

(Do not write above this line.)

| State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION PUBLIC MATTER | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>David Aigboboh Deputy Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 765-1097</p> <p>Bar # 312712</p> | <p>Case Number(s): 17-C-02285-CV</p> | <p>For Court use only</p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">FILED</p> <p style="text-align: center;">JAN 08 2018 <i>P.B.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</p> |
| <p>Counsel For Respondent</p> <p>Granth J. Crhoelman California Defense, P.C. 5900 Sepulveda Boulevard, Suite 400 Van Nuys, CA 91411 (310) 592-4834</p> <p>Bar # 259525</p> | <p>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> | |
| <p>In the Matter of: DOUGLAS ELLIOTT REUM</p> <p>Bar # 268490</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p> | <p>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p> | |

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 31, 2009**.
- (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 **12** 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 respondent's actual suspension.** (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 Page 9.
- (12) **Pattern:** Respondent's current misconduct demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (13) **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution.
- (14) **Vulnerable Victim:** The victim(s) of Respondent's misconduct was/were highly vulnerable.
- (15) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standards 1.2(i) & 1.6]. Facts supporting mitigating circumstances are required.

- (1) **No Prior Discipline:** Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not likely to recur.
- (2) **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client, the public, or the administration of justice.
- (3) **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations and proceedings.
- (4) **Remorse:** Respondent promptly took objective steps demonstrating spontaneous remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of his/her misconduct.
- (5) **Restitution:** Respondent paid \$ _____ on _____ in restitution to _____ without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.
- (6) **Delay:** These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her.
- (7) **Good Faith:** Respondent acted with a good faith belief that was honestly held and objectively reasonable.
- (8) **Emotional/Physical Difficulties:** At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical or mental disabilities which expert testimony would establish was directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the

(Do not write above this line.)

product of any illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and the difficulties or disabilities no longer pose a risk that Respondent will commit misconduct.

- (9) **Severe Financial Stress:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered from severe financial stress which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.
- (10) **Family Problems:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
- (11) **Good Character:** Respondent's extraordinarily good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of his/her misconduct.
- (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:

Absence of Prior Record of Discipline, See Page 9.

Pretrial Stipulation, See Page 9.

Respondent Entered Treatment for Alcohol Use, See Page 9.

D. Discipline:

- (1) **Stayed Suspension:**
- (a) Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of **one (1) 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 **one (1) year**, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 9.18, California Rules of Court)
- (3) **Actual Suspension:**

- (a) Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of **thirty (30) days**.
- i. and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.2(c)(1), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct
- ii. and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
- iii. and until Respondent does the following:

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

- (1) If Respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until he/she proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law, pursuant to standard 1.2(c)(1), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
- (2) During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3) Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (4) Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and conditions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must promptly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request.
- (5) Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.

In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.

- (6) Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.
- (7) Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (8) Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
- No Ethics School recommended. Reason: .
- (9) Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.
- (10) The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
- Substance Abuse Conditions Law Office Management Conditions
- Medical Conditions 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:**

1.) Respondent agrees to take the steps necessary to control the use of alcohol such that it will not affect respondent's law practice in the future. Respondent's agreement to participate in an abstinence-based self-help group (as defined herein), as a condition of discipline, is part of respondent's efforts to address such concerns.

As a condition of probation, and during the period of probation, respondent must attend a minimum of four (4) meetings per month of any abstinence-based self-help group of respondent's choosing, including without limitation Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, LifeRing, S.M.A.R.T., S.O.S., etc. Other self-help maintenance programs are acceptable if they include a subculture to support recovery, including abstinence-based group meetings. (See O'Conner v. Calif. (C.D. Calif. 1994) 855 F. Supp. 303 [no First Amendment violation where probationer given

(Do not write above this line.)

choice between AA and secular program.] Respondent is encouraged, but not required, to obtain a "sponsor" during the term of participation in these meetings.

The program called "Moderation Management" is not acceptable because it is not abstinence-based and allows the participant to continue consuming alcohol.

Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and obtain written approval for the program Respondent has selected prior to attending the first self-help group meeting. If Respondent wants to change groups, Respondent must first obtain the Office of Probation's written approval prior to attending a meeting with the new self-help group.

Respondent must provide the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance of the meetings set forth herein with each Quarterly Report submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent may not sign as the verifier of his own attendance.

During the period of probation, respondent must enroll in the Diversified Monitoring & SCRAM Alcohol Monitoring Program ("SCRAM") to monitor respondent's abstinence from alcohol. Respondent must provide the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of enrollment in SCRAM with each Quarterly Report submitted to the Office of Probation. In lieu of SCRAM, respondent may provide the Office of Probation proof of urine and/or blood testing from a laboratory approved by the Office of Probation.

Respondent is encouraged, but is not required, to participate in the Lawyers' Assistance Program, to abstain from alcohol.

2.) As a further condition of probation, and during the period of probation, respondent must attend a minimum of four (4) individualized counseling sessions per month conducted by a licensed medical healthcare professional. Respondent must provide the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance of the counseling sessions with each Quarterly Report submitted to the Office of Probation.

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: DOUGLAS ELLIOTT REUM

CASE NUMBER: 17-C-02285

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that the facts and circumstances surrounding the offense for which he was convicted involved other misconduct warranting discipline.

Case No. 17-C-02285 (Conviction Proceeding)

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND IN CONVICTION PROCEEDING

1. This is a proceeding pursuant to sections 6101 and 6102 of the Business and Professions Code and rule 9.10 of the California Rules of Court.
2. On October 12, 2016, the Los Angeles Office of the City Attorney filed a criminal complaint, entitled *People of the State of California v. Douglas Reum*, in Los Angeles County Superior Court, case number 6CJ03456, charging respondent with one count of Penal Code section 273.5(a) [corporal injury to cohabitant], a misdemeanor; one count of Penal Code section 597(a) [maliciously and intentionally maim, mutilate, torture, or wound a living animal], a misdemeanor; and one count of Penal Code section 243(e)(1) [battery on cohabitant], a misdemeanor.
3. On April 20, 2017, trial proceedings commenced in *People v. Reum*, Los Angeles Superior Court case number 6CJ03456. At the inception of trial, the People moved to amend the criminal complaint against respondent and dismiss one count of Penal Code section 273.5(a) [corporal injury to cohabitant] and one count of Penal Code section 243(e)(1) [battery on cohabitant], and add one count of Penal Code section 602.5(b) [aggravated trespass], a misdemeanor.
4. On April 20, 2017, the court entered respondent's plea of no contest to violations of Penal Code section 597(a) [maliciously and intentionally maim, mutilate, torture, or wound a living animal], a misdemeanor; and Penal Code section 602.5(b) [aggravated trespass], a misdemeanor.
5. The court ordered that respondent (1) be placed on summary probation for 36 months, (2) serve 90 days in Los Angeles County jail, (3) make restitution to the victim of his crimes, (4) obey an order protecting the victim, and (5) enroll in and complete 52 domestic violence counseling classes, 26 animal cruelty classes, and 104 Alcoholics Anonymous meetings.
6. On September 8, 2017, the Review Department of the State Bar Court issued an order referring the matter to the Hearing Department for a hearing and decision recommending the discipline to be imposed in the event that the Hearing Department found that the facts and circumstances of respondent's criminal conviction involved moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline.

FACTS

7. On October 10, 2016 respondent engaged in a verbal and physical altercation with M.W., respondent's cohabitant.

8. The Los Angeles Police Department responded to a 9-1-1 call made by a neighbor.

9. Upon their arrival at respondent's residence, the police officers observed visible bruises on M.W.'s right forearm and wrist.

10. During the altercation, respondent injured M.W.'s 9-year-old pet black poodle by throwing it down a flight of stairs. The dog suffered an injured leg and a dislodged tooth.

11. Respondent was placed under arrest. Respondent was under the influence of alcohol.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

12. The facts and circumstances surrounding the above-described violations did not involve moral turpitude but did involve other misconduct warranting discipline.

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Wrongdoing (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent was convicted of two misdemeanor offenses: (1) willfully, unlawfully, maliciously, and intentionally maiming, mutilating, torturing, and wounding an animal, and (2) aggravated trespass. (*In the Matter of Valinoti* (Review Dept. 2002) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 498, 555 [multiple acts of misconduct not limited to the counts pleaded].)

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Absence of Prior Record of Discipline: Respondent has practiced for seven years without any prior record of discipline, which is a basis for slight mitigation. (*In Re Naney* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 186, 196 [seven years discipline-free practice "not a strong mitigating factor"].)

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 [mitigative credit given for entering into a stipulation as to facts and culpability].)

Respondent entered alcohol treatment: Respondent is entitled to slight mitigation for entering treatment for his alcohol use, even though the treatment was a requirement of his criminal plea. (*In re Hickey* (1991) 50 Cal.3d 571, 579 [evidence that the attorney has taken steps to deal with his alcohol problem is mitigating evidence that may properly be taken into account in determining the degree and nature of the discipline that should be imposed]; *In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41, 49 [standards on aggravation and mitigation not an exclusive list of factors].)

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.)

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. (Standards 1.7(b)-(c).)

Standard 2.16(b) provides that a suspension or reproof is appropriate discipline for a final conviction of a misdemeanor not involving moral turpitude but involving other misconduct warranting discipline.

The State Bar Court and Supreme Court have withheld a finding of moral turpitude even where an attorney’s crime necessarily created a risk of harm to others. (*In re Hickey* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 571 [repeated acts of violence towards spouse]; *In re Otto* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 970 [assault with means likely to produce great bodily harm]; *In re Larkin* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 236 [assault with a deadly weapon]; *In re Titus* (1989) 47 Cal.3d 1105 [assault with a deadly weapon]; *In the Matter of Stewart* (Review Dept. 1994) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 52 [battery on a police officer]; *In the Matter of Respondent O* (Review Dept. 1993) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 581, 589-91 [felony assault with a firearm].)

Respondent was convicted of misdemeanor aggravated trespass and misdemeanor animal cruelty. Although respondent’s crime involved violence, under established precedent, it did not involve moral turpitude. In aggravation, respondent was convicted of two misdemeanors. Respondent is entitled to slight mitigation for seven years of discipline-free practice, for entering into a pretrial stipulation, and for entering alcohol treatment, although the treatment was ordered in the underlying criminal matter. Although the mitigation outweighs the aggravation in this case, discipline consisting of actual suspension is appropriate given the indications of alcohol abuse in the records of respondents’ criminal conviction. A period of 30 days of actual suspension, one year of stayed suspension, and one year of probation with treatment conditions is appropriate to protect the public, courts, and legal profession.

Case law supports that level of discipline.

In *In re Otto, supra*, 48 Cal.3d 970 (hereafter "*Otto*"), the attorney was convicted of violating Penal Code sections 245(a) [felony assault by means likely to produce great bodily injury] and 273.5 [felony corporal injury to cohabitant] before the trial court reduced both counts to misdemeanors. The Hearing Department found that Otto and his cohabitant were both under the influence of alcohol when they began arguing. Otto struck his partner numerous times with a closed fist and kicked her, then continued the assault even after police arrived. The Supreme Court upheld discipline that included six months' actual suspension and found that Otto's conviction did not involve moral turpitude.

As in *Otto*, respondent committed an act of violence against his cohabitant. However, the injuries inflicted on M.W. were significantly less severe than those inflicted on Otto's cohabitant. Respondent is entitled to slight mitigation for entering treatment for alcohol, for seven years of discipline-free practice, and for entering into a pretrial stipulation. On balance, those mitigating factors outweigh the aggravating factor of multiple acts of misconduct. However, a short period of actual suspension is warranted to reflect the seriousness of respondent's misconduct. Thus, a one-year stayed suspension, and one year of probation with treatment conditions including 30 days' actual suspension and medical treatment, is appropriate to effectuate the purposes of discipline.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of December 19, 2017, the discipline 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 cost of further proceedings.

EXCLUSION FROM MINIMUM CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION ("MCLE") CREDIT




Respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| In the Matter of: DOUGLAS ELLIOTT REUM | Case number(s): 17-C-02285 |
|--|--------------------------------------|

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>12/20/17</u> |  | Douglas Elliott Reum Print Name |
| <u>12-20-17</u> |  | Granth J. Crhoelman Print Name |
| <u>12/27/2017</u> |  | David Aigboboh Print Name |

(Do not write above this line.)

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| In the Matter of: DOUGLAS ELLIOTT REUM | Case Number(s): 17-C-02285 |
|---|-------------------------------|

ACTUAL SUSPENSION ORDER

Finding the stipulation to be fair to the parties and that it adequately protects the public, IT IS ORDERED that the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without prejudice, and:

- The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.
- All Hearing dates are vacated.

The 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.)**

Date

1/8/18


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 January 8, 2018, 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:

**GRANTH J. CRHOELMAN
CALIFORNIA DEFENSE, P.C.
5900 SEPULVEDA BLVD STE 400
VAN NUYS, CA 91411 - 2511**

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

DAVID E. AIGBOBOH, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on January 8, 2018.

Paul Barona

Paul Barona
Case Administrator
State Bar Court