

FILED

✓

OCT - 9 2014

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO

kwiktag® 183 821 260



In the Matter of)	Case Nos.: 09-O-12950 (10-O-05470)
)	(S210414)
VICTOR STEPHEN HALTOM,)	
)	(1) ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S
Member No. 155157,)	MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING
)	TIME; (2) ORDER GRANTING IN PART
A Member of the State Bar.)	MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR
)	TAKING AND PASSING MPRE

On September 12, 2014, respondent Victor Stephen Haltom filed a motion to extend the time in which he is required to take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination (Motion to Extend Time). Specifically, respondent, who took, but did not receive a passing score on the MPRE in August 2014, requested that he be allowed to retake the MPRE in November 2014, and provide proof of passage thereof by December 31, 2014. On September 18, 2014, the Office of Probation filed an opposition to respondent's Motion to Extend Time.

On September 16, 2014, respondent filed a second motion, i.e., his Motion for Order Shortening Time, requesting that this court issue an order to shorten the time in which the response or opposition to his September 12, 2014 Motion to Extend Time must be filed.¹ On

¹Respondent requests that this court issue an order to shorten the time limit in which the State Bar of California, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel must respond to his Motion to Extend Time. To clarify, it is the State Bar of California, Office of Probation (Office of Probation), and not the State Bar of California, Office of the Chief Trial Counsel, which would respond to respondent's motion for an extension of time regarding the MPRE. As such, this court deems respondent's

September 15, 2014, the motion for an order shortening time was served on the Office of Probation by overnight mail and email.

On September 17, 2014, the Office of Probation, by and through Supervising Attorney Terrie Goldade, served respondent by U.S. mail with its opposition to respondent's Motion to Extend Time. That opposition to the Motion to Extend Time was filed with the State Bar Court on September 18, 2014.

On September 18, 2014, the Office of Probation served respondent by U.S. Mail with its Opposition to Motion for Order Shortening Time. On September 19, 2014, the Office of Probation filed its Opposition to the Motion for an Order Shortening Time with the State Bar Court.

Having carefully considered each of respondent's two motions and each of the Office of Probation's oppositions thereto, the court finds as follows:

1. Respondent's Motion for an Order Shortening Time

The Office of Probation served its opposition to respondent's motion to extend time for taking and passing the MPRE on September 17, 2014, i.e., just one day after respondent filed his motion requesting that the court issue an order shortening the time in which the Office of Probation must provide its response to the motion to extend. Given that the Office of Probation served respondent with its opposition to the motion to extend time for taking and passing the MPRE, on the day after respondent filed his motion for an order shortening time, the motion for the order shortening time became moot.

Accordingly, respondent's Motion for an Order Shortening Time is hereby DENIED as moot.

request in his motion for an order shortening time as a request that the court issue an order directed to the Office of Probation and not to the State Bar's Office of the Chief Trial Counsel.

2. *Respondent's Motion to Extend Time for Taking and Passing the MPRE*

The court finds good cause and GRANTS respondent's motion as follows: Respondent's time to take the MPRE and pass the MPRE and provide satisfactory proof of passage to the State Bar's Office of Probation is extended. Respondent must provide satisfactory proof of passage of the MPRE to the State Bar's Office of Probation **on or before December 22, 2014**. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.10(b); Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.161(A)(2).)²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 9, 2014



LUCY ARMENDARIZ
Judge of the State Bar Court

² The court cautions respondent that no further extensions are contemplated.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of San Francisco, on October 9, 2014, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

(1) ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME; (2) ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR TAKING AND PASSING MPRE

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:

VICTOR S. HALTOM
428 J ST # 350
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

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

TERRIE GOLDADE, Probation, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on October 9, 2014.



Mazie Yip
Case Administrator
State Bar Court