

**STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
HEARING DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES**

In the Matter of	)	Case Nos.: <b>11-O-16101 (11-O-16173; 11-O-16190;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16193; 11-O-16409; 11-O-16450;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16532; 11-O-16605; 11-O-16608;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16609; 11-O-16611; 11-O-16613;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16614; 11-O-16618; 11-O-16620;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16740; 11-O-16751; 11-O-16823;</b>
<b>ANTHONY JOSEPH KASSAS,</b>	)	<b>11-O-16824; 11-O-16827; 11-O-16833;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16834; 11-O-16843; 11-O-16844;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16845; 11-O-16846; 11-O-16847;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16848; 11-O-16849; 11-O-16850;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16851; 11-O-16852; 11-O-16853;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16854; 11-O-16912; 11-O-16913;</b>
<b>Member No. 227647,</b>	)	<b>11-O-16914; 11-O-16915; 11-O-16918;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-16953; 11-O-16958; 11-O-17020;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-17023; 11-O-17024; 11-O-17112;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-17123; 11-O-17124; 11-O-17127;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-17133; 11-O-17136; 11-O-17137;</b>
	)	<b>11-O-17138; 11-O-17149; 11-O-17150;</b>
<b>A Member of the State Bar.</b>	)	<b>11-O-17151; 11-O-17152; 11-C-16440;</b>
	)	<b>12-C-10281(Cons.)-DFM</b>
	)	
	)	<b>DECISION AND ORDER OF</b>
	)	<b>INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE</b>
	)	<b>ENROLLMENT</b>
	)	

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Respondent Anthony Joseph Kassas (Respondent) was convicted on two separate occasions of violating Penal Code section 273.6, subdivision (a) [violation of a protective order], misdemeanors violations which may or may not involve moral turpitude or constitute other misconduct warranting discipline. After the finality of the convictions, the Review Department

of the State Bar Court issued orders referring these matters to the hearing department for a hearing and decision recommending the discipline to be imposed if the facts and circumstances surrounding the violations involved moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline.

In a separate matter, Respondent was also charged with (1) 52 counts of willfully violating rule 1-400 of the Rules of Professional Conduct<sup>1</sup> [improper solicitation]; (2) 56 counts of willfully violating rule 1-300(A) [aiding the unauthorized practice of law]; (3) 56 counts of willfully violating Business and Professions Code section 6106.3, subdivision (a)<sup>2</sup> [mortgage loan modifications-violation of Civil Code section 2944.7]; (4) 56 counts of willfully violating rule 4-100(B)(3) [render appropriate accounts]; (5) 55 counts of willfully violating section 6106 [moral turpitude]; (6) five counts of willfully violating rule 3-110(A) [failure to perform legal services with competence]; (7) three counts of willfully violating rule 3-700(D)(2) [failure to return unearned fees]; (8) one count of willfully violating rule 1-310 [forming a partnership with a non-lawyer]; and (9) one count of willfully violating rule 1-320(A) [sharing fees with non-lawyers].

All three matters were consolidated. Respondent's response to each Notice of Hearing on Conviction (NOH) in case No. 11-C-16440 and in case No.12-C-10281, and his response to the Notice of Disciplinary Charges (NDC) in case No. 11-O-16101 were stricken, and Respondent's default was entered in the consolidated matters pursuant to rules 5.80, 5.81, and 5.100 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, as a result of Respondent having failed to comply with the State Bar's notice to appear in lieu of subpoena (rule 5.100) and this court's orders that (1) he appear for trial and (2) he personally appear for the hearing of the Order to Show Cause (OSC) and show cause why sanctions should not be imposed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all further references to rules are to this source.

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all further references to section(s) refer to provisions of the Business and Professions Code.

The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel (State Bar) filed a petition for disbarment under rule 5.85 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar (Rules of Procedure). Rule 5.85 of the Rules of Procedure provides the procedure to follow when an attorney fails to participate in a disciplinary proceeding or fails to appear at trial after receiving adequate notice and opportunity. As pertinent to this matter, the rule provides that, if an attorney's default is entered for failing to respond to the NDC or the NOH, and the attorney fails to have the default set aside or vacated within 180 days, the State Bar will file a petition requesting the court to recommend the attorney's disbarment.<sup>3</sup>

In the instant case, the court concludes that the requirements of rule 5.85 have been satisfied, and therefore, grants the petition and recommends that Respondent be disbarred from the practice of law.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS**

Respondent was admitted to practice law in this state on December 3, 2003, and has been a member since then.<sup>4</sup>

#### **Procedural Requirements Have Been Satisfied**

On November 15, 2011, the State Bar Court filed and properly served the NOH in case No. 11-C-16440 on Respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to his membership records address on that date. The NOH notified Respondent that his failure to participate in the proceeding would result in a disbarment recommendation. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.41 & 5.345.) Respondent filed a response to the NOH on November 23, 2011.

---

<sup>3</sup> If the court determines that any due process requirements are not satisfied, including adequate notice to the attorney, it must deny the petition for disbarment and take other appropriate action to ensure that the matter is promptly resolved. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.85(E)(2).)

<sup>4</sup> Although the NDC alleges that Respondent was admitted to practice law in this state on December 3, 2002, pursuant to Evidence Code section 452, subdivision (h), the court takes judicial notice of Respondent's State Bar membership records which reflect that Respondent was admitted to practice law in this state on December 3, 2003.

On March 20, 2012, the State Bar Court filed and properly served the NOH in case No. 12-C-10281 on Respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to his membership records address on that date and by first-class mail, postage fully prepaid, on Respondent's counsel. The NOH notified Respondent that his failure to participate in the proceeding would result in a disbarment recommendation. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.41 & 5.345.) Respondent filed a response to the NOH on March 28, 2012.

The State Bar filed and served the NDC in case Nos. 11-O-16101, etc. on Respondent's counsel on April 6, 2012. The NDC notified Respondent that his failure to participate in the proceeding would result in a disbarment recommendation. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.41.) Respondent filed a response to the NDC on May 8, 2012.

Case Nos. 11-C-16440, 12-C-10281, and 11-O-16101, etc. were consolidated on May 9, 2012.

At an in-person status conference held on June 25, 2012, at which both Respondent and his counsel appeared, the court set trial for September 4-6, 11-14, and 18-21, 2012, in this consolidated matter. Thereafter, the court filed an order on June 27, 2012, setting forth that trial would commence on September 4, 2012, and would continue from day to day until completed or as otherwise ordered by the court. The order was properly served on Respondent's counsel by first-class mail, postage fully prepaid, on June 27, 2012.

A notice to appear in lieu of subpoena, requesting Respondent's attendance at trial on September 4-21, 2012, or as otherwise scheduled by the court, was filed and served on Respondent's counsel on July 12, 2012.

At a pretrial conference on August 27, 2012, at which Respondent's counsel appeared, trial was trailed to commence on September 5, 2012. A minute order setting forth that trial was to commence on September 5, 2012, was filed and properly served by first-class mail, postage fully prepaid, on Respondent's counsel on August 28, 2012.

On September 5, 2012, Respondent did not appear at trial, although he had been served with a notice to appear pursuant to rule 5.100 of the Rules of Procedure. Respondent's counsel, however, was present at trial. Respondent was not present when he was called as a witness on that day. During the proceedings, and in the presence of Respondent's counsel, the court orally ordered Respondent to appear for trial on September 6, 2012, at 9:30 a.m., in order to testify. The court memorialized its oral order in a written order filed on September 5, 2012, which was served on that same date on Respondent's counsel by first-class mail, postage fully prepaid, and on Respondent by overnight mail to his membership records address and which was also transmitted electronically to Respondent at an email address provided by Respondent's counsel.<sup>5</sup>

Notwithstanding the notice to appear and the court's September 5, 2012 order, Respondent failed to appear as a witness at trial on September 6, 2012.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, the court issued an oral and written order on September 6, 2012, that Respondent personally appear in this proceeding on September 10, 2012, at 1:45 p.m., and show cause in writing at or before that time, as to why his responses in this proceeding should not be stricken and his default entered, as a sanction for his failure to appear at trial, in violation of the notice to appear and this court's prior order. The order was properly served on September 6, 2012, by first-class mail, postage fully prepaid, to Respondent's counsel and personally served on Daniel Woodford of the Century Law Group. The order was also emailed to Respondent personally.

On September 10, 2012, Respondent failed to appear for the hearing on the Order to Show Cause (OSC). Respondent's attorney was present and confirmed that Respondent was aware of the court's OSC and of the threatened sanction, and stated that Respondent was consenting to having the threatened default sanction imposed. At that time, this court orally

---

<sup>5</sup> Pursuant to Evidence Code section 452, subdivision (h), the court takes judicial notice of the membership records address of Respondent and his counsel.

<sup>6</sup> Although Respondent did not appear, Daniel Woodford of the Century Law Group appeared for Respondent's counsel.

stated that it was striking Respondent's responses in the pending disciplinary matters and entering Respondent's default in the proceedings.

Respondent's having failed to comply with the State Bar's notice to appear in lieu of subpoena (rule 5.100) and this court's prior orders that (1) he appear for trial and (2) he personally appear for the hearing of the OSC and show cause why sanctions should not be imposed (as set out in the OSC), and good cause appearing, the court filed an order on September 11, 2012, striking Respondent's responses in case Nos. 11-O-16101, etc., 11-C-16440, and 12-C-10281 and entering Respondent default in such matters pursuant to rules 5.80, 5.81, and 5.100 of the Rules of Procedure. The order notified Respondent that if he did not timely move to set aside his default, the court would recommend his disbarment. The court also ordered Respondent enrolled as an inactive member of the State Bar of California under Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (e). The inactive enrollment was effective three days after the service of this order. The order was properly served on Respondent and his counsel on September 11, 2012, by certified mail, return receipt requested, to their membership records addresses.

Respondent did not seek to have his default set aside or vacated. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.83(C)(1) [attorney has 180 days to file motion to set aside default].) The State Bar filed a petition for disbarment on April 5, 2013. As required by rule 5.85(A), the State Bar reported in the petition that: (1) it has had no contact with Respondent since his default was entered and the order entering default was served; (2) there are other disciplinary matters pending against Respondent (over 100 investigation matters are pending); (3) Respondent has no prior record of discipline; and (4) the Client Security Fund has not paid out any claims as a result of Respondent's misconduct, although there are many claims pending. Respondent did not respond to the petition for disbarment or move to set aside or vacate the default. The case was submitted for decision on May 2, 2013.

## **The Admitted Factual Allegations Warrant the Imposition of Discipline**

Upon entry of Respondent's default, the factual allegations in the State Bar's pretrial statement and in the NDC are deemed admitted and no further proof is required to establish the truth of such facts. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.82.) As set forth below in greater detail, Respondent's convictions for violating a protective order, and the factual allegations in the NDC, support the conclusion that Respondent violated a statute, rule or court order that would warrant the imposition of discipline. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.85(E)(1)(d).)

- 1. Case Numbers 11-O-16101 (11-O-16173; 11-O-16190; 11-O-16193; 11-O-16409; 11-O-16450; 11-O-16532; 11-O-16605; 11-O-16608; 11-O-16609; 11-O-16611; 11-O-16613; 11-O-16614; 11-O-16618; 11-O-16620; 11-O-16740; 11-O-16751; 11-O-16823; 11-O-16824; 11-O-16827; 11-O-16833; 11-O-16834; 11-O-16843; 11-O-16844; 11-O-16845; 11-O-16846; 11-O-16847; 11-O-16848; 11-O-16849; 11-O-16850; 11-O-16851; 11-O-16852; 11-O-16853; 11-O-16854; 11-O-16912; 11-O-16913; 11-O-16914; 11-O-16915; 11-O-16918; 11-O-16953; 11-O-16958; 11-O-17020; 11-O-17023; 11-O-17024; 11-O-17112; 11-O-17123; 11-O-17124; 11-O-17127; 11-O-17133; 11-O-17136; 11-O-17137; 11-O-17138; 11-O-17149; 11-O-17150; 11-O-17151; 11-O-17152) (Forming a Partnership with a Non-Lawyer)**

Count 1 – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-310 [forming a partnership with a non-lawyer] by forming a partnership with a non-attorney firm where at least one of the activities of that partnership consisted of the practice of law; to wit, Respondent entered into an agreement with a non-attorney firm whereby the non-attorney firm would solicit client's for Respondent's law firm and provide foreclosure relief and loan modification services to Respondent's clients, and Respondent provided his name as an attorney for use by the non-attorney firm.

///

///

///

///

///

///

2. **Case Nos. 11-O-16101 (11-O-16173; 11-O-16190; 11-O-16193; 11-O-16409; 11-O-16450; 11-O-16532; 11-O-16605; 11-O-16608; 11-O-16609; 11-O-16611; 11-O-16613; 11-O-16614; 11-O-16618; 11-O-16620; 11-O-16740; 11-O-16751; 11-O-16823; 11-O-16824; 11-O-16827; 11-O-16833; 11-O-16834; 11-O-16843; 11-O-16844; 11-O-16845; 11-O-16846; 11-O-16847; 11-O-16848; 11-O-16849; 11-O-16850; 11-O-16851; 11-O-16852; 11-O-16853; 11-O-16854; 11-O-16912; 11-O-16913; 11-O-16914; 11-O-16915; 11-O-16918; 11-O-16953; 11-O-16958; 11-O-17020; 11-O-17023; 11-O-17024; 11-O-17112; 11-O-17123; 11-O-17124; 11-O-17127; 11-O-17133; 11-O-17136; 11-O-17137; 11-O-17138; 11-O-17149; 11-O-17150; 11-O-17151; 11-O-17152) (Sharing Legal Fees with a Non-Lawyer)**

Count Two – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-320(A) [sharing fees with non-lawyers] by sharing fees collected from Respondent’s clients with the non-attorney firm.

3. **Case Number 11-O-16101 (Martinez Matter)**

Count Three – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-400 [improper solicitation] by delivering or causing to be delivered, a communication seeking professional employment for pecuniary gain, which was transmitted by mail, which violated rule 1-400 by not bearing the words “Newsletter,” “Advertisement” or words of similar import in 12 point print on the first page; the presentation or arrangement of the communication tended to confuse, deceive, or mislead the public; and the communication contained an untrue statement.

Count Four – Respondent willfully violated rule 1-300(A) [aiding the unauthorized practice of law] by allowing his non-attorney employees to give legal advice to a client.

Count Five – Respondent willfully violated section 6106.3, subdivision (a) [mortgage loan modifications-violation of Civil Code section 2944.7] by negotiating, arranging or offering to perform a mortgage loan modification or mortgage loan forbearance for a fee paid by a borrower, and demanding, charging, collecting and/or receiving fees from a client prior to fully performing each and every service Respondent had contracted to perform or represented that he would perform in violation of Civil Code section 2944.7, subdivision (a)(1).



Count Six – Respondent willfully violated rule 3-110(A) [failure to perform legal services with competence] by failing to supervise his non-attorney employees and allowing them to make a misrepresentation to his client.

Count Seven – Respondent willfully violated rule 4-100(B)(3) [render appropriate accounts] by failing to provide an accounting to his client.

Count Eight – Respondent willfully violated section 6106 [moral turpitude] by causing a mailer to be sent to a potential client which encouraged the potential client to join a lawsuit which Respondent was aware had not been filed, with the intention of soliciting the potential client for loan modifications services; then, when the potential client responded to the mailer inquiring about joining the lawsuit, the potential client was signed up for loan modification services.

In addition to these eight counts, the facts alleged in the NDC which are deemed admitted as a result of the entry of Respondent's default, also support a finding that Respondent in an additional 55 counts willfully violated rules 1-300(A) and 4-100(B)(3) and section 6106.3, subdivision (a); in 53 additional counts willfully violated section 6106; in 51 additional counts willfully violated rule 1-400; in three counts willfully violated rule 3-700(D)(2) [failure to return unearned fees]; and in two additional counts willfully violated rule 3-110(A).<sup>7</sup>

#### **4. Case No. 11-C-16440 (Violation of Protective Order)**

Respondent pleaded guilty on July 20, 2011, to a violation of Penal Code section 273.6, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor violation of a protective order in Orange County Superior Court, case No. SAPD 10-38761. The superior court ordered the imposition of Respondent's sentence

---

<sup>7</sup> The court does not find Respondent culpable of willfully violating rule 3-110(A) in counts 12 and 18, as there is no clear and convincing evidence that misrepresentations were made to clients by Respondent's non-attorneys employee(s). The court also does not find Respondent culpable of willfully violating section 6106 in count 121, as there is no evidence that Respondent authorized his non-attorney employee to make the representation made to Respondent's client.

suspended; placed him on three years of informal probation; ordered him to complete eight hours of community service; and fined him \$870. Violating a protective order is a crime that may or may not involve moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline, depending upon the facts and circumstances surrounding the conviction. Although the court is not aware of the specific facts and circumstances surrounding Respondent's conviction, the conviction itself constitutes other misconduct warranting discipline, as it establishes a violation of section 6103 [violation of a court order]. Conviction of a crime involving other misconduct warranting discipline is grounds for discipline. (*Young v. State Bar* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 1204.)

**5. Case No. 12-C-10281 (Violation of Protective Order)**

The Los Angeles County District Attorney filed a complaint on April 11, 2011, in Los Angeles Superior Court charging Respondent with two counts of violating Penal Code section 273.6, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor violation of a protective order, and one count of violating Penal Code section 646.9, subdivision (a), stalking, in case No. 1LG01142. Respondent pleaded nolo contendere on July 5, 2011, to a violation of Penal Code section 273.6, subdivision (a) and the remaining counts were dismissed. The court ordered the imposition of Respondent's sentence suspended; placed him on three years of summary probation; ordered him to serve two days in jail (with credit for two days served); ordered him to complete 28 hours of Cal. Trans. community service; and fined him \$100. Violating a protective order is a crime that may or may not involve moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline, depending upon the facts and circumstances surrounding the conviction. Although the court is not aware of the specific facts and circumstances surrounding Respondent's conviction, the conviction itself constitutes other misconduct warranting discipline, as it establishes a violation of section 6103 [violation of a court order]. Conviction of a crime involving other misconduct warranting discipline is grounds for discipline. (*Young v. State Bar* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 1204.)

///

## **Disbarment is Recommended**

Based on the above, the court concludes that the requirements of rule 5.85(E) have been satisfied, and Respondent's disbarment is recommended. In particular:

(1) the NOHs were properly served on Respondent under rule 5.25; the NDC was served on Respondent's counsel by certified mail, return receipt requested;

(2) Respondent had actual notice of this consolidated proceeding, as he filed a response to each NOH and to the NDC. He also had notice of the trial dates prior to the entry of the default, as he appeared at the status conference where trial dates were set for September 2012, and his counsel was present at the pretrial conference at which time trial was trailed to September 5, 2012;

(3) the default was properly entered; and

(4) Respondent's convictions, and the factual allegations in the State Bar's pretrial statement and in the NDC, deemed admitted by the entry of the default, support a finding that respondent violated a statute, rule or court order that would warrant the imposition of discipline.<sup>8</sup>

Despite having actual notice of this consolidated proceeding, Respondent's responses to the NOHs in case No. 11-C-16440 and in case No.12-C-10281, and the NDC in case No. 11-O-16101, etc. were stricken, and Respondent's default was entered in this consolidated matter, as a result of Respondent having failed to comply with the State Bar's notice to appear in lieu of subpoena (rule 5.100) and this court's orders that (1) he appear for trial and (2) he personally appear for the hearing of the OSC and show cause why sanctions should not be imposed. As set forth in the Rules of Procedure, the court recommends disbarment.

---

<sup>8</sup> The court may recommend disbarment if, inter alia, the factual allegations deemed admitted in the NDC support at least one finding that the member violated a rule, statute or court order. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.85(E)(1)(d).) Here, Respondent has been found culpable of violating a rule or statute in 282 counts alleged in the NDC, and Respondent's criminal violations have been found to involve other misconduct warranting discipline; to wit, a violation of section 6103.

## RECOMMENDATION

### Disbarment

The court recommends that Respondent Anthony Joseph Kassas be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of California and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys.

### Restitution

The court recommends that Respondent be ordered to make restitution to the following payees:

- (1) Elvia Martinez in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from May 14, 2011;
- (2) Oscar Cascabelo in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 11, 2011;
- (3) Jorge Palacios in the amount of \$1,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 28, 2011;
- (4) Paul Grundy in the amount of \$3,666 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 21, 2011;
- (5) Oscar Romo in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 5, 2011;
- (6) Youssouf Traore in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from May 26, 2011;
- (7) Lucy Guadiana in the amount of \$1,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 2, 2011;
- (8) Margaret Hosmer in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 22, 2011;
- (9) Karla Robinson in the amount of \$2,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 9, 2011;
- (10) Lawrence Ruggiero in the amount of \$3,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 6, 2011;
- (11) Stephen and Amelia Koh in the amount of \$2,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 8, 2011;
- (12) Maria Rodriguez in the amount of \$4,665 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 7, 2011;

- (13) Massood Ghassemi in the amount of \$3,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 23, 2011;
- (14) Richard and Donna Rogers in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 12, 2011;
- (15) Alexandria Brown in the amount of \$1,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 8, 2011;
- (16) Tom and Charlotte Sheppard in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 1, 2011;
- (17) David and Gloria Assorson in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 21, 2011;
- (18) Daniel LaRosa in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 21, 2011;
- (19) Lilit Mambreyan in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 23, 2011;
- (20) Kenneth Villagran in the amount of \$2,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 3, 2011;
- (21) Pearl Maldonado in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 23, 2011;
- (22) Brian Lium in the amount of \$1,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 27, 2011;
- (23) Marina Limon in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from May 10, 2011;
- (24) Urik Ghazalian in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 1, 2011;
- (25) Kathy Massey in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 1, 2011;
- (26) May Akabogu Collins in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 17, 2011;
- (27) Nickolas and Lindsay Quinn in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from May 23, 2011;
- (28) William Infante in the amount of \$5,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from May 27, 2011;
- (29) Chet Thomas in the amount of \$3,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 15, 2011;

- (30) Colleen Fuglaar in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 2, 2011;
- (31) Danny Harrison in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 30, 2011;
- (32) David Battaglia in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 7, 2011;
- (33) Robert DeValle in the amount of \$3,125 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 30, 2011;
- (34) Tammara Moore in the amount of \$9,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 6, 2011;
- (35) Anthony Pagano in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 8, 2011;
- (36) Richard Walker in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 13, 2011;
- (37) Steven Iversen in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from April 28, 2011;
- (38) Louis Jackson in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 1, 2011;
- (39) Chad Ouellette in the amount of \$2,750 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 1, 2011;
- (40) Willie and Betty Daniel in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 4, 2011;
- (41) Rodney Thomas in the amount of \$3,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 1, 2011;
- (42) Donald Richards in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 22, 2011;
- (43) Apolinar Munoz in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 2, 2011;
- (44) Lynette Freeman in the amount of \$6,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 18, 2011;
- (45) Luis A. Vargas in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from May 23, 2011;
- (46) Sincerely Layne in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 10, 2011;

- (47) Anthony Sciarrino in the amount of \$2,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 1, 2011;
- (48) Kevin Crouch in the amount of \$1,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 12, 2011;
- (49) Carolyn Berger in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 15, 2011;
- (50) Marilyn and Walter Marchetti in the amount of \$5,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 15, 2011;
- (51) Michael Harris in the amount of \$3,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 8, 2011;
- (52) James Hanna in the amount of \$5,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from August 4, 2011;
- (53) Alfredo Landeros in the amount of \$4,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 1, 2011;
- (54) Francisco Zaragoza in the amount of \$4,500 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 11, 2011;
- (55) Seyed Yaghoubi in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 8, 2011; and
- (56) Boyd Kerr in the amount of \$2,250 plus 10 percent interest per year from July 21, 2011.

Any restitution owed to the Client Security Fund is enforceable as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.5, subdivisions (c) and (d).

**California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20**

The court also recommends that Respondent be ordered to comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this proceeding.

///

///

///

**Costs**

The court further recommends that costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10, such costs being enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

**INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT**

In accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), the court orders that Anthony Joseph Kassas, State Bar number 227647, be involuntarily enrolled as an inactive member of the State Bar of California, effective three calendar days after the service of this decision and order. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.111(D).)

Dated: July \_\_\_\_\_, 2013

---

DONALD F. MILES  
Judge of the State Bar Court