

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California
Hearing Department
San Francisco

Counsel For The State Bar Tammy M. Albertsen-Murray 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2527 Bar # 154248	Case Number (s) 06-O-14524-LMA and 07-O-12852 (not yet filed)	(for Court's use) PUBLIC MATTER FILED  NOV 07 2007 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO
In Pro Per Respondent Glenn R. Wilson 1411 "L" Street, Suite B Fresno, CA 93721 (559) 237-5297 Bar # 183727	Submitted to: Settlement Judge	
In the Matter Of: GLENN R. WILSON Bar # 183727 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	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 **October 30, 1996**.
- (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."
- (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."

(Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)



(Do not write above this line.)

- (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 284, Rules of Procedure.
 - costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: **2009 and 2010.**
(hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure)
 - costs waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs"
 - costs 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. **Respondent's knowing failure to respond to the various Court orders in the Torres matter, including the OSC re: status, resulted in the revocation of Torres' in forma pauperis status, thus requiring Torres to pay \$255 to the CJA Fund for the appeal.**
- (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

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

Additional mitigating circumstances

*** In case number 07-O-12852, respondent has agreed to refund \$2,000 to Mr. Thies under circumstances other than those outlines in C.(5) above;**

(Stipulation form approved by SBC Executive Committee 10/16/00. Revised 12/16/2004; 12/13/2006.)

Actual Suspension

***Respondent has voluntarily stipulated to the imposition of discipline, thus relieving the State Bar and State Bar Court of further expenditure of State Bar resources.**

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 **thirty (30) 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 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 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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 321(a)(1) & (c), Rules of Procedure.**
- No MPRE recommended. Reason: .

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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:**

Attachment language begins here (if any):

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Counts One and Three, Case No. 06-O-14524 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A) [Failure to Perform with Competence]

Facts.

On November 26, 2003, Moises Torres ("Torres"), hired respondent to represent him on the appeal of a drug conviction case. Respondent was to be paid between \$500 and \$1,000 per month for a total fee of \$20,000. Respondent collected a total of \$17,000 from or on behalf of Torres before ultimately substituting out of the case. From the beginning of and throughout his representation of Torres, respondent was authorized to communicate with Elisa Marie Arroyo, also known as 'Tina' (hereinafter, "Tina"), on Torres' behalf.

On February 24, 2004, respondent substituted into the matter styled *USA v. Moises Rodriguez-Torres*, case no. 03-10610, pending in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ("Ninth Circuit"). Respondent was not then nor has he ever been admitted to practice before the Ninth Circuit.

On March 5, 2004, the Court filed an order and entered respondent as retained counsel for Torres. The order required Torres to show cause ("OSC") within 14 days why his *in forma pauperis* status should not be revoked and why the case should not be referred to the district court to determine whether Torres should be required to reimburse the CJA Fund for the cost of Torres' appellate defense, including the cost of producing reporter's transcripts and the fees and expenses of Torres' former appointed counsel. The March 5 order also confirmed a briefing schedule established earlier, which required Torres' opening brief and excerpts of the record filed by May 17, 2004; the answering brief filed by June 16, 2004; and the optional reply brief within 14 days after service of the answering brief. Respondent received this order but did not file a response to the OSC.

In an April 2, 2004 order, the Court stated that respondent had failed to respond to the March 5, 2004, OSC; Torres' *in forma pauperis* status was revoked; the matter was referred to the district for determination of whether Torres would be required to reimburse the CJA Fund for costs and fees; Torres was required to pay \$255 to the District Court for the appeal and submit proof of payment to the court. The costs and fees ordered were paid on April 15, 2004.

On April 21, 2004, respondent filed a certificate of record on appeal in District Court.

On June 3, 2004, in response to a motion filed by respondent, the Court ordered an extension of time to file the opening brief, including the following schedule: The opening brief was ordered due June 21, 2004; the answering brief by July 21, 2004; the optional reply brief by 14 days after service of the answering brief. Respondent received this order, but did not file the opening brief when due.

On December 11, 2004, the Court filed a default order because of respondent's failure to file Torres' opening brief. Any response to the December 11 order was due in 14 days; respondent did not file the opening brief or any other reply.

Thereafter, on September 30, 2005, the Court entered a default order because of respondent's failure to file Torres' opening brief. A response to the September 30 order was due in 14 day; respondent did not file the opening brief when due or any other reply.

On November 22, 2005, the Court filed an order which contained the following findings: respondent had failed to comply with the Court's order; the Court allowed respondent one final opportunity to file the opening brief; respondent was given 14 days after the date of the order in which to file the opening brief, excerpts of the record, and a motion for relief from default; alternatively respondent was to file a motion to

withdraw. Respondent received this order, but did not file the opening brief, nor did he file a motion to withdraw.

On January 20, 2006, the Court filed an order, which contained the following findings: respondent had failed to reply to the November 22, 2005 order regarding filing the opening brief; and the court among other things ordered respondent to show cause in writing why he should not be sanctioned not less than \$1,000 for failure to comply with the court's rules and orders. Respondent received this order, but did not file a response to the OSC, did not file the opening brief or any other reply.

On March 28, 2006, the Court filed another order, which contained the following findings: respondent had not responded to the court's January 20, 2006 order; and Torres had one final opportunity to file a response to the court's January 20, 2006 order. The response was due within 21 days of the date of the order. Respondent received this order, but did not file the opening brief. This time the Court also served the order directly on Torres. On April 4, 2006, Torres and Tina received the Court's March 28, 2006 Order. Tina immediately contacted respondent's office, who put her in contact with another attorney, Brenda Grantland. Subsequently, Brenda Grantland was hired by Torres and Tina to work on Torres' appeal. In April, 2006 and May, 2007, respondent forwarded \$5,000 on each occasion for a total of \$10,000 to Grantland from advanced fees paid to him by or on behalf of Torres. On April 17, 2006, Brenda Grantland filed a notice of appearance on behalf of Torres.

Conclusions of Law.

Count One: By not filing Torres' opening brief in the Ninth Circuit despite numerous orders and default orders, and by not responding to the OSC re: *in forma pauperis*, respondent intentionally, recklessly and repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence, in violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A).

Count Four: By not responding in any way to the March 5, 2004, June 3, 2004, December 11, 2004, September 30, 2005, November 22, 2005, January 20, 2006 and March 28, 2006 Court orders, respondent willfully disobeyed court orders requiring him to do acts in the course of his profession which he ought in good faith to do, in violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6103.

Count Three, Case No. 06-O-14524, Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(3), [Failure to Render Accounts of Client Funds]

Facts.

On November 25, 2003, Tina, at the direction of respondent, provided cashier's check no. 8556335 in the amount of \$10,000 to the Wormley and Virgilio Law Firm as the first payment on the Torres appeal.

Pursuant to the contract, Tina made payments totaling \$17,000, to respondent, or respondent's agent, on behalf of Torres.

On February 8, 2005, Tina requested on Torres' behalf an accounting of fees paid for the appeal, receipt of which respondent's staff confirmed on February 9, 2005. Respondent ultimately did prepare and provide an accounting once State Bar proceedings had commenced, approximately two years after it was requested.

Conclusion of Law.

By failing to provide an accounting to Torres and Tina for approximately two years and not until State Bar proceedings were initiated, respondent failed to render an accounting to the client regarding client funds coming into respondent's possession.

Count Five, Case No. 06-O-14524, Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 1-300(B), [Unauthorized Practice of Law in Another Jurisdiction]

Facts.

Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure, rule 46(a) and Circuit Rule 46-1 require that in order for an attorney to practice before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal, he or she must be admitted to practice before the Court, is required to apply for admission thereto and must pay a fee.

From November 26, 2003 through April 17, 2006, respondent was not admitted to practice before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal; at no time between November 26, 2003 and April 17, 2006, was respondent entitled to practice law before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal.

Between November 26, 2003 and April 17, 2006, respondent knew that he was not admitted to practice law before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal; between November 26, 2003 and April 17, 2006, respondent knew that he was not entitled to practice law before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal.

By order dated January 20, 2006, the Court found that respondent was not admitted to practice before the Ninth Circuit. The Court ordered respondent to provide proof within 14 days of the January 20 order, showing admission to the Ninth Circuit bar or to complete and submit the bar admission form, which accompanied the order. Respondent received the order and form, but did not apply for admission to the Ninth Circuit or withdraw from representation of Torres. Respondent continued as attorney of record for Torres until April 17, 2006.

Conclusion of Law.

By substituting into the Torres appeal and filing documents with the Ninth Circuit in the Torres appeal, respondent held himself out to the Court as entitled to practice law and actually practiced law in a jurisdiction in which he was not entitled to do so, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and the Circuit Rules, in violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 1-300(B).

(Unfiled) Case No. 07-O-12852

Facts and Conclusion of Law.

In November 2004, Bryan Thies (hereinafter, "Thies") hired respondent to represent Thies in a criminal matter. Thies paid respondent a flat fee of \$4,500 for all services up to but not including trial. Respondent specifically contracted to conduct a thorough investigation because witness issues were of major significance to the settlement value of the case.

Respondent and/or attorney(s) on his behalf made one or more court appearances in the Thies matter. Respondent obtained and reviewed a portion of the available case-related documents and had limited discussions with the assigned Deputy District Attorney. However, pretrial investigation was incomplete. Among other things, many witnesses were not interviewed; police audio tapes were not obtained or transcribed. In addition, Thies paid for and submitted to inadmissible testing on the advice of respondent.

In August, 2005, based on the lack of work performed, Thies decided to and did retain new counsel. When Thies learned from his new attorney that very little of the work performed by respondent was useful to the new counsel and that new counsel promptly oversaw an investigation that included interviewing more than 20 witnesses and obtaining and transcribing police audio tapes, Thies demanded that respondent account for the \$4,500 Thies initially paid for a thorough pretrial investigation. Thies also sought from respondent a refund of a portion of the unearned fees.

Respondent initially failed to provide the accounting Thies demanded. Respondent also initially

refused to refund any portion of the fees. Under cover of letter dated July 5, 2007, respondent provided an accounting to Mr. Thies. In addition, respondent has agreed as part of the settlement negotiations in the State Bar matter to refund a portion (\$2,000) of the fees paid.

By failing to refund fees he had not earned, upon termination from Thies' representation, respondent willfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-700(D)(2).

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

The disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A.(7), was September 28, 2007.

DISMISSALS.

The parties respectfully request the Court to dismiss the following alleged violations in the interest of justice:

<u>Case No.</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Alleged Violation</u>
06-O-14524	Two	B&P Code, section 6068(m) [Failure to Inform]
06-O-14524	Six	B&P Code, section 6106 [Moral Turpitude]
06-O-14524	Seven	RPC rule 4-200(A), [Illegal Fee]
06-O-14524	Eight	RPC rule 3-700(D)(2), [Failure to Refund Unearned Fees]
06-O-14524	Nine	B&P Code, section 6106, [Moral Turpitude]

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of September 28, 2007, the costs in this matter are \$ 4,333.49. 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.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

Standards Pertaining to Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standards 2.4(b), 2.6(b) and 2.10;

Bluestein v. State Bar (1974) 13 Cal.3d 162;

In the Matter of Heiner (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 301;

In the Matter of Lilley (Review Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 476;

In the Matter of Nunez (Review Dept. 1992) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 196, 206.

FINANCIAL CONDITIONS, RESTITUTION.



Within ten (10) days of the effective date of discipline in this matter, respondent must make restitution to Bryan Thies (State Bar investigation number 07-O-12852), in the total amount (including principal and interest) of \$2,000.00. Respondent shall furnish satisfactory evidence of restitution to the Probation Unit. Respondent shall include in the first quarterly report required herein satisfactory evidence of full payment made by him pursuant to this condition.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of GLENN R. WILSON	Case number(s): 06-O-14524-LMA and 07-O-12852 (not yet filed)
--	--

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 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

<u>11-19-07</u> Date	 Respondent's Signature	<u>Glenn R. Wilson</u> Print Name
<u>10/29/07</u> Date	 Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Tammy M. Albertsen-Murray</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter Of GLENN R. WILSON	Case Number(s): 06-O-14524 LMA and 07-O-12852 (not yet filed)
--	---

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 box adjacent to E(10) on page 5 of the Stipulation is checked and the box adjacent to "Financial Conditions" under E(10) is checked. The following text is also added after "Financial Conditions under E(10) on page 5:" "See 'Financial Conditions, Restitution' on the bottom of page 10."

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 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)**

11/7/07
Date


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 November 7, 2007, 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:

**GLENN R. WILSON
LAW OFCS GLENN WILSON
2141 TUOLUMNE #B
FRESNO, CA 93721**

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

TAMMY ALBERTSEN-MURRAY, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on **November 7, 2007**.



Bernadette C. O. Molina
Case Administrator
State Bar Court