

Counsel for the State Bar CHARLES A. MURRAY, No. 146069 JOSEPH CARLUCCI, No. 172309 1149 SOUTH HILL STREET LOS ANGELES, CA 90015-2299 (213) 765-1000	Case Number(s) 97-0-13445 97-0-16026 97-0-17292 98-0-00336 99-0-11485 99-0-12482	(for Court use) <div style="text-align: center;"> FILED AUG 18 2006 <i>he</i> STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> LODGED DEC 16 2003 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div>
Counsel for Respondent ARTHUR L. MARGOLIS MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS LLP 2000 RIVERSIDE DR. LOS ANGELES, CA 90039-3758	Submitted to Pilot Program Judge <div style="text-align: center;"> STIPULATION RE FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW kwiktag® 022 603 796  </div> <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	
In the Matter of FRED G. GLANTZ Bar # 37933 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	Submitted to Pilot Program Judge <div style="text-align: center;"> STIPULATION RE FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW kwiktag® 022 603 796  </div> <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	

A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

(1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted January 5, 1966
 (Date)

(2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition (to be attached separately) are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court. However, if Respondent is not accepted into the Lawyer Assistance Program, this stipulation will be rejected and will not be binding on Respondent or the State Bar.

(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." This stipulation consists of 4 pages, plus Attachment 1, consisting of 12 pages, a Stipulation of Facts and Conclusions of Law Filed July 12, 2002.

(4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts". See Attachment 1.

(5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts, are also included under "Conclusions of Law." See Attachment 1.

(6) 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.

(7) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6086.10 & 6140.7 and will pay timely any disciplinary costs imposed in this proceeding.

Note: All information required by this form and any additional information which cannot be provided in the space provided, shall be set forth in the text component (attachment) of this stipulation under specific headings, i.e., "Facts", "Dismissals", "Conclusions of Law."

B. Aggravating Circumstances (Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b).) Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.

(1) Prior Record of Discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]

(a) State Bar Court Case # of prior case 91-0-0716; 93-0-13232

(b) Date prior discipline effective May 11, 1994

(c) Rules of Professional Conduct/State Bar Action violations
RPC 4-100 (A), RPC 4-200 (A)

(d) Degree of prior discipline private reproof, public disclosure

(e) If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or under "Prior Discipline"

(2) Dishonesty: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.

(3) 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.

(4) Harm: Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.

(5) Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.

(6) Lack of Cooperation: Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to the victims of his/her misconduct or the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.

(7) Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrong doing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.

(8) No aggravating circumstances are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

C. Mitigating Circumstances [standard 1.2(e)]. 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 deemed serious.
- (2) No Harm: Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.
- (3) Candor/Cooperation: Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation to the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings.
- (4) Remorse: Respondent promptly took objective steps spontaneously demonstrating 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 of 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 in good faith.
- (8) Emotional/Physical Difficulties: At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical disabilities which expert testimony would establish were directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the product of any illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drugs or substance abuse, and Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities.
- (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 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:

Respondent was evaluated by the Lawyer Assistance Program (LAP) and he complied with the LAP's terms for evaluation. At the conclusion of his LAP evaluation he met with the LAP EVALUATION Committee and then entered into a long-term participation agreement with the LAP on February 14, 2003.

Respondent enters into this stipulation as a condition of his/her participation in the Pilot Program. Respondent understands that he/she must abide by all terms and conditions of Respondent's Pilot Program Contract.

If the Respondent is not accepted into the Pilot Program or does not sign the Pilot Program contract, this Stipulation will be rejected and will not be binding on Respondent or the State Bar.

If the Respondent is accepted into the Pilot Program, upon Respondent's successful completion of or termination from the Program, this Stipulation will be filed and the specified level of discipline for successful completion of or termination from the Program as set forth in the State Bar Court's Statement Re: Discipline shall be imposed or recommended to the Supreme Court.

5-27-03
Date

[Signature]
Respondent's Signature

FRED G. GLANTZ
Print Name

5/27/03
Date

[Signature]
Respondent's Counsel Signature

ARTHUR L. MARGOLIS
Print Name

6/23/03
Date

[Signature]
Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature

CHARLES A MURRAY
Print Name

ORDER

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

- The stipulation as to facts and conclusions of law is APPROVED.

- The stipulation as to facts and conclusions of law is APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below.

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; 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved stipulation; or 3) Respondent is not accepted for participation in the Pilot Program or does not sign the Pilot Program Contract. (See rules 135(b) and 802(b), Rules of Procedure.)

The effective date of the disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after the file date of the Supreme Court Order. (See rule 953(a), California Rules of Court.)

Date

Judge of the State Bar Court

FILED

JUL 12 2002

STATE BAR COURT
CLERKS OFFICE
LOS ANGELES

1 THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
2 ENFORCEMENT
JOSEPH R. CARLUCCI, No. 172309
3 1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90015-2299
4 Telephone: (213) 765-1000

5

6

7

8

THE STATE BAR COURT

9

HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES

10

11 In the Matter of)

Case No. 97-O-13445-RMT

12)

97-O-16026

13 FRED G. GLANTZ,)

97-O-17292

14 No. 37933)

98-O-00336

15 A Member of the State Bar)

99-O-11485

16)

99-O-12482

**STIPULATION OF FACTS AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

17)

18

TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT M. TALCOTT, JUDGE OF THE STATE BAR COURT:

19

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Respondent, FRED G. GLANTZ

20

(hereinafter "Respondent"), his attorney of record, Arthur Margolis, and the State Bar of

21

California, by and through Deputy Trial Counsel Joseph R. Carlucci, in accordance with Rule

22

132 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California as follows:

23

(A) The following facts are true and correct, and Respondent admits that he is culpable of

24

the violations of the specified statutes and Rules of Professional Conduct. The parties hereby

25

stipulate that the facts and conclusions of law are not in dispute in the above-captioned matter.

26

(B) This Stipulation resolves the entire above-captioned proceeding except as expressly

27

set forth in the Stipulation, and except as to disposition.

28

1 2. From no later than March 1, 1997 through at least January 1998, Respondent
2 maintained a client trust account, account number 300403842, at the Bank of Los Angeles
3 (hereinafter "Bank of Los Angeles client trust account").

4 The "Moore" Matter

5 3. Respondent represented Mary Moore in a personal injury matter. On March 21, 1997,
6 Respondent deposited into his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account a settlement check from
7 A.I. Specialty Lines Insurance Company payable to Moore and Respondent in the sum of
8 \$70,000.00. Of these settlement funds, Moore was entitled to \$39,000.00.

9 4. On March 28, 1997, Respondent issued check #2110 from his Bank of Los Angeles
10 client trust account to Moore in the amount of \$39,000.00. However, on April 10, 1997, prior to
11 check #2110 being paid, Respondent caused the balance in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust
12 account to fall to **negative** \$988.81 when he knew he had to maintain \$39,000.00 on behalf of
13 Moore.

14 5. On April 23, 1997, check #2110 from Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust
15 account was presented for payment when the account had insufficient funds to pay the check.
16 Nonetheless, on April 23, 1997 the Bank of Los Angeles paid check #2110 against insufficient
17 funds.

18 6. Respondent knew that from March 21, 1997 to April 23, 1997 he was required to
19 maintain \$39,000.00 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account on behalf of Moore, but he
20 failed to do so.

21 7. By not maintaining at least \$39,000.00 on behalf of Moore in his Bank of Los Angeles
22 client trust account from March 21, 1997 to April 23, 1997, Respondent failed to maintain client
23 funds in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or words of similar
24 import, in willful violation of Rule 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

25 8. Respondent willfully misappropriated \$39,000.00 of Moore's funds which he was
26 required to hold in trust on Moore's behalf, and thereby committed an act involving moral
27 turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

28 The "Helberg" Matter

1
2 9. Respondent represented Sandy Helberg in a personal injury matter. On March 26,
3 1997, Respondent deposited into his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account a settlement check
4 from State Farm Mutual Insurance Company payable to Helberg and Respondent in the sum of
5 \$10,500.00. Of these settlement funds, Helberg was entitled to \$1,300.00, and her medical
6 provider, Malibu Rehabilitation, was entitled to \$670.00.

7 10. On April 10, 1997, prior to any disbursements to Helberg or Malibu Rehabilitation,
8 Respondent caused the balance in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to **negative**
9 \$988.81 when he knew he had to maintain \$1,970.00 on behalf of Helberg and Malibu. On April
10 23, 1997, prior to any disbursements to Helberg or Malibu Rehabilitation, Respondent caused the
11 balance in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to **negative** \$17,997.36.

12 11. On May 1, 1997, Respondent issued check #2206 from his Bank of Los Angeles
13 client trust account to Helberg's medical provider, Malibu Rehabilitation, in the amount of
14 \$670.00. Check #2206 was presented for payment and paid on May 9, 1997.

15 12. On June 23, 1997, Respondent issued check #2381 from his Bank of Los Angeles
16 client trust account to Helberg in the amount of \$1,300.00. Check #2381 was presented for
17 payment and paid on June 26, 1997.

18 13. Respondent knew that from March 21, 1997 and until Helberg and Malibu
19 Rehabilitation had received \$1,300.00 and \$670.00 respectively from him, he was required to
20 maintain \$1,970.00 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account on behalf of Helberg and
21 Malibu, but he failed to do so.

22 14. By not maintaining at least \$1,970.00 on behalf of Helberg and Malibu Rehabilitation
23 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account, Respondent failed to maintain client funds in a
24 bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or words of similar import, in
25 willful violation of Rule 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

26 15. Respondent willfully misappropriated \$1,970.00 of Helberg's funds which he was
27 required to hold in trust on her behalf, and thereby committed an act involving moral turpitude,
28 dishonesty or corruption in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

1 The "Donaldson" Matter

2 16. Respondent represented Bill and Donna Donaldson in a personal injury matter. On
3 July 28, 1997, Respondent issued check #2462 from his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account
4 to Bill Donaldson and Donna Donaldson in the amount of \$23,000.00. On August 1, 1997,
5 check #2462 from Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust account was presented for
6 payment when the account had insufficient funds to pay the check. Nonetheless, on or about
7 August 1, 1997 the Bank of Los Angeles paid check #2462 against insufficient funds, causing the
8 balance in Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to **negative \$14,519.09.**

9 17. Respondent knew that from at least July 28, 1997 to August 1, 1997, he was required
10 to maintain \$23,000.00 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account on behalf of the
11 Donaldson's, but he failed to do so.

12 18. By not maintaining at least \$23,000.00 on behalf of the Donaldson's in his Bank of
13 Los Angeles client trust account, Respondent failed to maintain client funds in a bank account
14 labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or words of similar import, in willful
15 violation of Rule 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

16 19. Respondent willfully misappropriated \$14,519.09 of the Donaldson's funds which he
17 was required to hold in trust on their behalf, and thereby committed an act involving moral
18 turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

19 The "Luevano" Matter

20 20. Respondent represented Eleanor Luevano in a personal injury matter. On July 8,
21 1997, Respondent issued check #2406 from his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to
22 Luevano in the amount of \$15,000.00.

23 21. On August 4, 1997, check #2406 from Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust
24 account was presented for payment when the account had insufficient funds to pay the check.
25 Nonetheless, on August 4, 1997 the Bank of Los Angeles paid check #2406 against insufficient
26 funds, causing the balance in Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to
27 **negative \$13,226.46.**

28

1 22. Respondent knew that from at least July 8, 1997 to August 4, 1997, he was required
2 to maintain \$15,000.00 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account on behalf of Luevano, but
3 he failed to do so.

4 23. By not maintaining at least \$15,000.00 on behalf of Luevano in his Bank of Los
5 Angeles client trust account, Respondent failed to maintain client funds in a bank account labeled
6 "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or words of similar import, in willful violation Rule
7 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

8 24. Respondent willfully misappropriated \$13,226.46 of Luevano's funds which he was
9 required to hold in trust on her behalf, and thereby committed an act involving moral turpitude,
10 dishonesty or corruption in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

11 The "Vowell" Matter

12 25. Respondent represented David Vowell in a personal injury matter. On September 29,
13 1997, Respondent deposited into his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account a settlement check
14 from 20th Century Insurance Company payable to Vowell and Respondent in the sum of
15 \$25,000.00. Of these settlement funds, Vowell was entitled to \$14,500.00.

16 26. Prior to any disbursements to Vowell, on October 6, 1997, Respondent caused the
17 balance in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to \$13,804.36 when he knew he
18 had to maintain \$14,500.00 on behalf of Vowell. On October 7, 1997, and prior to any
19 disbursements to Vowell, Respondent caused the balance in Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles
20 client trust account to fall to **negative** \$7,110.64.

21 27. On October 7, 1997, Respondent issued check #2643 from his Bank of Los Angeles
22 client trust account to Vowell in the amount of \$14,500.00. On October 21, 1997, check #2643
23 from Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust account was presented for payment. On
24 October 21, 1997, the Bank of Los Angeles paid check #2643 against insufficient funds, causing
25 the balance in Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to **negative**
26 \$8,091.14.

27

28

1 28. Respondent knew that from September 29, 1997 to October 21, 1997, he was
2 required to maintain \$14,500.00 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account on behalf of
3 Vowell, but he failed to do so.

4 29. By not maintaining at least \$14,500.00 on behalf of Vowell in his Bank of Los
5 Angeles client trust account from September 29, 1997 to October 21, 1997, Respondent failed to
6 maintain client funds in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or
7 words of similar import, in willful violation of Rule 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional
8 Conduct.

9 30. Respondent willfully misappropriated \$14,500.00 of Vowell's funds which he was
10 required to hold in trust on Vowell's behalf, and thereby committed an act involving moral
11 turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

12 The "Howe" Matter

13 31. Respondent represented Hadley Howe in a personal injury matter. On October 21,
14 1997, Respondent deposited into his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account a settlement check
15 from Crawford Company payable to Hadley Howe and Respondent in the sum of \$10,000.00. Of
16 these settlement funds, Howe was entitled to \$2,100.00.

17 32. Prior to any disbursements to Howe, on October 22, 1997, Respondent caused the
18 balance in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to **negative** \$4,912.14 when he
19 knew he had to maintain \$2,100.00 on behalf of Howe. On October 22, 1997, Respondent issued
20 check #2676 from his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to Howe in the amount of
21 \$2,100.00.

22 33. On October 24, 1997, check #2676 from Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client
23 trust account was presented for payment. On October 24, 1997, the Bank of Los Angeles paid
24 check #2676 from Respondent's Bank of Los Angeles client trust account.

25 34. Respondent knew that from October 21, 1997 to October 24, 1997, he was required
26 to maintain \$2,100.00 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account on behalf of Howe, but he
27 failed to do so.

1 35. By not maintaining at least \$2,100.00 on behalf of Hadley Howe in his Bank of Los
2 Angeles client trust account from October 21, 1997 to October 24, 1997, Respondent failed to
3 maintain client funds in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or
4 words of similar import, in willful violation of Rule 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional
5 Conduct.

6 36. Respondent willfully misappropriated \$2,100.00 of Howe's funds which Respondent
7 was required to hold in trust on Howe's behalf, and thereby committed an act involving moral
8 turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

9 The "Klein" Matter

10 37. Respondent represented Deborah and Ira Klein in a personal injury matter. On
11 October 17, 1997, Respondent deposited into his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account a
12 settlement check from Carl Warren & Company payable to Deborah and Ira Klein and
13 Respondent in the sum of \$9,000.00. Of these settlement funds, Deborah and Ira Klein were
14 entitled to \$3,800.00.

15 38. Prior to any disbursements to the Klein's, on October 21, 1997, Respondent caused
16 the balance in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to fall to **negative** \$8,091.14 when he
17 knew he had to maintain \$3,800.00 on behalf of the Klein's. On November 14, 1997,
18 Respondent issued check #2750 from his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account to Ira Klein in
19 the amount of \$3,800.00. On November 28, 1997, the Bank of Los Angeles paid check #2750.

20 39. Respondent knew that from October 17, 1997 to November 28, 1997, Respondent
21 was required to maintain \$3,800.00 in his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account on behalf of
22 the Klein's, but he failed to do so.

23 40. By not maintaining at least \$3,800.00 on behalf of the Kleins in his Bank of Los
24 Angeles client trust account from October 17, 1997 to November 28, 1997, Respondent failed to
25 maintain client funds in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account" or
26 words of similar import, in willful violation of Rule 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional
27 Conduct.

1 41. Respondent willfully misappropriated \$3,800.00 of the Klein's funds which he was
2 required to hold in trust on their behalf, and thereby committed an act involving moral turpitude,
3 dishonesty or corruption in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106.

4 Other Checks Paid Against Insufficient Funds

5 42. In addition to those checks paid against insufficient funds referenced above, from
6 April 1997 through and including January 1998, Respondent also issued the following checks
7 drawn upon his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account paid, which were paid against
8 insufficient funds by the use of overdraft protection:

- 9 A. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account check #2139 in the amount of
10 \$22,500.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on April
11 10, 1997;
- 12 B. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account check #2389 in the amount of
13 \$4,850.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on June
14 26, 1997;
- 15 C. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account check #2397 in the amount of
16 \$63,500.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on July
17 25, 1997;
- 18 D. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account check #2631 in the amount of
19 \$15,000.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on
20 October 7, 1997;
- 21 E. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account check #2669 in the amount of
22 \$5,061.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on
23 October 22, 1997;
- 24 F. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account check #2777 in the amount of
25 \$7,235.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on
26 November 25, 1997; and

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

G. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account checks numbered 2831 and 2832, totaling \$22,000.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on January 6, 1998.

43. By issuing checks drawn upon his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account, which were paid against insufficient funds by the banks by use of overdraft protection, Respondent failed to maintain client funds in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account," or words of similar import, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).


Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____, 2002

FRED G. GLANTZ, Respondent

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

Dated: 7/11/, 2002

By: 
JOSEPH R. CARLUCCI
Deputy Trial Counsel

MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS

Dated: _____, 2002

By: _____
ARTHUR MARGOLIS
Counsel for Respondent,
FRED G. GLANTZ


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

G. Bank of Los Angeles client trust account checks numbered 2831 and 2832, totaling \$22,000.00, paid by Respondent's bank against insufficient funds on January 6, 1998.

43. By issuing checks drawn upon his Bank of Los Angeles client trust account, which were paid against insufficient funds by the banks by use of overdraft protection, Respondent failed to maintain client funds in a bank account labeled "Trust Account," "Client's Funds Account," or words of similar import, in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7-11, 2002


FRED G. GLANTZ, Respondent

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

Dated: _____, 2002

By: JOSEPH R. CARLUCCI
Deputy Trial Counsel
MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS

Dated: 7/11/, 2002

By: Arthur L. Margolis
ARTHUR MARGOLIS
Counsel for Respondent.
FRED G. GLANTZ

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

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL

CASE NUMBER: 97-O-13445-RMT; 97-O-16026; 97-O-17292; 98-O-00336; 99-O-11485;
99-O-12482

I, the undersigned, over the age of eighteen (18) years, whose business address and place of employment is the State Bar of California, 1149 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90015, 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. 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 Los Angeles, on the date shown below, a true copy of the within

STIPULATION OF FACTS AND CONCLUSION OF LAW

in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing at Los Angeles, on the date shown below, addressed to:

**ARTHUR L. MARGOLIS, ESQ.
MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS, LLP.
2000 RIVERSIDE DRIVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90039-3758**

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 Los Angeles, California, on the date shown below.

DATED: July 12, 2002

SIGNED: Bonnie Bryan
Bonnie Bryan
Declarant

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

LODGED
FEB 26 2004 *Y/C*
STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES
CONFIDENTIAL

THE STATE BAR COURT
HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES

FILED

AUG 18 2006 *Y/C*
STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES


In the Matter of
FRED G. GLANTZ,
Member No. 37933,
A Member of the State Bar.

Case No. 97-O-13445-RMT
ORDER APPROVING STIPULATION

The stipulation as to facts and conclusions of law executed by the parties on
June 23, 2003 is approved nunc pro tunc from **December 16, 2003**, the date on which respondent
FRED G. GLANTZ, executed the written agreement regarding the terms and conditions of his OR
her participation in the Pilot Program for Respondents with Substance Abuse and/or Mental Health
Issues. (Rule 802(a), Rules Proc. of State Bar.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 24, 2004



ROBERT M. TALCOTT
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. 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 February 26, 2004, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

ORDER APPROVING STIPULATION, ~~Lodged~~ February 26, 2004

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:

**ARTHUR L. MARGOLIS
MARGOLIS & MARGOLIS
2000 RIVERSIDE DR.,
LOS ANGELES, CA 90039-3758**

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

CHARLES MURRAY, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on February 26, 2004.



Tammy R. Cleaver
Case Administrator
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 Los Angeles, on August 18, 2006, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

**DECISION AND DISCIPLINE ORDER; ORDER FILING AND SEALING
CERTAIN DOCUMENTS;**

STIPULATION RE FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW;

ORDER APPROVING STIPULATION

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:

**Fred G Glantz
16133 Ventura Blvd #850
Encino, CA 91436 2422**

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

CHARLES MURRAY, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **August 18, 2006.**



Tammy R. Cleaver
Case Administrator
State Bar Court