

FILED

NOV 23 2017 7:21

STATE BAR COURT
CLERK'S OFFICE
LOS ANGELES

STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

REVIEW DEPARTMENT

IN BANK

In the Matter of)	Case No. 17-Q-04547
)	
LOUISE A. LEWIS,)	RECOMMENDATION ON
)	RESIGNATION
A Member of the State Bar, No. 102792.)	
_____)	

On August 4, 2017, respondent Louise A. Lewis filed a resignation with charges pending. On August 17, 2017, the Office of Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar (OCTC) filed the parties' Stipulation as to Facts and Conclusions of Law (Stipulation), and on August 25, 2017, OCTC filed its report on the resignation. OCTC recommends that the resignation be accepted. Based on OCTC's recommendation and in light of the grounds set forth in California Rules of Court, rule 9.21(d),¹ as detailed below, we recommend that the Supreme Court accept the resignation.

I. BACKGROUND

Lewis was admitted to practice law in California on June 10, 1982, and has not been eligible to practice law in California since January 19, 2017. She has three prior records of discipline.

First, on April 5, 2013, Lewis received a public reproof with conditions lasting for one year. (State Bar Court case no. 12-O-11461.) She stipulated that in one client matter she repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence (Rules of Prof. Conduct, rule

¹ All further references to rules are to this source unless otherwise noted.



3-110(A)) and failed to keep her client reasonably informed of a significant development (Bus. & Prof. Code, §6068, subd.(m)). In mitigation, Lewis had: no prior record of discipline; demonstrated remorse, recognition of wrongdoing, and atonement for the consequences of her misconduct; entered into a pretrial stipulation; the misconduct occurred over a short period of time; and Lewis was undergoing domestic and health difficulties. In aggravation, Lewis harmed her client.

Second, on May 26, 2015, (effective June 25, 2015), the Supreme Court ordered Lewis suspended for one year, execution stayed, and placed on probation for two years with conditions including a thirty-day period of actual suspension. (*In re Louise A. Lewis* (S225246), State Bar Court case no. 14-H-03096.) Lewis stipulated that she failed to comply with the reproof conditions imposed in case no. 12-O-11461 in that she failed to timely contact the assigned probation deputy to schedule the required meeting, failed to timely submit her final probation report to the Office of Probation of the State Bar (Probation), failed to timely complete State Bar Ethics School, and failed to submit proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination. (Rules of Prof. Conduct, rule 1-110.) In mitigation, Lewis suffered extreme emotional difficulties and entered into a pretrial stipulation. In aggravation, Lewis had a prior record of discipline and committed multiple acts of misconduct.

Third, on December 20, 2016, (effective January 19, 2017), the Supreme Court ordered Lewis suspended for three years, execution stayed, and placed on probation for three years with conditions including that respondent be actually suspended for 18 months. (*In re Louise A. Lewis* (S237884), State Bar Court case nos. 15-O-15209; 15-O-15625.) Lewis stipulated she failed to comply with several conditions attached to her disciplinary probation from Supreme Court Order number S225246. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §6068, subd.(k).) She also committed an act of moral turpitude in holding herself out as being entitled to practice law and practicing law

when she was not an active member of the State Bar. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 6068, subd.(a), 6106.) In mitigation, Lewis entered into a pretrial stipulation, demonstrated good character, and performed significant pro bono work. In aggravation, Lewis had two prior records of discipline.

At the time Lewis filed her resignation, two disciplinary investigations and one filed disciplinary case were pending against her, which are resolved by the Stipulation as follows. In case number 17-O-04660, Lewis failed to submit two quarterly reports to Probation in violation of conditions attached to Supreme Court Order number S225246. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §6068, subd.(k).) In case number 17-N-02253, Lewis failed comply with Supreme Court Order S237884 by failing to timely submit a compliant rule 9.20(c) declaration. In case number 17-O-04659, she failed to comply with the same Supreme Court order by failing to schedule the required meeting with Probation, submit two quarterly reports, prove a copy of an executed medical waiver and declaration, provide a copy of treatment provider's written report, and provide a copy of two mental health reports. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §6068, subd.(k).)

OCTC also reports that Lewis is 75 years old and indicated to OCTC that she no longer wants to practice law. She would be 80-years old before she is eligible to seek reinstatement. No Client Security Fund claims are pending against Lewis.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE GROUNDS SET FORTH IN RULE 9.21(d)

We have considered Lewis's resignation under the grounds set forth in rule 9.21(d). We summarize below the relevant information for each ground:

1. Whether the preservation of testimony is complete.

OCTC reports that the perpetuation of the evidence is not necessary in the pending matter.

2. Whether after transfer to inactive status, Lewis has practiced law or has advertised or held herself out as entitled to practice law.

OCTC reports that there is no evidence that Lewis has practiced law in California or held herself out as entitled to practice law in California since she tendered her resignation.

3. Whether Lewis performed the acts specified in rule 9.20(a)-(b).

OCTC reports that, consistent with rule 9.20(a)-(b), Lewis has attested she has no clients, no client papers or other property to return, no unearned fees, and no pending client matters. Accordingly, it appears that there were no acts that Lewis was required to perform.

4. Whether Lewis provided proof of compliance with rule 9.20(c).

Lewis filed a rule 9.20(c) compliance declaration on August 16, 2017.

5. Whether the Supreme Court has filed a disbarment order.

The Supreme Court has not filed a disbarment order.

6. Whether the State Bar Court has filed a decision recommending disbarment.

The State Bar Court has not filed a decision recommending disbarment.

7. Whether Lewis previously resigned or has been disbarred and reinstated to the practice of law.

Lewis has not previously resigned or been disbarred in California.

8. Whether Lewis entered a stipulation with OCTC as to facts and conclusions of law regarding pending disciplinary matters.

Lewis and OCTC entered into a stipulation as to facts and conclusions of law regarding the pending disciplinary matter and investigations. No other unresolved discipline matters or investigations are pending against Lewis.

9. Whether accepting Lewis's resignation will reasonably be inconsistent with the need to protect the public, the courts, or the legal profession.

We recommend accepting Lewis's resignation for the reasons OCTC presented in its filings in this matter. Lewis: (1) submitted a rule 9.20 compliance declaration; (2) submitted a stipulation to facts and conclusions of law; (3) has not practiced in California since filing her resignation; (4) cooperated with OCTC by entering into a stipulation; and (5) has no Client Security Fund claims, or other, claims pending against her. Further, Lewis does not intend to seek reinstatement. Under these circumstances, we do not believe that public confidence in the discipline system will be undermined by accepting the resignation, and we believe that acceptance would be consistent with the need to protect the public, the courts, and the legal profession.

III. RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the Supreme Court accept the resignation Louise A. Lewis, State Bar number 102792. We further recommend that costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6068.10, and that such costs be enforceable both as provided in section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

PURCELL

Presiding Judge

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 November 28, 2017, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

ORDER RECOMMENDATION ON RESIGNATION FILED NOVEMBER 28, 2017

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:

LOUISE A. LEWIS
626 N GARFIELD AVE
ALHAMBRA, CA 91801 - 1448

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

Terrie Goldade, Office of Probation, Los Angeles
Jaymin Vaghashia, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on November 28, 2017.



Nikiah Hawkins
Case Administrator
State Bar Court