



(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION		
Counsel For The State Bar Mía R. Ellis Senior Trial Counsel 1149 South Hill St. Los Angeles, CA 90015 213-765-1380 Bar # 228235	Case Number(s): 12-J-15051-RAP	For Court use only <div style="text-align: center;"> FILED OCT -9 2013 <i>Jrc</i> STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div>
In Pro Per Respondent Kimuel Wayne Lee P.O. Box 77755 Baton Rouge, LA 70879 225-205-1675 Bar # 141518	PUBLIC MATTER	
In the Matter of: KIMUEL WAYNE LEE Bar # 141518 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	

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 July 31, 1989.
- (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 11 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: (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 [for definition, see 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
 - (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) **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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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. Please see page 9.
- (8) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

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 with 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) **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.

(Do not write above this line.)

(13) **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances:

No Prior Discipline and Pretrial Stipulation - please 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 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 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 two (2) years, 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 90 days.

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 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 learning and ability in the general law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), 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

(Do not write above this line.)

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.
- (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:
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Law Office Management Conditions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> 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.**

(Do not write above this line.)

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:**

Ethics School:

Since Respondent lives in Louisiana, he may choose not to attend Ethics School in CA, and instead, as a further condition of probation, within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of no less than 6 hours of participatory Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) approved courses in legal ethics. The MCLE hours required by this stipulation are in addition to any MCLE hours required by statute.

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: KIMUEL WAYNE LEE
CASE NUMBER: 12-J-15051

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that he is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

Case No. 12-J-15051 (Discipline in Other Jurisdiction)

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND IN OTHER JURISDICTION:

1. On October 6, 1989, Respondent was admitted to the practice law in the State of Louisiana.
2. In July 2009, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel filed formal charges against Respondent. Following hearings on June 23, 2010 and August 18, 2010, Louisiana's Hearing Committee issued factual findings and determined that Respondent violated Louisiana's Rules of Professional Conduct. Louisiana's Disciplinary Board adopted the Hearing Committee's factual findings and determined that the Hearing Committee correctly applied the Rules of Professional Conduct. On April 13, 2012, the Supreme Court of Louisiana issued a per curiam decision that the State Bar of Louisiana had proven by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent violated rules 1.1(a) [failure to provide competent representation to a client], 1.5(a) [charging an unreasonable fee], 1.15(a) [failure to timely remit funds to clients or third persons], and 8.4(c) [engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation] of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct.
3. On April 13, 2012, the Louisiana Supreme Court ordered that Respondent be disciplined upon finding that Respondent committed professional misconduct in that jurisdiction. The Supreme Court ordered that Respondent be suspended from the practice of law for two years and ordered Respondent to submit the fee dispute with the Ridley heirs to the Louisiana State Bar Association's Fee Dispute Resolution Program. The order is final.
4. The disciplinary proceeding in the other jurisdiction provided fundamental constitutional protection.

FACTS FOUND IN OTHER JURISDICTION:

The Ridley Succession Matter

5. On October 31, 1999, Theron Ridley ("Ridley") died. In 2000, the co-executrixes of Ridley's estate hired Respondent to handle Ridley's succession.
6. The estate's assets totaled \$89,547.46. Respondent claimed he performed 171.4 hours of work for \$51,420. However, on the distribution list for the estate, Respondent claimed fees of \$13,819.68 but only collected \$6,909.84 in attorneys fees, which was approximately 7.5% of the estate's total assets.

The Court found that this fee was considerably higher than what was normally charged in the locality for similar legal services.

7. On August 9, 2000, Respondent filed an amended distribution of the estate's assets and liabilities, which included a bill from LSU Shreveport Hospital ("LSU Hospital") for \$16,168.60.

8. On December 5, 2000, Respondent issued a check from his client trust account to LSU Hospital for \$16,168.60. LSU Hospital never received the check. The check was never negotiated.

9. On or about January 22, 2001, Respondent negotiated a reduction of the amount due to the hospital from \$16,168.60 to \$15,000. Respondent issued a check to LSU Hospital on that same date. LSU Hospital received the \$15,000 check.

10. Respondent did not notify the co-executrixes that he negotiated reduction in the bill and that there was a balance of \$1,168 due to the heirs. Rather, Respondent retained the \$1,168 balance for himself.

11. In April 2001, when the co-executrixes learned about the \$1,168 that Respondent retained, Respondent agreed to pay the Ridley heirs \$768.50. On May 20, 2001, Respondent issued checks to the Ridley heirs totaling \$768.60.

12. After the co-executrixes filed a complaint against Respondent with the Louisiana State Bar, on May 24, 2002, Respondent issued checks to the Ridley heirs totaling \$400.00.

13. The Louisiana Supreme Court found that Respondent lacked the legal knowledge and skill necessary to handle the Ridley succession and that the matter was not complex. Further, Respondent's filings included errors and illustrated his inexperience, and his lack of knowledge and skill contributed to the accumulation of fees.

14. The Louisiana Supreme Court found that Respondent violated rules 1.1(a) [failure to provide competent representation to a client], 1.5(a) [charging an unreasonable fee], 1.15(a) [failure to timely remit funds to clients or third persons]. Respondent's conduct in Louisiana is equivalent to a willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rules 3-110(A) and 4-100(B)(4).

The Nell Matter

15. Janet Lee ("Lee"), Respondent's wife, owns Foreign Car Sales, LLC ("Foreign Car Sales"), which is authorized to buy and sell used cars. In April 2005, Foreign Car Sales advertised a 2001 Dodge 3500 truck for sale.

16. On April 18, 2005, Respondent showed John Nell ("Nell") the car and negotiated the sales price on behalf of Foreign Car Sales.

17. Nell purchased the car from Foreign Car Sales for \$7,500. Nell paid Respondent cash for the car.

18. Respondent filled out the bill of sale, signed Lee's name to the bill of sale as the salesperson for Foreign Car Sales, and then notarized the document.

19. Respondent was not a licensed salesperson at the time of the sale to Nell.

20. The Louisiana Supreme Court determined that the bill of sale was substantively false. Also, the Court found that Respondent's notarial attestation was false as to who signed the document as the salesperson.

21. The Louisiana Supreme Court found that Respondent violated rule 8.4(c) [engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation] of the Louisiana Rules of Professional Conduct. Respondent's conduct in Louisiana is equivalent to a willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

22. As a matter of law, Respondent's culpability of professional misconduct determined in the proceeding in the State of Louisiana warrants the imposition of discipline under the laws and rules binding upon Respondent in the State of California at the time Respondent committed the misconduct in the other jurisdiction, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6049.1, subdivision (a).

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Misconduct (Std. 1.2(b)(ii)): The current misconduct found or acknowledged by Respondent evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing. Here, Respondent engaged in three acts of misconduct in two matters.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Discipline: Respondent was admitted to the State Bar on July 31, 1989 and has no prior record of discipline. While Respondent's misconduct here is serious, Respondent's lack of a prior record of discipline in over ten years of practice before the misconduct began is entitled to significant weight in mitigation. (*In the Matter of Bleeker* (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 113, 127.)

Pretrial Stipulation: Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into a full stipulation with the Office of Chief Trial Counsel prior to trial, thereby saving State Bar Court time and resources. (*In re Downey* (Review Dept. 2009) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 151, 156; *In the Matter of Van Sickle* (Review Dept. 2006) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 980, 993-994; *Silva-Vidor v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [where mitigative credit was given for entering into a stipulation as to facts and culpability].)

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct provide a "process of fixing discipline" pursuant to a set of written principles to "better discharge the purposes of attorney discipline as announced by the Supreme Court." (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, Introduction (all further references to standards are to this source).) The primary purposes of disciplinary proceedings and of the sanctions imposed are "the protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession; the maintenance of high professional standards by attorneys and the preservation of public confidence in the legal profession." (*In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 205; std. 1.3.)

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.) Any discipline recommendation different from that set forth in the applicable standards should clearly explain the reasons for the deviation. (*Blair v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 762, 776, fn. 5.)

Respondent admits to committing three acts of professional misconduct. Standard 1.6 (a) requires that where a Respondent acknowledges two or more acts of misconduct, and different sanctions are prescribed by the standards that apply to those acts, the sanction imposed shall be the more or most severe prescribed in the applicable standards. The most severe sanction is found in Standard 2.2(b).

Standard 2.2(b) provides that culpability of a member of commingling of entrusted funds or property with personal property or the commission of another violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100, none of which offenses result in the wilful misappropriation of entrusted funds or property, shall result in at least a three month actual suspension.

Here, Respondent's misconduct in failing to promptly pay out funds to the Ridley heirs was directly related to the practice of law. Respondent's misconduct in falsely signing and notarizing the Nell bill of sale also arguably related to the practice of law in that it involved a legal document. Further, although the Louisiana Supreme Court did not find any actual harm caused by Respondent's misconduct in the Nell matter, the Court did find actual harm in the Ridley matter. Respondent failed to pay out all of the funds to which the Ridley heirs were entitled for almost one and a half years, and then only after a bar complaint had been filed against him. Although the current misconduct evidences multiple acts of misconduct and involved harm in the Ridley matter, in mitigation, Respondent had no prior record of discipline in over ten years of practice before the misconduct began in the Ridley matter, there was no evidence of misappropriation in the facts presented in the Louisiana proceeding, and Respondent has cooperated in entering into this comprehensive pretrial stipulation. In light of standard 2.2(b), the facts of the misconduct, and the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, a one-year suspension, stayed, coupled with two years of probation with conditions including a 90-day actual suspension will serve the purposes of discipline to protect the public, the courts and the legal profession.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of September 23, 2013, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$6,944. 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 MCLE CREDIT

Pursuant to rule 3201, Respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School or if he chooses to complete six hours of participatory MCLE approved courses in legal ethics, then Respondent may not receive MCLE credit for those courses. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: KIMUEL WAYNE LEE	Case number(s): 12-J-15051-RAP
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

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.

9/25/13 [Signature] [Signature]
Date Respondent's Signature Print Name

9/27/13 [Signature] [Signature]
Date Respondent's Counsel Signature Print Name
9/27/13 [Signature] [Signature]
Date Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:
KIMUEL WAYNE LEE

Case Number(s):
12-J-15051

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.)**

10-07-2013
Date


RICHARD A. PLATEL
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 October 9, 2013, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION

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:

**KIMUEL W. LEE
PO BOX 77755
BATON ROUGE, LA 70879**

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

MIA ELLIS, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on October 9, 2013.



Tammy Cleaver
Case Administrator
State Bar Court