



**FILED**

AUG 19 2009

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE  
SAN FRANCISCO

**STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO**

In the Matter of	)	Case No. 96-O-01310-PEM
	)	
<b>WILLIAM DAVID PRIDE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Former Member No. 107429,</b>	)	<b>ORDER RE DISCIPLINARY COSTS</b>
	)	
<b>A Former Member of the State Bar.</b>	)	
	)	
	)	

**TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL IN THE ABOVE ENTITLED MATTER:**

On March 30, 2009, **William David Pride** (Pride) filed a motion for relief from order assessing discipline costs. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar (State Bar) did not file a response to Pride's motion. On June 12, 2009, the court issued an order denying Pride's motion without prejudice, based on the failure to submit a bill, invoice or other document from the State Bar that sets forth the total amount from which Pride seeks relief.

On June 25, 2009, Pride filed an Amended Motion/Petition for Relief from Order Assessing Costs, along with a financial declaration in support of his motion. (See Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 282(b)(2).) Also included with Pride's Amended Motion was a letter from the State Bar informing Pride that the discipline charges in State Bar Court case No. 96-O-01310 totaled \$6,595.20.

In his June 25, 2009 Amended Motion, as in his March 30, 2009 motion, Pride seeks relief from the Supreme Court's August 25, 1999 order No. S079846 (State Bar Court case No. 96-O-01310). Specifically, Pride requests that he be relieved of the order assessing costs, based on the grounds of financial hardship or, in the alternative, that "the order assessing costs be compromised."

Pride has failed to establish grounds of hardship, special circumstances, or other good cause sufficient for this court to waive all or part of the \$6,595.20 in assessed costs. Nonetheless, Pride has established sufficient financial hardship for this court to grant him an extension of time to pay the assessed costs.

### **ORDER**

In light of his financial hardship, the court ORDERS that the time in which William David Pride must pay the \$6,595.20 in disciplinary costs imposed on him by the Supreme Court in this matter is extended as follows: Beginning January 1, 2010, Pride must pay a minimum of \$329.76 per calendar quarter for the next five years (i.e., until the entire \$6,595.20 is paid). These quarterly installment payments are due no later than the 10th day of each January, April, July, and October. (Thus, Pride's first installment payment is due no later than January 10, 2010.)

The court further orders that Pride submit his payments directly to the State Bar's Membership Billing Office in San Francisco and that he promptly submit proof of each payment to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles.

Finally, the court orders that, if Pride fails to pay any installment payment more than 10 days after its due date without the *prior written approval* of the State Bar's Office of Probation,

the remaining unpaid balance of the costs is due immediately and is enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

Dated: August 19, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**PAT McELROY**  
Judge of the State Bar Court

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rule 62(b), Rules Proc.; 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 August 19, 2009, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):


### ORDER RE DISCIPLINARY COSTS

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:  
  
WILLIAM DAVID PRIDE  
1761 ELSTON CIR  
WOODLAND, CA 95776
- ☐ by certified mail, No. , with return receipt requested, through the United States Postal Service at , California, addressed as follows:
- ☐ by overnight mail at , California, addressed as follows:
- ☐ by fax transmission, at fax number . No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.
- ☐ By personal service by leaving the documents in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or a person having charge of the attorney's office, addressed as follows:
- ☒ by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

Lawrence J. Dal Cerro, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on August 19, 2009.

  
George Hue  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court