

(Do not write above this line.)

**State Bar Court of California  
Hearing Department  
San Francisco  
ACTUAL SUSPENSION**

<p>Counsel For The State Bar</p> <p>Wonder J. Liang Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, California 94105 (415) 538-2372</p> <p>Bar # 184357</p>	<p>Case Number(s):</p> <p>08-O-12932-LMA</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <p><b>PUBLIC MATTER FILED</b></p> <p>APR 04 2011</p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</p>
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>William B. Look, Jr. P.O. Box 1381 Monterey, California 93942 (831) 372-1371</p> <p>Bar # 66631</p>	<p>Submitted to: <b>Settlement Judge</b></p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p> <p><b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</p>	
<p>In the Matter of:</p> <p>WILLIAM B. LOOK, JR.</p> <p>Bar # 66631</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>		

**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 December 15, 1975.
- (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 12 pages, not including the order.



(Do not write above this line.)

- (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."
- (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: 2012 and 2013. (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 88-C-11157 (Supreme Court case no. BM 5674)
  - (b)  Date prior discipline effective June 22, 1989
  - (c)  Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: Conviction warranting discipline
  - (d)  Degree of prior discipline Private Reprimand
  - (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (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:**

**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.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

(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:**

**D. Discipline:**

(1)  **Stayed Suspension:**

(a)  Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of TWO (2) YEARS.

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 ONE-HUNDRED AND TWENTY (120) 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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.
- (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**

(Do not write above this line.)

---

**further hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 5.162(A) & (E), Rules of Procedure.**

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:**

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


IN THE MATTER OF:                      WILLIAM B. LOOK, JR.

CASE NUMBER(S): ET AL.              08-O-12932-LMA

**FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.**

**Facts: Count Two:**

1. In May, 2007, Craig Ataide hired respondent to address the foreclosure of the client's real property at 591 E. Franklin in Monterey, California. On May 9, 2007, respondent substituted into a suit on behalf of Craig and Laurie Ataide, *Datacom. v. Ataide*, case no. M83145, filed in Superior Court, County of Monterey. Respondent also filed suit on behalf of Ataide, entitled *Ataide v. Datacom*, case no. M89213, filed in Superior Court, County of Monterey (lis pendens) on or about February 14, 2008.
2. As a result of the lis pendens, respondent brought Datacom back to settlement negotiations regarding the Franklin Street property. The parties executed a settlement agreement in or about March, 2008, in which Ataide obtained the option to repurchase the parcel for \$450,000. Ataide failed to meet the financial terms of the agreement, and the renegotiations involved an increasingly more expensive price to keep the property at 591 Franklin.
3. On or about April 24, 2008, Ataide and his mother, Donna Ataide, met with respondent at his office. Shortly thereafter, Craig Ataide conveyed funds with a cashier's check to respondent in the sum of \$460,000, check no. 349143807. The check was issued to respondent with the name "Donna C. Ataide/Datacom" identified in the memo line. Respondent received the funds and deposited them into his attorney client trust account, account number 41099XXX at Bancorp Bank (hereinafter, "CTA").
4. During the meeting between Donna Ataide and respondent, respondent told Donna Ataide that he would properly maintain the funds in his CTA account and convey them to Datacom for the Franklin Street property. Respondent did not state that he would offset any of the funds prior to their return.
5. On April 29, 2008, respondent wrote opposing counsel, Appel, and advised that he had \$460,000 in confirmed funds, (referring to the funds from Donna Ataide), and that he intended to tender the funds for the \$450,000 cost plus a \$5,700 per diem charge to cancel the trustee's deeds and for Datacom to accept a pay off of the Datacom lien. On April 30, 2008, Appel notified respondent that Ataide did not timely close escrow and both the Monterey and Hawaii (a cross-collateralized property) properties were sold at trustees sales.
6. On April 30, 2008 respondent wrote to his client and confirmed that the client's \$460,000 offer to Datacom, for an assignment, from Datacom, of their trust deed was rejected, and that Datacom would insist that the matter be resolved not by an assignment, but by a reconveyance. A reconveyance would involve additional costs for judgement liens and other miscellaneous charges.

7. In the same April 30, 2008 letter, respondent allocated the \$460,000 in funds as follows: \$19,900 to himself for reimbursement of bad checks received by respondent and issued by Ataide; \$4,971.95 for an attorney's lien for attorney Iwashita for his work on the Hawaii property; \$44,000 to respondent for attorney's fees in the matter, (total: \$68,871.00) leaving a balance of \$391,000. Respondent enclosed a check to Craig Ataide in the sum of \$391,000. 129 

8. Shortly thereafter, on or about May 5, 2008, Craig Ataide disputed respondent's distribution of the \$460,000 to any party other than Ataide or Donna Ataide. Respondent received notice of Ataide's dispute of the funds on or before this date. Ataide's new counsel, Berry, sent respondent a letter dated May 12, 2008 objecting to his retention of the funds.

9. On or between April 30, 2008 and June 1, 2008, respondent distributed the Ataide funds in his CTA account as follows: The first five checks were issued on April 30, 2008; the remaining checks are noted individually, as follows:

- i) check no. 3071 in the sum of \$19,900 issued to respondent, notation: bad check reimbursement; this check was negotiated into another account on May 5, 2008;
- ii) check no. 3072 in the sum of \$4,971.65 issued to Andrew Iwashita, notation: fee outstanding, this check was negotiated on May 16, 2008 in First Hawaiian Bank;
- iii) check no. 3073 in the sum of \$391,129.00 issued to Craig Ataide, notation: "refund remaining balance of loan proceeds"; this check was negotiated on 5/2/08;
- iv) check no. 3076, in the sum of \$2,500, issued to respondent, notation: "Ataide, Craig, (cost reimbursement)"; this check was negotiated on May 2, 2008;
- v) check no. 3077, in the sum of \$31,000, issued to respondent, notation, "Ataide, Craig (stipulated fee payment)"; this check was negotiated May 14, 2008;
- vi) on May 6, 2008, check no. 3078, in the sum of \$10,000 issued to respondent, notation: Craig Ataide, stipulated fee payment; this check was negotiated May 7, 2008;
- vii) on June 1, 2008, check no. 3082, for \$499.35, notation: Craig Ataide stipulated fee payment; this check was negotiated on June 11, 2008.

10. Donna Ataide and Craig Ataide did not consent to respondent's distribution of the funds to himself or to any third party, other than Datacom, for any reason. Donna Ataide provided \$460,000 to respondent for the purpose of conveying the funds to Datacom for the Franklin Street property. The funds that respondent distributed to other parties amounted to \$68,871.00.

11. On or about May 5, 2008, respondent knew that Ataide, on behalf of himself and Donna Ataide, disputed respondent's distribution of Donna Ataide's funds to Ataide's legal fees and payments to third parties.

12. Respondent nonetheless distributed \$41,499.35 after May 5, 2008, after he was aware of Ataide's and Donna Ataide's dispute of his distribution of funds.



**Conclusions of Law: Count Two:**

By distributing \$41,499.35 of the funds after he knew that the Ataides disputed his distribution of the funds, respondent withdrew client funds from a client trust account prior to the resolution of a dispute with the client over respondent's right to receive those funds, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A)(2).

**Facts: Count Three:**

13. The allegations of Count Two are hereby incorporated by reference.

14. In or about December 2007 or January, 2008, respondent provided Ataide with a document entitled "General Appearance Waiver of Fee Arbitration Stipulation for Entry of Judgment and Order for Entry of Judgment," in which Ataide waived all arbitration rights and agreed to a stipulated fee of \$45,964.00. Ataide signed this document at respondent's behest.

15. Respondent obtained a pecuniary interest adverse to his client when Ataide executed the "General Appearance Waiver of Fee Arbitration Stipulation for Entry of Judgment and Order for Entry of Judgment" because Ataide had waived the right to arbitrate and/or litigate respondent's fee.

16. The "General Appearance Waiver of Fee Arbitration Stipulation for Entry of Judgment and Order for Entry of Judgment" was not a fair and reasonable agreement for Ataide for reasons including, but not limited to, the following:

- i) Respondent advised Ataide that he would no longer continue to represent Ataide unless Ataide signed the agreement, and, at the time, Ataide was at imminent risk for losing the Franklin Street property and in urgent need of legal assistance;
- ii) Respondent did not provide an accounting of fees to Ataide, to justify the \$45,964.00 amount.

17. The "General Appearance Waiver of Fee Arbitration Stipulation for Entry of Judgment and Order for Entry of Judgment" did not specify in writing that the client may seek the advice of an independent lawyer of the client's choice; respondent did not inform Ataide that he could seek the advice of an independent lawyer of his choice to review the agreement.

**Conclusion of Law: Count Three:**

By requiring that Ataide execute the "General Appearance Waiver of Fee Arbitration Stipulation for Entry of Judgment and Order for Entry of Judgment" during a period in which Ataide was in urgent need of legal assistance, without providing Ataide with an accounting of his fees, without advising Ataide that he could seek the advice of an independent lawyer of his choice to review the agreement, respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-300.

**Facts: Count Four:**

18. The allegations of Counts Two and Three are hereby incorporated by reference.

19. Ataide's uncle, Don Patterson, made several wire transfers to respondent on behalf of Ataide, including a transfer of \$15,000 on or about November 29, 2007 and a transfer of \$5,000 on or about December, 2007. These funds were transferred to respondent's business account, account number 410936XXX at First National (a.k.a. Pacific Capital Bancorp) Bank.

20. Ataide made several payments to respondent, including several checks that bounced.

21. Respondent did not render an accounting to Ataide regarding all funds coming into respondent's possession on Ataide's behalf. Respondent belatedly sought to reconstruct this information in 2010, at the request of the State Bar, but his records are incomplete.

22. Respondent is unable to fully account for all funds coming into his possession on behalf of Ataide. He cannot verify that payments were made to third parties, including, but not limited, to the following: 1) an alleged payment of \$952 made to a mortgage broker; 2) an alleged payment of \$1,734 to Recorder, Monterey County.

**Conclusions of Law: Count Four:**

By failing to render appropriate accounts to a client regarding all funds or coming into respondent's possession, respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(3).

**PENDING PROCEEDINGS.**

The disclosure date referred to, on page 2, paragraph A(7), was March 9, 2011.

**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>
08-O-12932	One	Business and Professions Code §6106
	Five	Rules of Professional Conduct rule 4-100(A)
	Six	Rules of Professional Conduct rule 4-210(A)

**COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.**

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of March 9, 2011, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$6,452.70. 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.**

Standard 1.6, subdivision (a) provides that the appropriate sanction for an act of professional misconduct shall be that set forth in the following standards for the particular act of misconduct found or acknowledged. If two or more acts of professional misconduct are found or acknowledged in a single

disciplinary proceeding, and different sanctions are prescribed by these standards for said acts, the sanction imposed shall be the more or most severe of the different applicable sanctions.

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

Standard 2.8 provides that Culpability of a member of a wilful violation of rule 3-300, Rules of Professional Conduct, shall result in suspension unless the extent of the member's misconduct and the harm to the client are minimal, in which case, the degree of discipline shall be reproof.

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



(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:  WILLIAM B. LOOK, JR. SBN 66631	Case Number(s):  08-O-12932-LMA
--	---------------------------------------

**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.)**

Date April 4, 2011 Pat McElroy  
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 San Francisco, on April 4, 2011, 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:

WILLIAM BLACKFORD LOOK, JR.  
P O BOX 1381  
MONTEREY, CA 93942 - 1381

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

WONDER LIANG, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on April 4, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Laine Silber  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court