


(Do not write above this line.)

<b>State Bar Court of California Hearing Department San Francisco REPROVAL</b>		
<b>Counsel For The State Bar</b>  <b>Maria J. Oropeza</b> <b>Deputy Trial Counsel</b> <b>180 Howard Street</b> <b>San Francisco, CA 94102</b> <b>(415) 538-2569</b>  <b>Bar # 182660</b>	<b>Case Number(s):</b> <b>16-O-13295 (Inv)</b>   <small>kwiktag = 228 160 176</small>	<b>For Court use only</b>  <b>PUBLIC MATTER</b>  <b>FILED</b>  <b>JUN 08 2017</b>  <b>STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO</b>
<b>Counsel For Respondent</b>  <b>Ruth Edelstein</b> <b>1515 Lakeside Drive</b> <b>Suite #121</b> <b>Oakland, CA 94612</b> <b>(415) 864-5100</b>  <b>Bar # 83343</b>	<b>Submitted to: Settlement Judge</b>  <b>STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING</b>  <b>PUBLIC REPROVAL</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED</b>	
<b>In the Matter of:</b> <b>LEON EMMANUEL JEW</b>  <b>Bar # 219298</b>  <b>A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)</b>		

**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 1, 2002.
- (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 13 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. (Check one option only):
- ☒ Costs are added to membership fee for calendar year following effective date of discipline (public reproof).
  - ☐ Case ineligible for costs (private reproof).
  - ☐ Costs are to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: (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.
- (9) The parties understand that:
- (a) ☐ A private reproof imposed on a respondent as a result of a stipulation approved by the Court prior to initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, but is not disclosed in response to public inquiries and is not reported on the State Bar's web page. The record of the proceeding in which such a private reproof was imposed is not available to the public except as part of the record of any subsequent proceeding in which it is introduced as evidence of a prior record of discipline under the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.
  - (b) ☐ A private reproof imposed on a respondent after initiation of a State Bar Court proceeding is part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.
  - (c) ☒ A public reproof imposed on a respondent is publicly available as part of the respondent's official State Bar membership records, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and is reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web page.

**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 or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline."

- (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.
- (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. See Attachment to Stipulation page 10.
- (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. See Attachment to Stipulation page 10.
- (3) ☒ **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings. See Attachment to Stipulation page 10.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (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.
- (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 subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13) ☐ **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

**Additional mitigating circumstances:**

**No Prior Record of Discipline-See Attachment to Stipulation at page 10.**  
**Pre-filing Stipulation-See Attachment to Stipulation at page 10.**

#### **D. Discipline:**

- (1) ☐ **Private reproof (check applicable conditions, if any, below)**
- (a) ☐ Approved by the Court prior to initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (no public disclosure).
- (b) ☐ Approved by the Court after initiation of the State Bar Court proceedings (public disclosure).
- or
- (2) ☒ **Public reproof (Check applicable conditions, if any, below)**

#### **E. Conditions Attached to Reproval:**

- (1) ☒ Respondent must comply with the conditions attached to the reproof for a period of **one year**.

(Do not write above this line.)

- (2) ☒ During the condition period attached to the reprobation, 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 reprobation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the reprobation conditions period, 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 condition period attached to the reprobation. 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 the reprobation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state in each report 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 (thirty) days, that report must be submitted on the next following 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 condition period and no later than the last day of the condition period.

- (6) ☐ Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of reprobation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the reprobation conditions period, Respondent must furnish 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 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 conditions attached to the reprobation.
- (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: .
- (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) ☒ 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 within one year of the effective date of the reprobation.
  - ☐ No MPRE recommended. Reason: .

- (11) ☒ The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:

(Do not write above this line.)

---

☐ Substance Abuse Conditions

☐ Law Office Management Conditions

☐ Medical Conditions

☒ Financial Conditions

**F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:**

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: <b>LEON EMMANUEL JEW</b>	Case Number(s): <b>16-O-13296 (Inv)</b>
---	--

## Financial Conditions

### a. Restitution

- ☐ Respondent must pay restitution (including the principal amount, plus interest of 10% per annum) to the payee(s) listed below. If the Client Security Fund ("CSF") has reimbursed one or more of the payee(s) for all or any portion of the principal amount(s) listed below, Respondent must also pay restitution to CSF in the amount(s) paid, plus applicable interest and costs.

Payee	Principal Amount	Interest Accrues From

- ☐ Respondent must pay above-referenced restitution and provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation not later than

### b. Installment Restitution Payments

- ☐ Respondent must pay the above-referenced restitution on the payment schedule set forth below. Respondent must provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation with each quarterly probation report, or as otherwise directed by the Office of Probation. No later than 30 days prior to the expiration of the period of probation (or period of reprobation), Respondent must make any necessary final payment(s) in order to complete the payment of restitution, including interest, in full.

Payee/CSF (as applicable)	Minimum Payment Amount	Payment Frequency

- ☐ 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.

### c. Client Funds Certificate

- ☒ 1. If Respondent possesses client funds at any time during the period covered by a required quarterly report, Respondent must file with each required report a certificate from Respondent and/or a certified public accountant or other financial professional approved by the Office of Probation, certifying that:
- Respondent has maintained a bank account in a bank authorized to do business in the State of California, at a branch located within the State of California, and that such account is designated as a "Trust Account" or "Clients' Funds Account";

**b. Respondent has kept and maintained the following:**

- i. A written ledger for each client on whose behalf funds are held that sets forth:**
  - 1. the name of such client;**
  - 2. the date, amount and source of all funds received on behalf of such client;**
  - 3. the date, amount, payee and purpose of each disbursement made on behalf of such client; and,**
  - 4. the current balance for such client.**
- ii. a written journal for each client trust fund account that sets forth:**
  - 1. the name of such account;**
  - 2. the date, amount and client affected by each debit and credit; and,**
  - 3. the current balance in such account.**
- iii. all bank statements and cancelled checks for each client trust account; and,**
- iv. each monthly reconciliation (balancing) of (i), (ii), and (iii), above, and if there are any differences between the monthly total balances reflected in (i), (ii), and (iii), above, the reasons for the differences.**

**c. Respondent has maintained a written journal of securities or other properties held for clients that specifies:**

- i. each item of security and property held;**
- ii. the person on whose behalf the security or property is held;**
- iii. the date of receipt of the security or property;**
- iv. the date of distribution of the security or property; and,**
- v. the person to whom the security or property was distributed.**

**2. If Respondent does not possess any client funds, property or securities during the entire period covered by a report, Respondent must so state under penalty of perjury in the report filed with the Office of Probation for that reporting period. In this circumstance, Respondent need not file the accountant's certificate described above.**

**3. The requirements of this condition are in addition to those set forth in rule 4-100, Rules of Professional Conduct.**

**d. Client Trust Accounting School**

- ☒ **Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must supply to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School Client Trust Accounting School, within the same period of time, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.**



**ATTACHMENT TO**  
**STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION**

IN THE MATTER OF:                      LEON EMMANUEL JEW

CASE NUMBER:                          16-O-13295

**FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.**

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

**Case No. 16-O-13295 (State Bar Investigation)**

**FACTS:**

1. On March 15, 2016 and, respondent deposited and commingled funds belonging to respondent in respondent's client trust account at Wells Fargo Bank, account number 6275xxxxxx by depositing the sum of \$2,000 cash into the client trust account.

2. Between January 6, 2016 and July 12, 2016, respondent issued checks from respondent's client trust account at Wells Fargo Bank, account number 6275xxxxxx for non-client related purposes as follows:

Date	Check Number	Amount	Payee/Payor	Memo Line Notes
01/07/16	1389	\$1,000.00	TVBOLCC (Tri-Valley Bread of Life Christian Church)	January 2016
01/25/16	1389	\$2,015.50	Pleasanton Bilingual Montessori Preschool	Leon, Leonard
01/26/16	1399	\$200.37	Costco	
02/02/16	1402	\$1,100.00	TVBOLCC	
02/08/16	1403	\$2,015.50	Pleasanton Bilingual Montessori Preschool	Leon & Leonard Jew, Feb 2016
03/04/16	1410	\$1,200.00	TVBOLCC	
03/08/16	1414	\$71.65	Costco	
04/12/16	1419	\$1,200.00	TVBOLCC	
05/03/16	1422	\$1,200.00	TVBOLCC	
05/10/16	1423	\$480.67	Costco	
05/12/16	1426	\$50.00	US Post Office	
05/27/16	1427	\$1,820.00	Chinese Art	

			Gallery	
07/06/16	1429	\$3,000.00	TVBOLCC	
07/12/16	1430	\$144.99	Costco	

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

3. By depositing funds belonging to respondent into respondent's CTA, respondent willfully commingled personal funds in a client trust account in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).

4. By issuing checks from respondent's CTA for the payment of respondent's personal expenses, respondent willfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A).

#### AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**Multiple Acts of Wrongdoing (Std. 1.5(b)):** Respondent committed multiple acts of professional misconduct.

#### MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES.

**Lack of Harm to Client, Public or Administration of Justice (Std. 1.6(c)):** No clients were harmed by respondent's misconduct.

**Good Character(Std. 1.6(f)):** Respondent has presented letters from fifteen character witnesses from the legal and general communities ( two lawyers; three friends; five former clients; two patent agents; three church members including a pastor), all of whom are aware of the misconduct in this case, and all of whom have attested to his good character. (See *In re Ford* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 810, 818 – letter writers must be aware of the full extent of respondent's misconduct; *In the Matter of Koehler* (Review Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 615, 624 & 628 – three character references (one attorney and two clients) merited consideration.)

**Spontaneous Candor and Cooperation (Std. 1.6(e)):** Respondent fully cooperated with the State Bar during the investigation of the misconduct.

**No Prior Discipline:** Although respondent's misconduct is serious, he is entitled to mitigation for having practiced law for approximately 14 years without discipline. (See *Edwards v. State Bar* (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 28, 31, 32, 36,39 mitigative credit given for almost twelve years of discipline-free practice despite intentional misappropriation and commingling; *In the Matter of Riordan*, (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41, 49.)

**Pre-filing 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 Spaiht* (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].)

## **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 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. (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).)

In this matter, respondent admits to committing multiple 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 2.2(a), which applies to respondent’s violation(s) of rule 4-100(A) of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Standard 2.2(a) states in pertinent part “Actual suspension of three months is the presumed sanction for commingling or failure to promptly pay out entrusted funds.”

In *Dudugjian v. State Bar* (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1092, the Supreme Court rejected the review department’s application of standard 2.2(b) as requiring three months’ actual suspension. Even though the Supreme Court adopted the review department’s determination that Dudugjian was culpable of willful commingling and failing to promptly pay out client funds, the court concluded that a public reproof was the appropriate discipline under the facts of the case. The court focused on Dudugjian’s honest belief that the clients had given him permission to retain their settlement funds and rejected the review department’s recommendation.

In light of respondent’s misconduct as well as the mitigating circumstances in this matter, a deviation from the standard is justified. Respondent’s misconduct did not harm any of his clients, respondent’s good character has been attested to by at least 15 individuals who are familiar with the extent of the

misconduct and respondent's misconduct is less egregious than Dudugjian's misconduct. A public reproof is adequate to protect the public.

#### **COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.**

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of May 11, 2017, the discipline costs in this matter are \$3,215. 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**




Respondent may not receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School, State Bar Client Trust Accounting School, and/or any other educational course(s) to be ordered as a condition of reproof or suspension. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of: LEON EMMANUEL JEW	Case number(s): 16-O-13295(inv)
--	------------------------------------

### 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.

5/21/2017		Leon Emmanuel Jew
Date	Respondent's Signature	Print Name
5/21/17		Ruth Edelstein
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
5/25/17		Maria J. Oropeza
Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of:  
LEON EMMANUEL JEW

Case Number(s):  
16-O-13295 (inv)

### REPROVAL ORDER

Finding that the stipulation protects the public and that the interests of Respondent will be served by any conditions attached to the reproof, 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 REPROVAL IMPOSED.
- ☐ The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the REPROVAL IMPOSED.
- ☐ All court dates in the Hearing Department 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.) Otherwise the stipulation shall be effective 15 days after service of this order.

Failure to comply with any conditions attached to this reproof may constitute cause for a separate proceeding for willful breach of rule 1-110, Rules of Professional Conduct.

Date

June 8, 2017

PAT E. McELROY  
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 San Francisco, on June 8, 2017, 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 San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

RUTH MARIAN EDELSTEIN  
LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES F. BOURDON  
1555 LAKESIDE DR  
APT 121  
OAKLAND, CA 94612 - 4548

- ☐ by certified mail, No. , with return receipt requested, through the United States Postal Service at , California, addressed as follows:

- ☐ by overnight mail at , California, addressed as follows:

- ☐ by fax transmission, at fax number . No error was reported by the fax machine that I used.

- ☐ By personal service by leaving the documents in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or a person having charge of the attorney's office, addressed as follows:

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

Maria J. Oropeza, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on June 8, 2017.

  
George Hue  
Case Administrator