



# PUBLIC MATTER

**FILED**  
**MAR 21 2018**  
STATE BAR COURT  
CLERK'S OFFICE  
LOS ANGELES

## STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA HEARING DEPARTMENT - LOS ANGELES

In the Matter of	)	Case No. 17-N-00929-DFM
	)	
RONNY MOR,	)	DECISION AND ORDER OF
	)	INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE
A Member of the State Bar, No. 248274.	)	ENROLLMENT
_____	)	

Respondent Ronny Mor (Respondent) was charged with one count of wilfully violating California Rules of Court, rule 9.20. Even though Respondent had notice of the trial date, he failed to appear at the trial, and his default was entered. Thereafter, the Office of Chief Trial Counsel (State Bar) filed a petition for disbarment under rule 5.85 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.<sup>1</sup>

Rule 5.85 provides the procedure to follow when an attorney fails to appear at trial after receiving adequate notice and opportunity. The rule provides that, if an attorney's default is entered for failing to appear at trial and if the attorney fails to have the default set aside or vacated within 45 days, the State Bar will file a petition requesting the court to recommend the attorney's disbarment.<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>2</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. (Rule 5.85(F)(2).)

In the instant case, the court concludes that all of 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 AND CONCLUSIONS**

Respondent was admitted to the practice of law in California on January 30, 2007, and has been a member of the State Bar since then.

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

On July 19, 2017, the State Bar filed and properly served a Notice of Disciplinary Charges (NDC) on Respondent at his membership records address by certified mail, return receipt requested.

Respondent personally participated in a status conference in this matter on August 28, 2017. At the August 28, 2017, status conference, the court set this matter for trial on November 1, 2017. On August 30, 2017, the court filed an order memorializing the November 1, 2017, trial date. The court's August 30, 2017, order was properly served on Respondent at his membership records address by first class mail, postage fully prepaid. (Rule 5.81(A).)

Respondent filed an answer to the NDC on September 7, 2017. On October 6, 2017, the State Bar filed a motion to consolidate this proceeding with case number 17-N-04490. The court indicated to the parties that it would grant the motion if Respondent promptly filed an answer in case number 17-N-04490. Respondent did not, however, promptly file an answer in case number 17-N-04490, and his default was eventually entered in that case. Accordingly, the motion to consolidate is DISMISSED as moot.

The State Bar appeared for trial in the present matter on November 1, 2017, but Respondent did not. The court entered Respondent's default in this proceeding in an order filed on November 1, 2017. That order was properly served on Respondent at his membership records

address by certified mail, return receipt requested. (Rules 5.25(B), 5.81(B).) The order notified Respondent that, if he did not timely move to set aside his default, the court would recommend his disbarment. The order also placed Respondent on involuntary inactive status under Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (e), effective three days after service of the order, and he has remained inactively enrolled since that time. The copy of the court's order entering default that was served on Respondent was returned to the State Bar Court marked "Return to Sender [¶] Unable to Forward."

Respondent did not seek to have his default set aside or vacated. (Rule 5.83(C)(2) [attorney has 45 days after order entering default is served to file motion to set aside default].) On February 1, 2018, the State Bar properly filed and properly served a petition for disbarment on Respondent at his membership records address by certified mail, return receipt requested. (Rules 5.25(B), 5.85(D).) As required by rule 5.85(A), the State Bar reported in the petition that: (1) the State Bar has not received any contact from Respondent since his default was entered; (2) Respondent has one other disciplinary proceeding pending against him; (3) Respondent has three prior records of discipline; and (4) the Client Security Fund has not paid out a claim as a result of Respondent's misconduct.

Respondent did not respond to the petition for disbarment or move to set aside or vacate his default. The case was submitted for decision on February 27, 2018.

#### **Prior Records of Discipline**

Respondent has been disciplined on three prior occasions.

##### State Bar Court case No. 14-O-05766

Pursuant to Supreme Court order No. S229719, filed on December 8, 2015, Respondent was placed on one year's stayed suspension and two years' probation on conditions, including his suspension from the practice of law for the first thirty days of probation. In that matter,

Respondent stipulated to engaging in the unauthorized practice of law in another state, collecting a \$4,250 illegal fee, and failing to return a client file as requested.

State Bar Court case No. 16-PM-13899

Pursuant to Supreme Court order No. S229719, filed on October 19, 2016, Respondent's two-year disciplinary probation under the Supreme Court's December 8, 2015, order was revoked, and Respondent was placed on two years' stayed suspension and two years' probation on conditions, including actual suspension for a minimum of the first year of probation and continuing until Respondent makes restitution with interest for the \$4,250 illegal fee he collected and, if Respondent's actual suspension continues for two years or more as a result of his not making restitution, Respondent's actual suspension will continue until he establishes his rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in the general law in accordance with standard 1.2(c)(1) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct (standard 1.2(c)(1)). The Supreme Court imposed that discipline on Respondent in accordance with a State Bar Court decision finding Respondent culpable of failing to comply with three of the conditions of the two-year disciplinary probation that the Supreme Court imposed on him in its December 8, 2015, order, to wit, failing to schedule a meeting with his probation deputy, failing to submit his first quarterly probation report, and failing to make restitution for the \$4,250 illegal fee he collected.

In aggravation, Respondent had, at that time, one prior record of discipline and was indifferent towards rectifying his misconduct. No mitigation was found.

State Bar Court case Nos. 15-O-15566, 16-O-11124, and 16-O-12366 (Consolidated)

Pursuant to Supreme Court order No. S240081, filed on April 19, 2017, Respondent was placed on three years' stayed suspension and three years' probation on conditions, including actual suspension for a minimum of the first eighteen months of probation and continuing until

Respondent makes restitution with interest for two illegal fees he collected totaling \$5,495 and, if Respondent's actual suspension continues for two years or more as a result of his not making restitution, Respondent's actual suspension will continue until he establishes his rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in the general law in accordance with standard 1.2(c)(1). In that matter, Respondent stipulated to failing to perform legal services with competence, engaging in the unauthorized practice of law in another state, collecting two illegal fees totaling \$5,495, failing to refund an unearned fee, failing to cooperate in two separate State Bar investigations, failing to respond to a client's status inquires, and engaging in an act involving moral turpitude by writing an insufficiently funded check drawn on his client trust account.

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

Upon entry of a respondent's default, the factual allegations in the NDC are deemed admitted, and no further proof is required to establish the truth of such facts. (Rule 5.82.) As set forth below in greater detail, the factual allegations in the NDC support the conclusion that Respondent is culpable as charged and, therefore, violated a statute, rule or court order that would warrant the imposition of discipline. (Rule 5.85(F)(1)(d).)

**Case Number 17-N-00929 (Rule 9.20 Compliance Matter)**

Respondent wilfully violated rule 9.20 of the California Rules of Court by failing to file a declaration of compliance with rule 9.20, in conformity with the requirements of rule 9.20(c), with the clerk of the State Bar Court by December 28, 2016, as required by Supreme Court order number S229719, filed on October 19, 2016.

**Disbarment is Recommended**

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

(1) the NDC was properly served on Respondent under rule 5.25;  
(2) Respondent had actual notice of the trial date prior to entry of the default;  
(3) the default was properly entered under rule 5.81; and  
(4) the factual allegations 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.

Despite adequate notice and opportunity, Respondent failed to appear for trial in this disciplinary proceeding. As set forth in the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar, the court recommends disbarment.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Disbarment**

The court recommends that respondent **Ronny Mor**, State Bar number **248274**, be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of California and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys.

### **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 and that the costs be enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

///

**ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT**

In accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (c)(4), the court orders that Ronny Mor, State Bar Number 248274, 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 by mail (rule 5.111(D)).

Dated: March 21, 2018.

  

---

**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 Court Specialist 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 March 21, 2018, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

**DECISION AND ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT**

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:

RONNY MOR  
2009 COURT ST  
APT C  
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92663 - 4349

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

JAMIE J. KIM, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on March 21, 2018.



Marc Krause  
Court Specialist  
State Bar Court