PUBLIC MATTER

State Bar Court of California **Hearing Department** Los Angeles **ACTUAL SUSPENSION**

ORIGINAL

Counsel For The State Bar	Case Number(s): 13-O-11607	For Court use only
William Todd	13-0-11007	
Deputy Trial Counsel		
1149 S Hill. Street		
Los Angeles, California 90015		EII ED
213-765-1491		FILED
		JAN 0 7 2014 PB.
Bar # 259194		STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
In Pro Per Respondent		LOS ANGELES
Teri S. Zimon		
12707 Westminster Ave		
Los Angeles, California 90066		
No Phone Number Available		
	Submitted to: Settlement J	udge
Bar # 213023	STIPULATION RE FACTS, DISPOSITION AND ORDER	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND R APPROVING
In the Matter of:		
TERI SUZANNE ZIMON	ACTUAL SUSPENSION	
Bar # 213023	☐ PREVIOUS STIPULATION	ON REJECTED
A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)		

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:

- Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted May 30, 2001. (1)
- The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or (2) disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by (3) this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of 10 pages, not including the order.
- A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included (4) under "Facts."

12/13/13

(Do	not w	ite above this line.)				
(5)	Co	nclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of				
(-/	La	W".				
(6)	Th "S	e parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading upporting Authority."				
(7)	No pe	more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any nding investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.				
(8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 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: the three billing cycles immediately 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".				
F	Prof	avating Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for essional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances equired.				
(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. Please see "Attachment to Stipulation", at 8.				
5)		Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.				

(Do	(Do not write above this line.)				
	_				
(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.			
Add	lition	al aggravating circumstances:			
C. I	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.			

(Do n	(Do not write above this line.)					
(13)		No	mitiga	ating circumstances are involved.		
Add	ition			ng circumstances:		
	F	'lease	e see	"No Prior Discipline" and "Pre-Filing Stipulation" in "Attachment to Stipulation", at 8.		
D. C	Disc	iplin	e:			
(1) Stayed Suspension:						
	(a)	\boxtimes	Res	condent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of one 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)	\boxtimes	The a	above-referenced suspension is stayed.		
(2)	\boxtimes	Prob	ation	:		
		Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of two 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)						
	(a)	a) Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of 60 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. A	ddit	iona	l Cor	nditions 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)				probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of al Conduct.		
(3)				(10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the nd to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of		

(Do r	ot wri	te abov	e this line.)			
			mation, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar oses, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.			
(4)		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.				
			ent status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be nitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.			
			dition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than ty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.			
(6)		cond During in ad	condent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and itions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. In the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, dition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must erate fully with the probation monitor.			
(7)	\boxtimes	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)	\boxtimes	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 f	following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:			
			Substance Abuse Conditions Law Office Management Conditions			
			Medical Conditions			
F. O	the	r Cor	ditions Negotiated by the Parties:			
(1)		the Cor one furt	tistate Professional Responsibility Examination: Respondent must provide proof of passage of Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Inference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within year, whichever period is longer. Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without her hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 5.162(A) & Rules of Procedure.			

(טט ו	ot write	above (nis line.)
		☐ 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:

TERI SUZANNE ZIMON

CASE NUMBER:

13-0-11607

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

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

Case No. 13-O-11607 (Complainant: Alex Weingarten, Counsel for David Bergstein)

FACTS:

- 1. At all times relevant to the stipulated facts herein, Respondent represented multiple business entities owned by David Bergstein ("Bergstein's entities") in a variety of matters. In January 2010, Respondent learned that another attorney who also represented Bergstein and Bergstein's entities was concurrently advising a creditor of those entities without disclosing the concurrent employment to Bergstein or any representative of Bergstein's entities. Respondent also learned that the other attorney was colluding with that same creditor in the creditor's strategy to force several of Bergstein's entities into involuntary bankruptcy proceedings, and that the other attorney had not disclosed these facts to Bergstein or his entities.
- 2. Despite Respondent's ongoing representation of at least one of the entities affected by the creditor's strategy, and despite Respondent's knowledge regarding the activities of the other attorney, Respondent did not disclose any of these facts to Bergstein or any representative of Bergstein's entities in violation of Respondent's common law fiduciary duty as an attorney to Bergstein and his entities.
- 3. On March 17, 2010, the creditor filed involuntary bankruptcy petitions against several of Bergstein's entities consistent with the creditor's strategy and aided by the other attorney. Respondent was attorney of record for at least one of the entities targeted by the involuntary bankruptcy petitions, and her actions deprived her client and other Bergstein entities an opportunity to prepare a defense for the creditor's strategy as early as those parties otherwise would have been able. Respondent's actions also left Respondent's client, other Bergstein entities and Bergstein himself unaware of the other attorney's betrayal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

4. By failing to inform Bergstein or any representative of Bergstein's entities of the other attorney's concurrent representation of both Bergstein's entities and a creditor of those entities, despite Respondent's knowledge that the other attorney was aiding that creditor in planned involuntary bankruptcy proceedings against Bergstein's business entities, Respondent willfully violated her common law fiduciary duty to her clients and committed an act of moral turpitude, dishonesty, or corruption in willful violation Business and Professions Code section 6106.

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Harm (Std. 1.2(b)(iv)): Respondent's misconduct contributed to significant harm suffered by Bergstein by denying Bergstein advance warning of the malfeasance of another Bergstein attorney. Harm to a client is an aggravating circumstance.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

No Prior Discipline: At the time the misconduct was committed, Respondent had practiced law for eight years without discipline, which merits slight mitigation. (See *In the Matter of Aguiluz* (Review Dept. 1992) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 32, 44 (seven years of practice in California prior to misconduct should be accorded only "slight weight" in mitigation).)

Prefiling Stipulation: Respondent cooperated in the completion of this stipulation, thereby saving the time and expense of filing a Notice of Disciplinary Charges or engaging in State Bar Court proceedings. (See *Silva-Vidor v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 1071, 1079 [mitigative credit 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.)

The sanction applicable to Respondent's misconduct is found in standard 2.3, which provides that culpability of a member of an act of moral turpitude, fraud, or intentional dishonesty toward a court, client or another person or of concealment of a material fact to a court, client or another person shall result in actual suspension or disbarment depending upon the extent to which the victim of the misconduct is harmed or misled and depending upon the magnitude of the act of misconduct and the degree to which it relates to the member's acts within the practice of law.

Moral turpitude typically occurs whenever an attorney intentionally breaches a fiduciary duty to a client (Hunniecutt v. State Bar (1988) 44 Cal.3d 362, 372–373; Giovanazzi v. State Bar (1980) 28 Cal.3d 465, 472–473), and may occur even if an attorney acts non-deliberately to breach a fiduciary duty to a client where the breach occurs as a result of gross carelessness and neglect. (In the Matter of Kittrell (Review

Dept. 2000) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 195, 208, citing, inter alia, Lipson v. State Bar (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1010, 1020.)

Here, Respondent represented Bergstein-owned entities in at least two matters, and during the course of that representation she learned that another attorney employed by Bergstein and his business entities was actively working against Bergstein's interests by representing a creditor of Bergstein's and aiding that creditor in its strategy of forcing Bergstein's entities into bankruptcy. Despite this knowledge and her fiduciary duty to Bergstein and his entities, Respondent failed to advise either Bergstein or his entities of the other attorney's actions. As a result, Bergstein and his entities were denied an advance opportunity to defend against the actions of the other attorney, actions which ultimately culminated in involuntary bankruptcy petitions filed against several of Bergstein's entities on March 17, 2010. Though Respondent lacks a prior record of discipline and acknowledges her misconduct by entering into this stipulation, discipline consistent with standard 2.3 is warranted. Therefore, in light of Respondent's misconduct, the applicable standard, and the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, a one-year suspension, stayed, with 60 days' actual suspension and two years' probation with standard conditions is necessary to further the primary purposes of attorney discipline, which are the protection of the public, the courts, and the legal profession.

Case law also supports the recommended discipline. In *In the Matter of Casey* (2008) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 117, the court recommended 90 days' actual suspension for an attorney culpable of a violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106 for breach of fiduciary duty. In *Casey*, the attorney represented both the buyer and seller in a condominium sale transaction, yet failed to disclose this conflict of interest to the seller. The attorney also failed to fully disclose to the seller the terms of the condominium sale, failed to disclose the risks and benefits of the condominium transaction to the seller and failed to appropriately document the transaction. When compared to the instant matter, the misconduct here is narrower than that described in *Casey*. Also, the misconduct in *Casey* was aggravated by a record of prior discipline, which is not the case in the instant misconduct. Therefore, a slightly lower level of discipline is appropriate.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of December 10, 2013, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$2,865. 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 <u>not</u> receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School, State Bar Client Trust Accounting School, and/or any other educational course(s) to be ordered as a condition of reproval or suspension. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)	
In the Matter of: TERI SUZANNE Z	IMON Case number(s) 13-O-11607	:
	SIGNATURE OF THE	PARTIES
	ow, the parties and their counsel, as application the terms and conditions of this Stipulation	ble, signify their agreement with each of the Re Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Disposition.
12/13/13		Teri Suzanne Zimon
Date	Respondent's Signature	Print Name
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
12/13/13	/ww/	William Todd
Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name

Date

(Do not write above this line.) In the Matter of: TERI SUZANNE ZIMON Case Number(s): 13-0-11607	
ACTUAL SUSPENSION ORDER	
Finding the stipulation to be fair to the parties and that it adequately protects the public, IT IS ORDERED the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without prejudice, and:	at the
The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED Supreme Court.	to the
The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and to DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.	he
All Hearing dates are vacated.	
The parties are bound by the stipulation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation within 15 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approve stipulation. (See rule 5.58(E) & (F), Rules of Procedure.) The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of this disposition is the effective court order herein, normally 30 days after file date. (See rule 9.18(a), California Rule Court.)	d ective date
Date GEORGE E. SCOTT, JUDGE PRO TEM 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 Los Angeles, on January 7, 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 Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

TERI S. ZIMON 12707 WESTMINSTER AVE LOS ANGELES, CA 90066

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

William S. Todd, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on January 7, 2014.

Paul Barona

Case Administrator

State Bar Court