



ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION		
Counsel For The State Bar Alex Hackert Deputy Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, CA 90017 213-765-1498 Bar # 267342	Case Number(s): 15-O-14384	For Court use only <div style="text-align: center;"> PUBLIC MATTER FILED JUN 14 2016 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES </div>
In Pro Per Respondent Tiffany Carrie Stevens 855 President St. Apt. 3R Brooklyn, NY 11215 Bar # 225940	Submitted to: Settlement Judge	
In the Matter of: TIFFANY CARRIE STEVENS Bar # 225940 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	

Note: All information required by this form and any additional information which cannot be provided in the space provided, must be set forth in an attachment to this stipulation under specific headings, e.g., "Facts," "Dismissals," "Conclusions of Law," "Supporting Authority," etc.

A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted **June 17, 2003**.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of **11** pages, not including the order.
- (4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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: **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".
 - Costs are entirely waived.

B. Aggravating Circumstances [Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standards 1.2(h) & 1.5]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.

- (1) **Prior record of discipline**
- (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) **Intentional/Bad Faith/Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was dishonest, intentional, or surrounded by, or followed by bad faith.
- (3) **Misrepresentation:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, misrepresentation.
- (4) **Concealment:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, concealment.
- (5) **Overreaching:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by, or followed by, overreaching.
- (6) **Uncharged Violations:** Respondent's conduct involves uncharged violations of the Business and Professions Code, or the Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (7) **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.)

- (8) **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public, or the administration of justice.
- (9) **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (10) **Candor/Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct, or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations or proceedings.
- (11) **Multiple Acts:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing.
- (12) **Pattern:** Respondent's current misconduct demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.
- (13) **Restitution:** Respondent failed to make restitution.
- (14) **Vulnerable Victim:** The victim(s) of Respondent's misconduct was/were highly vulnerable.
- (15) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standards 1.2(i) & 1.6]. 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 likely to recur.
- (2) **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client, the public, or the administration of justice.
- (3) **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations and proceedings.
- (4) **Remorse:** Respondent promptly took objective steps demonstrating spontaneous 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 with a good faith belief that was honestly held and objectively reasonable.
- (8) **Emotional/Physical Difficulties:** At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical or mental 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 the difficulties or disabilities no longer pose a risk that Respondent will commit misconduct.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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 extraordinarily 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:

Pre-filing Stipulation, see page 8.

Good Chracter, see page 8.

Charitable Work, see page 8.

D. Discipline:

- (1) **Stayed Suspension:**
- (a) Respondent 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 fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.2(c)(1) 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 **one year**, 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 fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.2(c)(1), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct

(Do not write above this line.)

- 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 present learning and ability in the general law, pursuant to standard 1.2(c)(1), 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: **Respondent resides in New York. A comparable alternative to Ethics School is provided in section F below.**

(Do not write above this line.)

- (9) Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.
- (10) The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Law Office Management Conditions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Conditions |

F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

- (1) **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination:** Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. **Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 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:** As a further condition of probation, because respondent lives out of state, respondent must either (1) attend a session of State Bar Ethics School, pass the test given at the end of that session, and provide proof of the same satisfactory to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein; or (2) complete a total of six (6) hours of live, in-person Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) approved courses in legal ethics offered through a certified/accredited MCLE provider in New York or California and provide proof of the same satisfactory to the Office of Probation within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline.

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: TIFFANY CARRIE STEVENS

CASE NUMBER: 15-O-14384

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. 15-O-14384 (State Bar Investigation)

FACTS:

1. As a member of the State Bar, respondent was required to complete 25 hours of Minimum Continuing Legal Education ("MCLE") during the period commencing on February 1, 2011, and ending on January 31, 2014 (the "compliance period").
2. On June 25, 2014, respondent reported to the State Bar, under penalty of perjury, that she had completed all required MCLE hours for the compliance period of February 1, 2011 through January 31, 2014.
3. In fact, respondent had only completed one hour of MCLE within the compliance period.
4. On July 7, 2014 respondent was notified that she had been selected for an audit of her MCLE compliance for this period. Respondent was instructed to submit her proof of compliance by August 21, 2014.
5. In response to the audit, respondent did not produce any documentation to show that she completed her MCLE requirements during the compliance period.
6. On October 13, 2015, a State Bar investigator sent an investigative letter to respondent at her current membership records address via U.S. Mail, requesting that respondent respond in writing to the allegations of misconduct being investigated in case no. 15-O-14384.
7. Respondent received the October 13, 2015 letter, but did not provide a response thereto.
8. On January 4, 2016, a State Bar investigator sent a second investigative letter to respondent at her current membership records address via U.S. Mail, requesting that respondent respond in writing to the allegations of misconduct being investigated in case no. 15-O-14384.
9. Respondent received the January 4, 2016 letter, but did not provide a response thereto.

10. At the time respondent reported to the State Bar that she was in compliance with the MCLE requirements, respondent knew that she had not completed the required 25 hours of MCLE. Respondent was not representing any clients during that time, and had not practiced law since 2007.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

11. By reporting to the State Bar, under penalty of perjury, that respondent had complied with all MCLE requirements for the compliance period, when respondent knew that she was not in full compliance, respondent committed an act involving dishonesty, in willful violation of California Business and Professions Code section 6106.

12. By failing to provide a response to the State Bar's investigative letters of October 13, 2015 and January 4, 2016, which respondent received, and which requested respondent's response to the allegations of misconduct being investigated in case number 15-O-14384, and failing to otherwise cooperate in the State Bar investigation, respondent willfully violated Business and Professions Code section 6068(i).

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Good Character: Respondent provided evidence of six individuals who attested to their belief in respondent's good character, honesty and integrity. These include a manager at a legal support services firm, a professional writer and college level writing instructor, a college professor, an attorney, and two non-profit organization executives. These references have known respondent for 7 to 17 years, and each is aware of the charges in this matter. They have all stated their belief in respondent's good character, integrity, and her remorse concerning the misconduct. While these references are somewhat diverse, given their limited number, respondent is only entitled to modest mitigation for good character. (*In the Matter of Wells* (Review Dept. 2006) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 896, 912.)

Charitable and Pro Bono Work: For the past year, respondent has volunteered once a month at a crisis hotline for people coping with breast cancer. Since 2012 respondent has served on the board of a non-profit global anti-poverty organization that works in 13 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Respondent is also a founding member of an organization that provides educational programs in Pakistan. She began serving in this role in 2013. When respondent worked for a legal support services firm, she voluntarily started a pro bono program to connect the company's attorneys with legal aid organizations in New York City. Community service may mitigate an attorney's misconduct and respondent should receive significant mitigation for her charitable work and community service. (*Calvert v. State Bar* (1991) 54 Cal.3d765, 785).

Pre-filing Stipulation: Respondent voluntarily entered into this stipulation to resolve this matter prior to the filing of disciplinary charges and should receive mitigative credit for her admission of culpability and consent to the imposition of discipline, thus saving limited State Bar resources and acknowledging and accepting responsibility for the misconduct. (*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 "set forth a means for determining the appropriate disciplinary sanction in a particular case and to ensure consistency across cases dealing

with similar misconduct and surrounding circumstances.” (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. For Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.1; hereinafter “Standards.”) The Standards help fulfill the primary purposes of discipline, which include: protection of the public, the courts, and the legal profession; maintenance of the highest professional standards; and preservation of public confidence in the legal profession. (See, Standard 1.1; *In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 205.)

Although not binding, the Standards are entitled to “great weight” and should be followed “whenever possible” in determining level of discipline. (*In re Silvertown* (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.) If a recommendation is at the high end or low end of a Standard, an explanation must be given as to how the recommendation was reached. (Standard 1.1.) “Any disciplinary recommendation that deviates from the Standards must include clear reasons for the departure.” (Standard 1.1; *Blair v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 762, 776 & fn. 5.)

In determining whether to impose a sanction greater or less than that specified in a given Standard, in addition to the factors set forth in the specific Standard, consideration is to be given to the primary purposes of discipline; the balancing of all aggravating and mitigating circumstances; the type of misconduct at issue; whether the client, public, legal system, or profession was harmed; and the member’s willingness and ability to conform to ethical responsibilities in the future. (Standards 1.7(b)-(c).)

In this matter respondent is alleged to have committed two acts of professional misconduct. Standard 1.7(a) requires that where a respondent “commits two or more acts of misconduct and the Standards specify different sanctions for each act, the most severe sanction must be imposed.” The most severe sanction applicable to respondent’s misconduct is found in Standard 2.11, which applies to respondent’s misrepresentation regarding MCLE compliance. It states that, “disbarment or actual suspension is the presumed sanction for an act of moral turpitude,” and that the “degree of sanction depends on the magnitude of the misconduct; the extent to which the misconduct harmed or misled the victim, which may include the adjudicator; the impact on the administration of justice, if any; and the extent to which the misconduct related to the member’s practice of law.”

Respondent’s false statement regarding her MCLE compliance is serious and constitutes an act of dishonesty directly relating to the practice of law. In the instant case, although there was no client, the State Bar, and in a more general sense the public, can be seen as victims. The purpose of California’s MCLE program is to protect consumers by enhancing the competency of attorneys practicing law in this state. Respondent’s failure to comply with MCLE harms both the State Bar’s ability to protect the public from incompetent attorneys and the public’s assurance that attorneys will remain competent after admission/licensure. In addition, it is significant that respondent’s misrepresentation to the State Bar would never have come to light but for the fact that respondent was randomly chosen to be a part of the MCLE audit undertaken by Membership Services.

“An attorney’s misconduct need not be in bad faith to be willful; rather, all that is required is a general purpose or willingness to commit the act or permit the omission. The lack of an evil intent does not immunize the attorney’s conduct from a finding of moral turpitude.” (*McKnight v. State Bar* (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 1025, 1034 (citation omitted)). “Even if petitioner’s misconduct were not wilful and dishonest, gross carelessness and negligence constitute a violation of an attorney’s oath faithfully to discharge his duties and involve moral turpitude.” (*Jackson v. State Bar* (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 509, 513).

Here, mitigating factors predominate and there are no aggravating factors. Respondent is entitled to significant mitigation based on her charitable work, in addition to mitigation for evidence of good character and for entering into a pre-filing stipulation. Under Standard 2.11 discipline at the low end of the range is appropriate. Therefore, a 30-day actual suspension is the appropriate level of discipline. This result would fulfill the primary purposes of attorney discipline, and specifically, “inform[s] the public and members of the State Bar that failing to comply with MCLE requirements may result in discipline.” (*In the Matter of Yee, supra*, 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. at p. 337.)

Case law supports this level of discipline. In *In the Matter of Yee* (Review Dept. 2014) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 330, Yee affirmed her MCLE compliance when she had not taken any courses during the relevant reporting period. Yee mistakenly recalled that she had completed the courses and did not check or maintain any records to confirm if her recollection was accurate. The Review Department found that Yee’s failure to verify records before submitting a statement of compliance amounted to moral turpitude based on gross negligence. The Review Department found no aggravation, but compelling mitigation: no prior record of discipline, candor and cooperation, good character, remorse and recognition of wrongdoing, pro bono work and community service, and no harm to the public or the judicial system. Due to the compelling mitigation, the lack of aggravating circumstances, and Yee’s genuine recognition of wrongdoing, the Review Department deviated from the Standards and ordered a public reproof.

Respondent’s misconduct is not as heavily mitigated as the misconduct in *Yee*. Moreover, unlike *Yee*, respondent’s misconduct was intentional and not the result of gross negligence. Therefore, deviation from Standard 2.11 is not appropriate. A 30-day period of actual suspension is appropriate.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of May 23, 2016, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$3,139. 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 MINIMUM CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION (“MCLE”) CREDIT


Pursuant to rule 3201, respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School, and/or any other educational course(s) to be ordered as a condition of probation. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)


(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: TIFFANY CARRIE STEVENS	Case number(s): 15-O-14384
--	--------------------------------------

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.

05/26/2016  Tiffany Carrie Stevens
Date Respondent's Signature Print Name

5/31/16  Alex Hackert
Date Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: TIFFANY CARRIE STEVENS	Case Number(s): 15-O-14384
---	-------------------------------


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.)**

6/13/16
Date


DONALD F. MILES
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 June 14, 2016, 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:

TIFFANY C. STEVENS
855 PRESIDENT ST APT 3R
BROOKLYN, NY 11215

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

ALEX HACKERT, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on June 14, 2016.



Rose M. Luthi
Case Administrator
State Bar Court