

FILED 

FEB 17 2010

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO



In the Matter of	)	Case Nos.: 04-N-10083; 99-O-13663;
	)	01-O-02733; 03-O-01617;
LEO BENSON WILKES	)	03-F-105-1NR; 08-Q-11052
	)	(Not Cons.)
Petitioner for Relief from Costs.	)	
	)	ORDER RE COSTS
_____	)	

On January 14, 2010, petitioner **Leo Benson Wilkes** filed a brief entitled [Petitioner's] Motion for Relief from or Extension of Time to Pay Disciplinary Costs ("Motion for Relief"). In his Motion for Relief, petitioner sought relief from or an extension of time to comply with an order of payment of disciplinary costs and Client Security Fund reimbursements relating to the above-referenced case numbers. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 282, *et seq.*) Petitioner's motion was based on financial hardship.

On February 10, 2010, Deputy Trial Counsel Erica L. M. Dennings of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California ("State Bar") filed a response. The State Bar opposes petitioner's request for relief in whole or in part, but does not oppose an extension of two years for payment of the disciplinary costs. The State Bar also asserts that the court lacks jurisdiction over the monies petitioner currently owes the Client Security Fund because a judgment has yet to be entered.

After consideration of the parties' moving papers, the court issues the following orders:

1. Petitioner's motion for relief from payment of disciplinary costs is **DENIED**, no good cause having been shown;


2. Petitioner's motion for extension of time to comply with the order to pay disciplinary costs is **GRANTED**. The court orders that petitioner's time to pay the disciplinary costs relating to the above-referenced case numbers be extended by two years from the date of filing of the present order; and

3. Petitioner's motion for relief from or an extension of time to comply with an order of payment of Client Security Fund reimbursements is **DENIED**, for lack of jurisdiction. (See Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 285(a).)

Court staff is directed to place a copy of this order, petitioner's motion, and the State Bar's response in the State Bar Court file for each of the cases set forth in the caption of this order. With respect to case no. 03-F-105-1NR, court staff is directed to send a courtesy copy of this order, petitioner's motion, and the State Bar's response to the State Bar's Office of General Counsel, Attention: Tracey L. McCormick.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 17, 2010


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, February 17, 2010, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

ORDER RE 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:

**LEO BENSON WILKES
640 TAYLOR CT #503
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94043**

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

ERICA DENNINGS , Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on February 17, 2010.


Lauretta Cramer
Case Administrator
State Bar Court