

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California Hearing Department Los Angeles ACTUAL SUSPENSION		
Counsel for the State Bar Arizvel Chaudhari Deputy Trial Counsel 845 S. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 765-1182 Bar # 262955	Case Number(s): 18-C-11038-YDR	For Court use only <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">PUBLIC MATTER</div> <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.5em; font-weight: bold;">FILED</div> <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.5em; font-weight: bold;">APR 18 2019</div> <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES</div>
Counsel For Respondent Artak Barsegyan Pansky Markle Attorneys at Law 1010 Sycamore Ave. Unit 308 S. Pasadena, CA 91030 (213) 626-7300 Bar # 279064	Submitted to: Settlement Judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION <input type="checkbox"/> PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	
In the Matter of: Louis Julian White Bar # 139092 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:

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted **December 7, 1988.**
- (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 **18** 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."



(Do not write above this line.)

- (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. It is recommended that (check one option only):
- Costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10, and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment. Unless the time for payment of discipline costs is extended pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 6086.10, costs assessed against a member who is actually suspended or disbarred must be paid as a condition of reinstatement or return to active status.
 - Costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment. **SELECT ONE** of the costs must be paid with Respondent's membership fees for each of the following years:

If Respondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified in writing by the State Bar or the State Bar Court, the remaining balance will be 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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.
- (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 Respondent's misconduct.
- (10) **Candor/Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of Respondent's misconduct, or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigations or proceedings.
- (11) **Multiple Acts:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing. **See page 14.**
- (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 [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. **See page 15.**
- (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 Respondent's 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 Respondent's 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 Respondent.
- (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 Respondent, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and the difficulties or disabilities no longer pose a risk that Respondent will commit misconduct.
- (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 Respondent's control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.
- (10) **Family Problems:** At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in Respondent's 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 Respondent's misconduct. **See page 15.**
- (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:

Pretrial Stipulation: see page 15.

Charitable Work: see page 15.

Emotional/Personal Difficulties: see page 15.

D. Recommended Discipline:

- (1) **Actual Suspension:**

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for _____, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for _____ with the following conditions.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for the first _____ of the period of Respondent's probation.

- (2) **Actual Suspension "And Until" Rehabilitation:**

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for **three years**, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for **three years** with the following conditions.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first **two years** of Respondent's probation and until Respondent provides proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

- (3) **Actual Suspension "And Until" Restitution (Single Payee) and Rehabilitation:**

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for _____, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for _____ with the following conditions.

(Do not write above this line.)

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first _____ of Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until both of the following requirements are satisfied:
 - a. Respondent makes restitution to _____ in the amount of \$ _____ plus 10 percent interest per year from _____ (or reimburses the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the Fund to such payee, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5) and furnishes satisfactory proof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles; and
 - b. Respondent provides proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

(4) **Actual Suspension "And Until" Restitution (Multiple Payees) and Rehabilitation:**

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for _____, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for _____ with the following conditions.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first _____ of Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until both of the following requirements are satisfied:
 - a. Respondent must make restitution, including the principal amount plus 10 percent interest per year (and furnish satisfactory proof of such restitution to the Office of Probation), to each of the following payees (or reimburse the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the Fund to such payee in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5):

<i>Payee</i>	<i>Principal Amount</i>	<i>Interest Accrues From</i>

- b. Respondent provides proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

(5) **Actual Suspension "And Until" Restitution (Single Payee) with Conditional Std. 1.2(c)(1) Requirement:**

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for _____, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for _____ with the following conditions.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum for the first _____ of Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until the following requirements are satisfied:
 - a. Respondent makes restitution to _____ in the amount of \$ _____ plus 10 percent interest per year from _____ (or reimburses the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the

(Do not write above this line.)

Fund to such payee, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5) and furnishes satisfactory proof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles; and,

- b. If Respondent remains suspended for two years or longer, Respondent must provide proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

(6) **Actual Suspension "And Until" Restitution (Multiple Payees) with Conditional Std. 1.2(c)(1) Requirement:**

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for _____, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for _____ with the following conditions.

- Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a minimum for the first _____ of Respondent's probation, and Respondent will remain suspended until the following requirements are satisfied:
 - a. Respondent must make restitution, including the principal amount plus 10 percent interest per year (and furnish satisfactory proof of such restitution to the Office of Probation), to each of the following payees (or reimburse the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the Fund to such payee in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5):

<i>Payee</i>	<i>Principal Amount</i>	<i>Interest Accrues From</i>

- b. If Respondent remains suspended for two years or longer, Respondent must provide proof to the State Bar Court of Respondent's rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and present learning and ability in the general law. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.2(c)(1).)

(7) **Actual Suspension with Credit for Interim Suspension:**

Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for _____, the execution of that suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for _____ with the following conditions.

- Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for the first _____ of probation (with credit given for the period of interim suspension which commenced on _____).

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

- (1) **Review Rules of Professional Conduct:** Within 30 days after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must (1) read the California Rules of Professional Conduct (Rules of Professional Conduct) and Business and Professions Code sections 6067, 6068, and 6103 through 6126, and (2) provide a declaration, under penalty of perjury, attesting to Respondent's

(Do not write above this line.)

compliance with this requirement, to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles (Office of Probation) with Respondent's first quarterly report.

- (2) **Comply with State Bar Act, Rules of Professional Conduct, and Probation Conditions:** Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of Respondent's probation.
- (3) **Maintain Valid Official Membership Address and Other Required Contact Information:** Within 30 days after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must make certain that the State Bar Attorney Regulation and Consumer Resources Office (ARCR) has Respondent's current office address, email address, and telephone number. If Respondent does not maintain an office, Respondent must provide the mailing address, email address, and telephone number to be used for State Bar purposes. Respondent must report, in writing, any change in the above information to ARCR, within ten (10) days after such change, in the manner required by that office.
- (4) **Meet and Cooperate with Office of Probation:** Within 15 days after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation case specialist to discuss the terms and conditions of Respondent's discipline and, within 30 days after the effective date of the court's order, must participate in such meeting. Unless otherwise instructed by the Office of Probation, Respondent may meet with the probation case specialist in person or by telephone. During the probation period, Respondent must promptly meet with representatives of the Office of Probation as requested by it and, subject to the assertion of applicable privileges, must fully, promptly, and truthfully answer any inquiries by it and provide to it any other information requested by it.
- (5) **State Bar Court Retains Jurisdiction/Appear Before and Cooperate with State Bar Court:** During Respondent's probation period, the State Bar Court retains jurisdiction over Respondent to address issues concerning compliance with probation conditions. During this period, Respondent must appear before the State Bar Court as required by the court or by the Office of Probation after written notice mailed to Respondent's official membership address, as provided above. Subject to the assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must fully, promptly, and truthfully answer any inquiries by the court and must provide any other information the court requests.
- (6) **Quarterly and Final Reports:**
- a. **Deadlines for Reports.** Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation no later than each January 10 (covering October 1 through December 31 of the prior year), April 10 (covering January 1 through March 31), July 10 (covering April 1 through June 30), and October 10 (covering July 1 through September 30) within the period of probation. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date and cover the extended deadline. In addition to all quarterly reports, Respondent must submit a final report no earlier than ten (10) days before the last day of the probation period and no later than the last day of the probation period.
- b. **Contents of Reports.** Respondent must answer, under penalty of perjury, all inquiries contained in the quarterly report form provided by the Office of Probation, including stating whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act and the Rules of Professional Conduct during the applicable quarter or period. All reports must be: (1) submitted on the form provided by the Office of Probation; (2) signed and dated after the completion of the period for which the report is being submitted (except for the final report); (3) filled out completely and signed under penalty of perjury; and (4) submitted to the Office of Probation on or before each report's due date.
- c. **Submission of Reports.** All reports must be submitted by: (1) fax or email to the Office of Probation; (2) personal delivery to the Office of Probation; (3) certified mail, return receipt requested, to the Office of Probation (postmarked on or before the due date); or (4) other tracked-service provider, such as Federal Express or United Parcel Service, etc. (physically delivered to such provider on or before the due date).

d. Proof of Compliance. Respondent is directed to maintain proof of Respondent's compliance with the above requirements for each such report for a minimum of one year after either the period of probation or the period of Respondent's actual suspension has ended, whichever is longer. Respondent is required to present such proof upon request by the State Bar, the Office of Probation, or the State Bar Court.

- (7) **State Bar Ethics School:** Within one year after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of the State Bar Ethics School and passage of the test given at the end of that session. This requirement is separate from any Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for attending this session. If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of completion of the Ethics School after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this condition.
- (8) **State Bar Ethics School Not Recommended:** It is not recommended that Respondent be ordered to attend the State Bar Ethics School because _____.
- (9) **State Bar Client Trust Accounting School:** Within one year after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of the State Bar Client Trust Accounting School and passage of the test given at the end of that session. This requirement is separate from any Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for attending this session. If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of completion of the Client Trust Accounting School after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this condition.
- (10) **Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) Courses – California Legal Ethics [Alternative to State Bar Ethics School for Out-of-State Residents]:** Because Respondent resides outside of California, within _____ after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must either submit to the Office of Probation satisfactory evidence of completion of the State Bar Ethics School and passage of the test given at the end of that session or, in the alternative, complete _____ hours of California Minimum Continuing Legal Education-approved participatory activity in California legal ethics and provide proof of such completion to the Office of Probation. This requirement is separate from any MCLE requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for this activity. If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of completion of the Ethics School or the hours of legal education described above, completed after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this condition.
- (11) **Criminal Probation:** Respondent must comply with all probation conditions imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must report such compliance under penalty of perjury in all quarterly and final reports submitted to the Office of Probation covering any portion of the period of the criminal probation. In each quarterly and final report, if Respondent has an assigned criminal probation officer, Respondent must provide the name and current contact information for that criminal probation officer. If the criminal probation was successfully completed during the period covered by a quarterly or final report, that fact must be reported by Respondent in such report and satisfactory evidence of such fact must be provided with it. If, at any time before or during the period of probation, Respondent's criminal probation is revoked, Respondent is sanctioned by the criminal court, or Respondent's status is otherwise changed due to any alleged violation of the criminal probation conditions by Respondent, Respondent must submit the criminal court records regarding any such action with Respondent's next quarterly or final report.
- (12) **Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE):** Within _____ after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter, Respondent must complete _____ hour(s) of California Minimum Continuing Legal Education-approved participatory activity in SELECT ONE _____ and must _____.

(Do not write above this line.)

provide proof of such completion to the Office of Probation. This requirement is separate from any MCLE requirement, and Respondent will not receive MCLE credit for this activity. If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of completion of the hours of legal education described above, completed after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this condition.

(13) **Other:** Respondent must also comply with the following additional conditions of probation: **Respondent is directed to maintain, for a minimum of one year after commencement of probation, proof of compliance with the Review Department's order that respondent comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, subdivisions (a) and (c). Such proof must include: the names and addresses of all individuals and entities to whom respondent sent notification pursuant to rule 9.20; a copy of each notification letter sent to each recipient; the original receipt or postal authority tracking document for each notification sent; the originals of all returned receipts and notifications of non-delivery; and a copy of the completed compliance affidavit filed by the respondent with the State Bar Court. Respondent is required to present such proof upon request by the State Bar, the Office of Probation, or the State Bar Court.**

(14) **Proof of Compliance with Rule 9.20 Obligations:** Respondent is directed to maintain, for a minimum of one year after commencement of probation, proof of compliance with the Supreme Court's order that Respondent comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, subdivisions (a) and (c). Such proof must include: the names and addresses of all individuals and entities to whom Respondent sent notification pursuant to rule 9.20; a copy of each notification letter sent to each recipient; the original receipt or postal authority tracking document for each notification sent; the originals of all returned receipts and notifications of non-delivery; and a copy of the completed compliance affidavit filed by Respondent with the State Bar Court. Respondent is required to present such proof upon request by the State Bar, the Office of Probation, or the State Bar Court.

(15) **The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:**

Financial Conditions

Medical Conditions

Substance Abuse Conditions

The period of probation will commence on the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter. At the expiration of the probation period, if Respondent has complied with all conditions of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

F. Other Requirements Negotiated by the Parties (Not Probation Conditions):

(1) **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination Within One Year or During Period of Actual Suspension:** Respondent must take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners within one year after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter or during the period of Respondent's actual suspension, whichever is longer, and to provide satisfactory proof of such passage to the State Bar's Office of Probation within the same period. Failure to do so may result in suspension. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.10(b).) If Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of the taking and passage of the above examination after the date of this stipulation but before the effective date of the Supreme Court's order in this matter, Respondent will nonetheless receive credit for such evidence toward Respondent's duty to comply with this requirement.

(2) **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination Requirement Not Recommended:** It is not recommended that Respondent be ordered to take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination because

- (3) **California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20:** Respondent must comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and 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 imposing discipline in this matter. Failure to do so may result in disbarment or suspension.

For purposes of compliance with rule 9.20(a), the operative date for identification of "clients being represented in pending matters" and others to be notified is the filing date of the Supreme Court order, not any later "effective" date of the order. (*Athearn v. State Bar* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 38, 45.) Further, Respondent is required to file a rule 9.20(c) affidavit even if Respondent has no clients to notify on the date the Supreme Court filed its order in this proceeding. (*Powers v. State Bar* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 337, 341.) In addition to being punished as a crime or contempt, an attorney's failure to comply with rule 9.20 is, inter alia, cause for disbarment, suspension, revocation of any pending disciplinary probation, and denial of an application for reinstatement after disbarment. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.20(d).)

- (4) **California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20 – Conditional Requirement:** If Respondent remains suspended for 90 days or longer, Respondent must comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court order imposing discipline in this matter. Failure to do so may result in disbarment or suspension.

For purposes of compliance with rule 9.20(a), the operative date for identification of "clients being represented in pending matters" and others to be notified is the filing date of the Supreme Court order, not any later "effective" date of the order. (*Athearn v. State Bar* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 38, 45.) Further, Respondent is required to file a rule 9.20(c) affidavit even if Respondent has no clients to notify on the date the Supreme Court filed its order in this proceeding. (*Powers v. State Bar* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 337, 341.) In addition to being punished as a crime or contempt, an attorney's failure to comply with rule 9.20 is, inter alia, cause for disbarment, suspension, revocation of any pending disciplinary probation, and denial of an application for reinstatement after disbarment. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.20(d).)

- (5) **California Rules of Court, Rule 9.20, Requirement Not Recommended:** It is not recommended that Respondent be ordered to comply with the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, because **Respondent was required to comply with rule 9.20 when he was placed on interim suspension; he timely complied and timely filed the rule 9.20 Declaration on December 28, 2018 and he continues to be on interim suspension. (See In the Matter of Carr (Review Dept.1992) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 108 [court declined to order compliance with rule 955 (predecessor to rule 9.20) where attorney had been on continuous interim suspension for 5 years].)**
- (6) **Other Requirements:** It is further recommended that Respondent be ordered to comply with the following additional requirements: .

ATTACHMENT TO
STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: LOUIS JULIAN WHITE

CASE NUMBER: 18-C-11038

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and the facts and circumstances surrounding the offenses for which he was convicted involved moral turpitude.

Case No. 18-C-11038 (Conviction Proceedings)

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND IN CONVICTION PROCEEDING:

1. This is a proceeding pursuant to sections 6101 and 6102 of the Business and Professions Code and rule 9.10 of the California Rules of Court.
2. On January 10, 2018, the Orange County District Attorney filed a felony complaint against respondent in Orange County Superior Court case no. 18CF0149, charging respondent with one count of violating Penal Code sections 664(a)-487(a)/504, attempted grand theft by embezzlement, a felony; one count of violating Penal Code sections 487(a)/504, grand theft by embezzlement, public or private officer, a felony; one count of violating Penal Code section 487(a), grand theft by false pretense, a felony. The complaint further alleged that the offense of attempted embezzlement is a felony having a material element of fraud and breach of fiduciary obligation.
3. On March 28, 2018, the court, on its own motion, reduced the felony charges to misdemeanors. Also, on March 28, 2018, respondent pled guilty to violating Penal Code sections 664(a)-487(a)/504, attempted grand theft by embezzlement, a misdemeanor; Penal Code sections 487(a)/504, grand theft by embezzlement, public or private officer, a misdemeanor; Penal Code section 487(a), grand theft by false pretense, a misdemeanor. Respondent was sentenced to three years of informal probation, one day of jail, and was ordered to pay restitution. The informal probation was to terminate after respondent paid restitution. Thereafter, respondent's conviction became final.
4. On April 13, 2018, the court received a Notice from Victim Witness, informing the court that no restitution was due.
5. On April 16, 2018, respondent filed a motion to terminate probation in his criminal case because he had completed the terms of his probation. On May 17, 2018, respondent's motion was granted and his probation was terminated.
6. On August 16, 2018, respondent filed a petition for dismissal pursuant to Penal Code section 1203.4.
7. On September 10, 2018, the court ordered that respondent's guilty pleas be vacated and a plea of not guilty be entered and that the complaint be dismissed.

8. On November 21, 2018, the Review Department of the State Bar Court issued an order referring the matter to the Hearing Department for a hearing and decision recommending the discipline to be imposed for the offense(s) for which respondent was convicted which the Review Department determined involved moral turpitude as a matter of law. Furthermore, the Review Department ordered respondent's interim suspension effective December 17, 2018, and compliance with Rule of Court 9.20.

FACTS:

9. Respondent was employed as a Senior Claims Counsel at DSI, which was a subsidiary of Insko, and thereafter a subsidiary of AmTrust.

10. AmTrust created Surety Central, a bond management system. It maintains records, manages claims, and issues checks. Surety Central is only available to AmTrust employees.

11. Respondent was the attorney responsible for two performance bonds issued by DSI on a real estate development project: performance bonds 726995S and 727325S. Palm Desert National Bank provided a loan on the development project, and as an inducement for DSI's execution of the performance bonds, the bank agreed to allocate from the loan and set aside funds in the amount of \$74,000. A claim was made against the bonds, and Palm Desert National Bank issued a set aside letter and agreed to pay DSI \$60,790.34 in full settlement of DSI's claims against the set aside letter. DSI was to pay a total of \$60,790.34 to Apex Pacific Asset Management, LLC ("Apex") once all of the work was completed and accepted. Apex is an entity under American Pacific Homes, Inc. ("American Pacific").

12. Respondent was the main point of contact for Steve Topor ("Topor"), the Vice President of American Pacific and Apex. Apex purchased the above-described real estate development project subject to the existing bonds. Apex was supposed to receive funds from the set aside letter once the work had been completed, but they sold the project around June 2010 to Young Homes, Inc ("Young Homes"). These funds were assigned to Young Homes in their Purchase and Sales Agreement. On May 21, 2010, a check was issued from Palm Desert National Bank to DSI for \$60,790.34. This was the amount for the set aside.

13. On or around April 11, 2013, the required work was completed on the subject of the performance bonds issued by DSI. Thereafter, the city inspector approved the completion of the requirements and released the bonds. As part of these release/inspection/completion documents Young Homes, and not Apex, was indicated as the builder/contractor. These documents alerted respondent that Apex was no longer the owner of the bond funds.

14. In December 2013, respondent made an entry into the Surety Central bond management system indicating that he called Kevin Brooks at Apex, indicating respondent was closing out the final reimbursement per the Settlement and Cooperation Agreement and sending out a reimbursement to Kevin Brooks' attention. This was a fraudulent entry. Respondent did not speak to or call Kevin Brooks.

15. On December 19, 2013, respondent requested funds from DSI through Lisa Brass, assistant controller at Am Trust. These funds were from DSI's cash account ledger, and were placed into the claims liability account. This action was necessary for checks to be issued from Surety Central pursuant to the set aside agreement. Thereafter, after securing the funds, respondent caused two checks be issued by Surety Central: one check to Apex Pacific Management and one check to American Pacific Management regarding bonds 726995S and 727325S, check nos. 19478 and 19479. These checks, each

for \$23,463.71, represented a reimbursement payment to the owner of the bonded project for completion of the work, minus \$13,864 that was used to pay the outstanding premium. Notably, this premium was possibly not chargeable to Apex as the bond agreement was not between DSI and Apex.

16. On December 22, 2013, respondent made a check deposit, at a JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. (“Chase”) ATM into his personal account with Chase in the amount of \$23,463.17. The check was processed on December 23, 2013 and the funds were deposited into Respondent’s account. On December 24, 2013 this amount was debited from respondent’s account with a notation, “DR Due to ATM/Dep Error.”

17. On February 7, 2014, respondent opened a business account in the name of “Louis White DBA Apex Pacific Management” (“DBA Account”) with Chase Bank. The address listed for the business account was 192 East Green Street, Claremont, CA 91711. This is the same address that was listed on respondent’s personal checking account with Chase. The entity was identified as a sole proprietorship with respondent listed as the sole owner and only signer on the account. This entity had no relation to Apex. The primary identification used by respondent to open the account was an Assumed Name Certificate No. 2014000430 issued from Claremont, CA on February 2, 2014, and expiring February 2, 2019. Document No. 2014000430 belongs to Sugar Smacks and not Apex Pacific Management. Sugar Smacks is owned by Damian Garcia, with a business address of 16243 Abbey Street, La Puente, CA 91744. This fictitious business name was originally filed on February 25, 2009 and the most recent refile was done on January 2, 2014 and expires on January 2, 2019.

18. On February 10, 2014, respondent entered a note into the Surety Central bond management system indicating that Steve Topor had called him and stated that the checks were misplaced and that he requested that they be reissued. This was a fraudulent entry. Respondent did not speak to or call Topor about misplaced checks in 2014.

19. Sometime prior to February 11, 2014, respondent issued a stop payment on both of these checks following the purported conversation with Topor. However, it appears that stop payments were not actually issued on these checks by the bank.

20. On February 12, 2014, respondent issued two new checks to “Apex Pacific Management”, the name of his DBA account, in relation to a matter for DSI’s client, Apex. Check numbers 19652 and 19653 each in the amount of \$23,463.17, were issued from the DSI operating account with Community Bank, and were provided to respondent.

21. On February 17, 2014, respondent deposited check 19652 in the amount of \$23,463.17 into his DBA Account.

22. On February 18, 2014, respondent deposited check 19653 in the amount of 23,463.17 into his DBA Account. Both checks were posted to respondent’s DBA Account on February 18, 2014. Respondent was never given authority to deposit these funds into the DBA Account.

23. On February 25, 2014, respondent first confessed to Moore that he had diverted the two checks, for a total of \$46,926.34. Respondent also confessed to the company’s Chief Legal Officer and Executive Vice President, David Kerrigan. As part of his confession, respondent provided the Chase Bank account number in which the funds were deposited, and the relevant Chase Bank branch address.

24. After confessing to his supervisors, respondent terminated his employment with the company.

25. On March 18, 2014, there was a "Debit DDA-Check Charge" posted to the DBA Account in the amount of \$47,532.43. This was the entire balance of the DBA Account and essentially closed the account. These funds remained with Chase.

26. On March 29, 2014, Community Bank informed DSI that Chase would not release the funds, and that they were closing the case as there was nothing further they could do.

27. On November 26, 2014, the California Department of Insurance ("CDI") received a complaint regarding respondent from AmTrust.

28. On December 21, 2017, the investigation was completed. After the CDI completed its investigation into the matter, it was referred to the Orange County District Attorney.

29. After his employment ended with AmTrust, respondent was not contacted by anyone informing him that AmTrust was having difficulty recovering the funds from Chase, until January 2018, when the Orange County District Attorney's Office contacted him about the matter. Thereafter, respondent signed a release as to the funds with Chase and AmTrust was subsequently able to recover the funds. Further, as part of criminal probation, respondent paid interest on the funds.

30. On April 25, 2018, respondent self-reported his criminal conviction to the State Bar.

31. Respondent timely filed a 9.20 Compliance Declaration on December 28, 2018.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

32. The facts and circumstances surrounding the above-described convictions involved moral turpitude.

AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Multiple Acts of Wrongdoing (Std. 1.5(b)): Respondent pled guilty to multiple criminal violations in the underlying criminal conviction matter prior to the post-conviction relief, specifically, dismissal pursuant to Penal Code 1203.4. Respondent committed multiple acts of wrongdoing by attempted grand theft by embezzlement, grand theft by embezzlement, and grand theft by false pretense. Respondent's criminal violations included the taking of multiple steps to complete the \$46,950.35 diversion of funds, including making false statements regarding the surety bonds he was responsible for, fraudulently requesting payment for those bonds, fraudulently issuing checks for those bonds, depositing one check into his personal bank account, falsely claiming the checks issued pursuant to those bonds were reported lost when the deposit failed, requesting a stop payment on those original checks, using altered business identity documents to open a business bank account, using another business's business license number, creating a false name to open a bank account, re-issuing of two checks for the purported payment pursuant to the bonds, depositing the two checks into his DBA Account, and thereafter attempting to withdraw the funds from his DBA Account. These numerous wrongful acts over the course of approximately two months are aggravating.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

Pretrial Stipulation: By entering into this stipulation, respondent has acknowledged misconduct and is entitled to mitigation for recognition of wrongdoing and saving the State Bar significant resources and time. (*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]; *In the Matter of Spaith* (Review Dept. 1996) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 511, 521 [where the attorney's stipulation to facts and culpability was held to be a mitigating circumstance].)

No Prior Discipline (Std. 1.6(a)): Respondent was admitted to practice law in California on December 7, 1988. At the time of the misconduct, Respondent had practiced law for approximately 29 years without a prior record of discipline. Respondent is entitled to significant mitigation due to his many years in practice without discipline. (See *In the Matter of Davis* (Review Dept. 2003) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr 576, 588-589, 591 [mitigation acknowledged for the absence of a prior record of discipline in twelve years of practice despite willful misappropriation of over \$29,000]; *Boehme v. State Bar* (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 448, 452-453, 454-455 [twenty-two years of practice without prior discipline was an important mitigating circumstance despite attorney's intentional misappropriation and lack of candor to State Bar Court].)

Charitable Work: Respondent donated his time and legal services to The Alliance for Children's Rights from 2014-2015. He began this work shortly after his misconduct, and he had already left AmTrust at the time. As part of respondent's work with this organization, he obtained guardianship and designation of Special Immigrant Juvenile Status for a 16-year-old undocumented girl, who had been brought to the United States as a young child. Respondent devoted over 50 hours to this matter. Respondent has also volunteered with Claremont Heritage from July 2018 to present in a non-legal capacity. Respondent is also a repeat blood donor to the American Red Cross. He also volunteers at Ophelia's Jump, a local theater company. (See *In the Matter of Respondent K* (Review Dept. 1993) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 335; *Porter v. State Bar* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 518 [civic service and charitable work can be mitigation as evidence of good character].)

Letters of Good Character: Respondent is entitled to mitigation for the seven letters of good character attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities, all of whom are aware of the full extent of the misconduct, including former co-workers, the former Executive Vice President of InSCO, other attorneys, and personal friends who have known respondent for 15 years or longer. (See *In the Matter of Davis* (Review Department. 2013) 4 Cal. State Bar. Ct. Rptr. 576, 592 [significant weight afforded to attorney who provided character evidence from three witnesses familiar with him and knowledge of his good character, work habits, and professional skills].) The former Vice President of InSCO attested that but for this one incident, respondent served the company well during his 20 year career at the company.

Emotional/Difficulties: Respondent suffered emotional distress and anxiety during the time of his misconduct. Respondent suffered emotional difficulties following the death of respondent's father. These emotional difficulties caused respondent to suffer from undiagnosed depression and anxiety which negatively affected his behavior related to his work. Respondent successfully sought help in the form of counseling to learn to cope with his depression and anxiety, and to understand the underlying reasons for the misconduct. According to respondent's therapist, as of late 2014, respondent was no longer suffering from these conditions.

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. All further references to standards are to this source.) 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 Std. 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 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.) 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. (Std. 1.1.) “Any disciplinary recommendation that deviates from the Standards must include clear reasons for the departure.” (Std. 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. (Stds. 1.7(b) and (c).)

Respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of three misdemeanors involving moral turpitude, including attempted grand theft by embezzlement, grand theft by embezzlement, and grand theft by false pretense in March 23, 2018. (See *In re Basinger* (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1348, 1363 [criminal conviction of one count of grand theft was conclusive evidence of guilt of a crime involving an intent to steal, and as such the crime necessarily involved moral turpitude].) The conduct occurred from December 2013 to February 2014. Respondent’s dishonesty and theft resulted in over \$46,000 being diverted to his own bank account, thereby depriving the true owner of the funds. Respondent’s multiple acts of wrongdoing are aggravating factors. However, respondent later signed a release to have the funds provided to AmTrust, and respondent paid AmTrust interest on the funds through the court ordered restitution in the criminal matter mere weeks after sentencing. Respondent’s conviction, though serious misconduct, is mitigated by 29 years of discipline free practice, evidence of good moral character, charitable work, and emotional/personal difficulties. Additionally, by entering into this stipulation, respondent has acknowledged misconduct and is entitled to mitigation for recognition of wrongdoing and saving the State Bar significant resources and time

Standard 2.15(c) provides that disbarment or actual suspension is the presumed sanction for final conviction of a misdemeanor involving moral turpitude. Here, respondent’s guilty plea to three misdemeanor crimes involving fraud and theft committed in his capacity as an attorney for DSI, though serious ethical breaches, resulted in a minimal sentence by the Orange County Superior Court. Following respondent’s guilty plea, respondent was sentenced to three years of informal probation, one day of jail, and was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$5,634.04. Significantly, probation was set to terminate after respondent paid restitution. The initial reduction in the severity of the charges

against respondent and the imposed minimal sentence demonstrate that the criminal court believed respondent's criminal conduct to be deserving of a minimal sentence. (See *In the Matter of Jackson* (Review Dept. 2003) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 610, 614 [grade of crime bears on degree of discipline]; *In the Matter of Meza* (Review Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 608, 613 [leniency in attorney's criminal sentence may be relevant in assessing discipline].) The criminal court's view of respondents conduct is relevant to the issue of the appropriate discipline to be imposed by the State Bar. (See *In Re Larkin* (1989) 48 Cal. 3d. 236, 244; *In the Matter of Burns* (Review Department 1995) 3 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 406, 413.) Accordingly, a significant period of actual suspension is warranted. Three years of probation, three years of stayed suspension, with two years of actual suspension and until respondent demonstrates rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning in the law pursuant to Standard 1.2(c)(1) is appropriate and is necessary in order to protect the public, the courts and the legal profession, maintain the highest of professional standards, and preserve public confidence in the legal profession.

This outcome is consistent with case law. In *In the Matter of Stamper* (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 96, the attorney was convicted of two counts of forgery and two counts of grand theft by embezzlement for funds belonging to his law partner. The misconduct occurred over a period of five years, and on 17 separate occasions, where the attorney drafted letters for purported refunds for clients, placed those letters in the files to conceal the diversion of funds, wrote checks from the CTA for the refunds, and then forged client's signatures and deposited those funds into his own personal account thereby depriving the law partnership of the funds, totaling \$32,138.36, half of the funds belonging to the attorney. *Id.* at 104. In mitigation, the attorney had no prior record of discipline in seven years of practice, suffered emotional difficulties and provided good character evidence. *Id.* at 106-107. The Review Department imposed five years stayed suspension, five years' probation with conditions, including the condition that the attorney be actually suspended for four years. *Id.* at 110.

While respondent's criminal convictions clearly involve multiple convictions for crimes that constitute moral turpitude, respondent's behavior was not as egregious as that of *Stamper*. The funds involved in respondent's matter did not involve funds held in trust by respondent for a personal client of respondent. Moreover, the criminal court's reduction of respondent's crimes from felonies to misdemeanors and the resulting light sentence strongly suggest that the court believed respondent's conduct to be aberrational and thus deserving of a minimal sentence. Here, respondent's 29 years of discipline free practice combined with the seven letters of good character shed a significantly positive light on respondent's character. See *Boehme v. State Bar* (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 448, 452-453, 454-455 [twenty-two years of practice without prior discipline was important mitigating circumstance despite attorney's intentional misappropriation and lack of candor to State Bar Court]. Moreover, respondent's criminal actions were limited to approximately a three month period as compared to a period of five years in *Stamper*. Given respondent's significant overall mitigation and lesser misconduct discipline less than that imposed in *Stamper* is appropriate.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.




Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of March 14, 2019, the discipline costs in this matter are \$2,699. 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.

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of LOUIS JULIAN WHITE	Case number(s): 18-C-11038-YDR
--	-----------------------------------

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 Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

<u>3-18-2019</u> Date	 _____ Respondent's Signature	<u>Louis Julian White</u> Print Name
<u>3-20-19</u> Date	 _____ Respondent's Counsel Signature	<u>Artak Barsegyan</u> Print Name
<u>3-21-19.</u> Date	 _____ Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	<u>Arizvel Chaudhari</u> Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: LOUIS JULIAN WHITE	Case Number(s): 18-C-11038-YDR
---	-----------------------------------

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.

On page 17 of the Stipulation, line 8, "Accordingly, a significant period of actual suspension is warranted" is deleted, and in its place is inserted "Accordingly, a significant period of actual suspension (without credit for the period of interim suspension) is warranted."

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 Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 5.58(E) & (F).) **The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after the filed date of the Supreme Court order.** (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.18(a).)

April 18, 2019
Date

Rebecca Meyer Rosenberg
REBECCA MEYER ROSENBERG, 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 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 April 18, 2019, 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:

ARTAK BARSEGYAN
PANSKY MARKLE ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1010 SYCAMORE AVE UNIT 308
S PASADENA, CA 91030 - 6139

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

ARIZVEL CHAUDHARI, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on April 18, 2019.



Mazie Yip
Court Specialist
State Bar Court