

<p>Counsel for the State Bar                  The State Bar of California                  Office of the Chief Trial Counsel                  Fumiko D. Kimura, No. 208763                  1149 S. Hill Street                  Los Angeles, California 90015                  (213) 765-1380</p>	<p>Case number(s)                  01-C-04213</p> <p>kwiktag® 035 117 205</p> 	<p>(for Court's use)</p> <p><b>PUBLIC MATTER</b></p> <p><b>FILED</b></p> <p>MAY 17 2004</p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE                  SAN FRANCISCO</p>
<p>Counsel for Respondent                  Arthur L. Margolis                  MARGOLIS &amp; MARGOLIS                  2000 Riverside Drive                  Los Angeles, CA 90039                  (323) 953-8996</p>	<p>Submitted to <input type="checkbox"/> assigned judge <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> settlement judge</p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION                  AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p>STAYED SUSPENSION; NO ACTUAL SUSPENSION</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p>	
<p>In the Matter of                  Laurence Ring</p> <p>Bar # 75619</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California                  (Respondent)</p>		

**A. Parties' Acknowledgments:**

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted December 27, 1977  
 (date)
- (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 and order consist of 9 pages.
- (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) 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. (Check one option only):
  - costs added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline
  - costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years:  
(hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure)
  - costs waived in part as set forth under "Partial Waiver of Costs"
  - costs entirely waived

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 of this stipulation under specific headings, i.e. "Facts," "Dismissals," "Conclusions of Law."

C. Mitigating Circumstances [see 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 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 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 was directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the product of any illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities.
- (9)  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.
- (10)  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.
- (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 made himself available for an examination by Dr. Richard Sandor for psychiatric and addiction medicine evaluation. (See page 8 of the attachment under "Other conditions negotiated by the parties")

B. Aggravating Circumstance (for definition, see Standards for Attorneys' Actions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b).) Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are revealed.

- (1)  Prior record of discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]
  - (a)  State Bar Court case # of prior case 89-0-11393
  - (b)  date prior discipline effective July 17, 1993
  - (c)  Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: Count 2: Rule 5-102(B), Rule 6-101(A)(2); Count 4: Rule 8-101(B)(4); Count 5: Rule 3-500 And Business & Professions Code section 6068(m), Note: In addition, under Count 5, Respondent stipulated to 3-110(A) and 6-101(A)(2), however, those counts were not addressed by the Court in its Order.
  - (d)  degree of prior discipline 6 months stayed suspension; No actual suspension; 2 years probation with conditions
  - (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 victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.
- (7)  Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (8)  No aggravating circumstances are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

1. Stayed Suspension.

A. Respondent shall be suspended from the practice of law for a period of Six (6) Months

- i. and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct
- ii. and until Respondent pays restitution to \_\_\_\_\_ [payee(s)] (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate), in the amount of \_\_\_\_\_, plus 10% per annum accruing from \_\_\_\_\_ and provides proof thereof to the Probation Unit, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel
- iii. and until Respondent does the following: \_\_\_\_\_

B. The above-referenced suspension shall be stayed.

2. Probation.

Respondent shall be placed on probation for a period of Three (3) years which shall commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein. (See rule 953, California Rules of Court.)

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

- (1)  During the probation period, Respondent shall comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (2)  Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent shall report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Probation Unit, 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.
- (3)  Respondent shall submit written quarterly reports to the Probation Unit on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, respondent shall 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. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report shall 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.

- (4)  Respondent shall be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent shall 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 shall furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Probation Unit. Respondent shall cooperate fully with the probation monitor.
- (5)  Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent shall answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Probation Unit of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel 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.

- (6)  Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, respondent shall provide to the Probation Unit 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.
- (7)  Respondent shall comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and shall so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Probation Unit.
- (8)  The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
- Substance Abuse Conditions       Law Office Management Conditions
- Medical Conditions                       Financial Conditions
- (9)  Other conditions negotiated by the parties:

- Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination: Respondent shall provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Probation Unit of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel within one year. Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 951(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 321(a)(1) & (c), Rules of Procedure.
- No MPRE recommended.

**ATTACHMENT TO STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND  
DISPOSITION**

IN THE MATTER OF:       LAURENCE RING, SBN 75619

CASE NUMBER:           01-C-04213-PEM

**PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

This is a proceeding pursuant to §§ 6101 and 6102 of the Business and Professions Code and Rule 951 of the California Rules of Court.

On August 30, 2001, Respondent was found guilty after a jury trial of violating California Vehicle Code § 20001(a), Hit and Run Driving Causing Injury, a misdemeanor. Respondent was acquitted of violating California Vehicle Code § 23152(a), Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs, a misdemeanor.

On January 16, 2003, the Review Department of the State Bar Court issued an order referring the matter to the Hearing Department to determine the level of discipline to be imposed if the facts and circumstances surrounding the violation of Vehicle Code § 20002(a) [Hit and Run Driving Causing Property Damage] involved moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline.

On August 7, 2003, the Review Department of the State Bar Court issued an amended order, based on the evidence received, referring the matter to the Hearing Department to determine the level of discipline to be imposed if the facts and circumstances surrounding the violation of Vehicle Code § 20001(a) [Hit and Run Driving Causing Injury] involved moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline.

**FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Laurence Ring ("Respondent") admits the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct:

**Facts**

On or about February 28, 2001, at approximately 10:20 p.m., Respondent was driving his Lexus LS400 on the northbound Canon Drive after he left RJ's restaurant where he watched the Laker's game while consuming alcohol. The traffic collision occurred at the intersection of Canon Drive and S. Santa Monica Boulevard. At that time, the turning pocket on the northbound Canon Drive was coned off and posted with a "no left turn" sign due to a structure fire which occurred on the previous day. As Respondent went around the left turning pocket in order to negotiate a left turn onto westbound side of S. Santa Monica Boulevard, he struck a black Nissan Sentra, driven by Daniel Hepner, traveling south on Canon Drive. While Mr. Hepner was having difficulty steering his vehicle due to the collision, Respondent left the scene

without providing his information or rendering assistance to Mr. Hepner, who Respondent knew or should have known was injured as a result of the collision.

The police arrived at the accident scene. Based on the information obtained at the scene, the police broadcasted the description of the hit and run vehicle and its driver. Thereafter, Respondent's vehicle was spotted as he drove northbound on Linden Drive. The police stopped Respondent on Whittier Drive near Sunset Boulevard, and arrested him for violations of Vehicle Code § 20001 [Hit and Run Driving Causing Injury] and § 23153(a) [Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol].

The impact resulted in moderate damage to the front driver side of Respondent's vehicle and to the Nissan driven by Mr. Hepner. The impact caused Respondent to strike his head against the interior of his vehicle. Respondent told the police that he felt dizzy, but refused any medical treatment. Respondent refused to take a field sobriety test. Respondent also refused to submit to a blood, urine or breath test. Mr. Hepner complained of pain to his left shoulder, chest and left shin. Mr. Hepner was checked by the paramedics at the scene and was released.

On or about March 26, 2001, a two-count misdemeanor complaint was filed by the District Attorney's Office against Respondent, alleging as Count 1, a violation of Vehicle Code § 23152(a) [Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs] and as Count 2, a violation of Vehicle Code § 20002(a) [Hit and Run Driving Resulting in Property Damage]. On or about July 30, 2001, an amended two-count misdemeanor complaint was filed which alleged a violation of Vehicle Code § 20001(a) [Hit and Run Driving Causing Injury] as Count 2 of the complaint instead of Vehicle Code § 20002(a) [Hit and Run Driving Resulting in Property Damage].

On August 30, 2001, after a jury trial, Respondent was found guilty of Count 2, Vehicle Code § 20001(a) [Hit and Run Driving Causing Injury] only. On October 4, 2001, Respondent was sentenced to 20 days in jail and was placed on probation for 36 months. The terms and conditions of his probation included payment of \$1,000.00 plus the penalty assessment, a restitution fund fine of \$250.00, 300 hours of community service, restitution to the victim, and no alcohol consumption. Furthermore, Respondent's driver's license was suspended for 12 months. Per criminal court order signed July 8, 2003, Respondent fulfilled the conditions of probation for the entire period.

### Conclusions of Law

Having been found guilty of violating California Vehicle Code § 20001(a), Misdemeanor Hit and Run Driving Causing Injury, Respondent has been convicted of a misdemeanor which involved other misconduct warranting discipline. Respondent acknowledges that by the conduct described above, he failed to support the laws of the State of California in wilful violation of California Business and Professions Code § 6068(a).

## **PENDING PROCEEDINGS**

The disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A (6) was March 11, 2004.

## **COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS**

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of March 11, 2004, the estimated prosecution costs in this matter are approximately \$4,820.00. Respondent acknowledges that this figure is an estimate only and that it does not include State Bar Court costs which will be included in any final cost assessment. 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. The parties agree that disciplinary costs shall be added to and become a part of the State Bar membership fees for the year 2005.

## **OTHER CONDITIONS NEGOTIATED BY THE PARTIES**

Respondent was referred by his counsel to Richard S. Sandor, M.D. for a psychiatric/addiction medicine evaluation. Dr. Sandor examined Respondent on or about October 14, 2003. Dr. Sandor was provided with the arrest and booking report, dated March 1, 2001, from the Beverly Hills Police Department, the CHP report dated March 1, 2001 and Respondent's prior disciplinary record from the State Bar of California. Dr. Sandor concluded that Respondent did not have a drinking problem or any other psychiatric diagnosis based on the review of the documents provided, the examination of Respondent, and 23 years of experience as a practitioner.

The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel agreed to accept Dr. Sandor's report regarding Respondent and waived the evaluation by Lawyer Assistance Program.

## **AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE**

### **Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct**

According to standard 3.4, final conviction of a member of a crime which does not involve moral turpitude but which does involve other misconduct warranting discipline shall result in a sanction as prescribed under Part B, "Standards Pertaining to Sanctions for Professional Misconduct Found or Acknowledged in Original Disciplinary Proceedings," appropriate to the nature and extent of the misconduct found to have been committed by the member.

Per standard 2.10 of Part B, culpability of a member of a violation of any provision of the Business and Professions Code not specified in these standards or of a wilful violation of any Rule of Professional Conduct not specified in these standards shall result in reproof or suspension according to the gravity of the offense or the harm, if any, to the victim, with due regard to the purposes of imposing discipline as set forth in standard 1.3.

Date 3/29/04

Laurence Ring  
Respondent's signature

LAURENCE RING  
print name

Date 4/2/04

Arthur L. Margolis  
Respondent's Counsel's signature

ARTHUR L. MARGOLIS  
print name

Date 4-9-04

[Signature]  
Deputy Trial Counsel's signature

FUMIKO D. KIMURA  
print name

**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.

On page 4, paragraph D, item number (1) insert an "X" in box before "Approved by the Court prior to initiation of State Bar Court proceeding (no public disclosure)."

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 135(b), 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 953(a), California Rules of Court.)

Date 5/13/04

[Signature]  
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 San Francisco, on May 17, 2004, 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:

**ARTHUR LEWIS 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:

**FUMIKO KIMURA , Enforcement, Los Angeles**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on **May 17, 2004**.



**Laretta Cramer**  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court