Sticlaru"), all of the client's papers and property following the client's request for the client's file on January 9, 2015, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(1).

NOTICE - INACTIVE ENROLLMENT!

YOU ARE HEREBY FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT IF THE STATE BAR COURT FINDS, PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6007(c), THAT YOUR CONDUCT POSES A SUBSTANTIAL THREAT OF HARM TO THE INTERESTS OF YOUR CLIENTS OR TO THE PUBLIC, YOU MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR. YOUR INACTIVE ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT.

NOTICE - COST ASSESSMENT!

IN THE EVENT THESE PROCEDURES RESULT IN PUBLIC DISCIPLINE, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10.

Respectfully submitted,

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

DATED: November 16, 2015

By: Robert A. Henderson
Robert A. Henderson
Supervising Senior Trial Counsel

DECLARATION OF SERVICE
BY CERTIFIED AND REGULAR MAIL

CASE NOS.: 15-O-11281; [15-O-11398]

I, the undersigned, over the age of eighteen (18) years, whose business address and place of employment is the State Bar of California, 180 Howard Street, San Francisco, California 94105, declare that I am not a party to the within action; that I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service; that in the ordinary course of the State Bar of California's practice, correspondence collected and processed by the State Bar of California would be deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day; that I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date on the envelope or package is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing contained in the affidavit; and that in accordance with the practice of the State Bar of California for collection and processing of mail, I deposited or placed for collection and mailing in the City and County of San Francisco, on the date shown below, a true copy of the within

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing as *certified mail*, return receipt requested, and in an additional sealed envelope as *regular mail*, at San Francisco, on the date shown below, addressed to:

Article No.: 9414 7266 9904 2042 4851 16

Cary L. Petersen
Cary Petersen, Esq.
312 Natoma St., # 11
Folsom, CA 95630

Courtesy copy:

Cary L. Petersen
2300 Iron Point Rd., #1211
Folsom, CA 95630

in an inter-office mail facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed to:

N/A

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at San Francisco, California, on the date shown below.

DATED: November 16, 2015

Signed: 

Paula H. D'Oyen
Declarant



The document to which this certificate is affixed is a full, true and correct copy of the original on file and of record in the State Bar Court.

ATTEST July 13, 2017

State Bar Court, State Bar of California,
Los Angeles

By
Clerk

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 July 18, 2017, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING; ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

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:

SCOTT A. GALATI
DAYZEN LLC
2501 CAPITOL AVE
SUITE 201
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

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

LISA J. SERAFINI, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on July 18, 2017.


Lauretta Cramer
Case Administrator
State Bar Court