


(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>Tammy M. Albertsen Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2527</p> <p>Bar # 154248</p>	<p>Case Number(s): 12-C-17750-PEM</p>	<p>For Court use only</p> <p><b>PUBLIC MATTER</b></p> <p><b>FILED</b> </p> <p>JAN 09 2014</p> <p>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</p>
<p>In Pro Per Respondent</p> <p>James Allen Reichle 661 Red Knoll Road Greenville, CA 95947 (530) 284-1944</p> <p>Bar # 45807</p>	<p>Submitted to: <b>Settlement Judge</b></p> <p>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</p>	
<p>In the Matter of:</p> <p><b>JAMES ALLEN REICHLER</b></p> <p>Bar # 45807</p> <p>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</p>	<p><b>ACTUAL SUSPENSION</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</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 January 15, 1970.
- (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.

(Effective January 1, 2011)



(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: Costs are to be paid in equal amounts over the three billing cycles following the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (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 06-C-15271; 07-C-13429 [See Attachment at page 9]
  - (b)  Date prior discipline effective March 27, 2008
  - (c)  Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: facts and circumstances surrounding criminal convictions for first and second alcohol offenses (handled as a single - although not officially consolidated - matter) show misconduct warranting discipline
  - (d)  Degree of prior discipline public reproof
  - (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

---

- (4)  **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.
- (5)  **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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:**

See, Stipulation Attachment, pages 8-9.

\* Pre-trial Stipulation

**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 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:**

(Do not write above this line.)

- (1)  If Respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until he/she proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in the general law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
- (2)  During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3)  Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of 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:**

(Effective January 1, 2011)

Actual Suspension

- (1)  **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination:** Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. **Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 5.162(A) & (E), Rules of Procedure.**
- 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:** Respondent must attend a minimum of two (2) meetings per month of any abstinence-based self-help group. See page 7.

Attachment language (if any):

Respondent recognizes that a repeat conviction for DUI suggests an alcohol and/or drug problem that needs to be addressed before it affects Respondent's legal practice. Respondent agrees to take the steps necessary to control the use of alcohol and/or drugs such that it will not affect Respondent's law practice in the future. Respondent's agreement to participate in an abstinence-based self-help group (as defined herein), as a condition of this stipulation, is part of Respondent's efforts to address such concerns.

As a condition of this stipulation, and during the period of probation, Respondent must attend a minimum of two (2) meetings per month of any abstinence-based self-help group of Respondent's choosing, including without limitation Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, LifeRing, S.M.A.R.T., S.O.S., etc. Other self-help maintenance programs are acceptable if they include a subculture to support recovery, including abstinence-based group meetings. (See *O'Conner v. Calif.* (C.D. Calif. 1994) 855 F. Supp. 303 [no First Amendment violation where probationer given choice between AA and secular program.] ) Respondent is encouraged, but not required, to obtain a "sponsor" during the term of participation in these meetings.

The program called "Moderation Management" is not acceptable because it is not abstinence-based and allows the participant to continue consuming alcohol.

Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and obtain written approval for the program Respondent has selected prior to attending the first self-help group meeting. If Respondent wants to change groups, Respondent must first obtain the Office of Probation's written approval prior to attending a meeting with the new self-help group.

Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance of the meetings set forth herein with each Quarterly Report submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent may not sign as the verifier of his or her own attendance.

Respondent is encouraged, but is not required, to participate in the Lawyers' Assistance Program, to abstain from alcohol and illegal drugs, and to undergo random urinalysis testing to complement abstinence.





had driven his car up to a local resident to ask a question, then drove away but stopped again, blocking other traffic. The resident approached Respondent to get Respondent to move his car out of the way. Respondent moved the car and then exited the car and began speaking to the resident, at which time Respondent fell to the ground. The local resident caused 9-1-1 to be called. Paramedics and police officers responded. Upon arrival, police discovered Respondent being treated by paramedics. Based on the statements of the resident and the police officer's own observations, the police officer suspected that Respondent was under the influence of alcohol at the time of driving. Respondent was transported to the hospital.

7. Police went to the hospital to further investigate the allegation that Respondent was under the influence of alcohol when he was driving. Respondent had earlier lost consciousness and, after being roused by a paramedic, had then fallen asleep. Once awake and able to respond to questions, police asked Respondent's permission to obtain a blood sample. Respondent agreed.

8. Respondent's blood had an alcohol content of .23. Police cited Respondent for driving under the influence of alcohol and for having an excessive blood alcohol level.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

9. The facts and circumstances surrounding the above-described violation(s) did not involve moral turpitude but did involve other misconduct warranting discipline.

#### **AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**

**Prior Record of Discipline (Std. 1.2(b)(i)):** Respondent has a prior record of discipline from 2008 for two DUI convictions. State Bar case number 06-C-15271 resulted from Respondent's conviction of a violation of Vehicle Code section 23103.5 [alcohol-related reckless driving]. State Bar case number 07-C-13249 resulted from Respondent's conviction to a violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 [driving under the influence of alcohol with a blood alcohol level of 0.08 percent or more]; at the time, Respondent was still on probation for the 2006 conviction. In mitigation, Respondent had been practicing for 36 years before the first arrest, performed significant pro bono work, was found to have good character as attested by numerous witnesses, and cooperated fully with the State Bar.

#### **MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**

**Pretrial Stipulation:** Respondent voluntarily entered the instant stipulation, thereby accepting responsibility for his actions and also alleviating the State Bar and State Bar Court from expending further resources. (*Silva-Vidor v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [where mitigative credit was given for entering into a stipulation as to facts and culpability].)

#### **AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.**

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

preservation of public confidence in the legal profession.” (*In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 205; std 1.3.)

Although not binding, the standards are entitled to “great weight” and should be followed “whenever possible” in determining level of discipline. (*In re Silverton* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 81, 92, quoting *In re Brown* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 205, 220 and *In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 267, fn. 11.) Adherence to the standards in the great majority of cases serves the valuable purpose of eliminating disparity and assuring consistency, that is, the imposition of similar attorney discipline for instances of similar attorney misconduct. (*In re Naney* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 186, 190.) Any discipline recommendation different from that set forth in the applicable standards should clearly explain the reasons for the deviation. (*Blair v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 762, 776, fn. 5.)

Respondent’s offense does not involve moral turpitude, but does involve other misconduct warranting discipline.

Standard 3.4 provides that “[f]inal conviction of a member of a crime which does not involve moral turpitude inherently or in the facts and circumstances surrounding the crime’s commission but which does involve other misconduct warranting discipline shall result in a sanction as prescribed under part B of these standards appropriate to the nature and extent of the misconduct found to have been committed by the member.”

Under Part B, Standard 2.10 is most applicable to Respondent’s misconduct. Standard 2.10 states that the appropriate level of discipline for such misconduct is a “reproval or suspension according to the gravity of the offense or the harm, if any, to the victim, with due regard to the purposes of imposing discipline set forth in standard 1.3.”

Here, Respondent was convicted of driving under the influence of in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, enhanced by an excessively high blood alcohol level. Most notably, Respondent was still on probation from a previous DUI conviction at the time he committed the misconduct at issue. Although Respondent’s misconduct does not involve the practice of law, it is serious because it demonstrates a disregard for the law and for the safety of others. Therefore, discipline at the higher range of the standard is appropriate.

In aggravation, Respondent has one prior record of discipline since being admitted in 1970. His prior record of discipline also involved convictions for driving under the influence and was effective March 27, 2008. The instant misconduct occurred while Respondent was still on probation for the earlier matter.

In mitigation, Respondent has voluntarily entered into this stipulation.

In addition, because Respondent has a prior record of discipline, Standard 1.7(a) applies. Standard 1.7(a) provides “the degree of discipline imposed in the current proceeding shall be greater than that imposed in the prior proceeding unless the prior discipline imposed was so remote in time to the current proceeding and the offense for which it was imposed was so minimal in severity that imposing greater discipline in the current proceeding would be manifestly unjust.” The prior discipline – a prior reproval – took effect in March, 2008 and resolved two convictions for driving under the influence of alcohol. The prior discipline is neither “so remote in time” nor “minimal in severity” that adherence to the

imposition of greater discipline would be considered “manifestly unjust.” Therefore, the appropriate level of discipline in the current matter must be greater than a public reproof.

Based on the serious and repetitive nature of Respondent’s misconduct, the aggravation and limited mitigation, a 30-day actual suspension with substance abuse conditions is warranted. The conditions attached to this discipline, if complied with, should minimize the likelihood of Respondent’s engaging in similar misconduct in the future.

*In re Kelley* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 487 is instructive. The attorney in *Kelley* was publicly reproofed for a second conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol, which occurred while she was on probation for the first conviction. However the attorney in *Kelley* proffered significant mitigation. The attorney’s misconduct was aggravated by her belligerent and disrespectful behavior toward police officers.

Like the attorney in *Kelley*, Respondent was also on probation at the time of the conviction giving rise to the instant matter. Unlike the attorney in *Kelley*, Respondent was completely cooperative with authorities, but this is Respondent’s conviction for driving under the influence. Therefore, taking all circumstances into consideration, Respondent’s misconduct is more serious than that in *Kelley* and warrants higher discipline.

#### **COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.**

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of December 13, 2013, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$2,392.00. Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from the stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the cost of further proceedings.

#### **EXCLUSION FROM MCLE CREDIT**

Pursuant to rule 3201, Respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:  
JAMES ALLEN REICHLE

Case number(s):  
12-C-177750-PEM

### SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES

By their signatures below, the parties and their counsel, as applicable, signify their agreement with each of the recitations and each of the terms and conditions of this Stipulation Re Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Disposition.

<u>12/14/2013</u> Date	<u>James Reichle</u> Respondent's Signature	<u>James Allen Reichle</u> Print Name
<u>12/20/2013</u> Date	<u>12 P M Per</u> Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u>Tammy M. Albertsen</u> Print Name
<u>12/20/2013</u> Date	<u>Tammy M. Albertsen</u> Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Tammy M. Albertsen</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: JAMES ALLEN REICHLE	Case Number(s): 12-C-17750-PEM
--	-----------------------------------

### 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.

1. On p. 4, (13), Additional mitigating circumstances are on page 9, not "pages 8-9."
2. On p. 11, third paragraph, third line, insert "third" so to read "this is Respondent's third conviction for driving under the influence."
3. On pp. 12 and 13, heading for the case number, delete "12-C-177750" and insert "12-C-17750" in its place.

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 Jan 9, 2014 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 January 9, 2014, 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:
- JAMES ALLEN REICHLE  
661 RED KNOLL RD  
GREENVILLE, CA 95947
- by certified mail, No. , with return receipt requested, through the United States Postal Service at , California, addressed as follows:
- by overnight mail at , California, addressed as follows:
- by fax transmission, at fax number . No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.
- By personal service by leaving the documents in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or a person having charge of the attorney's office, addressed as follows:
- by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

Tammy M. Albertsen, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on January 9, 2014.

  
George Hue  
Case Administrator  
State Bar Court