kwiktag® 022 605 253

(Do not write above this line.)

State Bar Court of California

Hearing Department ☒ Los Angeles ☐ San Francisco

Counsel for the State Bar Monique T. Miller, Deputy Trial Counsel 1149 South Hill Street Los Angeles, CA 90015 Tel.: (213) 765-1486 Bar # 212469	Case number(s) 02-O-14394; 02-O-15643	(for Court's use) FILED JUN - 9 2005 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE LOS ANGELES
☒ Counsel for Respondent ☐ In Pro Per, Respondent Erica Tabacknick 900 Wilshire Blvd., #1000 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Tel.: (213) 895-4640 Bar # 94324	PUBLIC MATTER ORIGINAL	
In the Matter of RITA MAHDESSIAN Bar # 141901 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)	Submitted to ☐ assigned judge ☒ settlement judge STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING ACTUAL SUSPENSION ☐ PREVIOUS STIPULATION REJECTED	

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

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 November 20, 1989 (date)

(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 and order consist of 14 pages.

(4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."

(5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law."

(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.

ORIGINAL

(Do not write above this line.)

(8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):

- ☐ until costs are paid in full, Respondent will remain actually suspended from the practice of law unless relief is obtained per rule 284, Rules of Procedure.
- XX costs to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: 2006, 2007 (hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 284, Rules of Procedure)
- ☐ costs waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs"
- ☐ costs entirely waived

B. Aggravating Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

(1) ☒ Prior record of discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]

(a) ☒ State Bar Court case # of prior case 94-C-13451

(b) ☒ Date prior discipline effective September 12, 1996

(c) ☒ Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations: Business & Professions Code section 6106

(d) XX Degree of prior discipline 3 years stayed suspension, 3 years probation, 2 years actual suspension

(e) ☐ If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below or a separate attachment entitled "Prior Discipline."

(2) ☐ **Dishonesty:** Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.

(3) ☐ **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.

(4) ☒ **Harm:** Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice.

(Do not write above this line.)

(5) ☐ **Indifference:** Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.

(6) ☐ **Lack of Cooperation:** Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.

(7) ☐ **Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct:** Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct.

(8) ☐ **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008
Cited in

C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. 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 deemed serious.

(2) ☐ **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.

(3) XX **Candor/Cooperation:** Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings.

(4) ☐ **Remorse:** Respondent promptly took objective steps spontaneously demonstrating 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 in good faith.

(8) ☐ **Emotional/Physical Difficulties:** At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical 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 Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities.

(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.

(Do not write above this line.)

(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 good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of his/her misconduct.

(12) ☐ **Rehabilitation:** Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.

(13) ☐ **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances:

Over the last two years, Respondent has been a member of the Board of Friends of UCLA-Armenian Chair, an organization that assists college students and professors. Respondent also does pro bono work in immigration law, including representing detained immigrants.

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

D. Discipline:

(1) ☒ **Stayed Suspension:**

(a) ☒ Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of Two (2) years

i. ☐ and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.

ii. ☐ and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.

iii. ☐ and until Respondent does the following: _____

(b) ☒ The above-referenced suspension is stayed.

(2) ☒ **Probation:**

Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of Two (2) years, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 953, Calif. Rules of Ct.)

(Do not write above this line.)

(3) ☒ **Actual Suspension:**

(a) ☒ Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of Three (3) months

i. ☐ and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct

ii. ☐ and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.

iii. ☐ and until Respondent does the following: _____

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

(1) ☐ If Respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until he/she proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in general law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.

(2) ☒ During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.

(3) ☒ Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.

(4) ☒ Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and conditions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must promptly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request.

(5) ☒ Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.

In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.

(6) ☒ Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.

(7) ☒ Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.

(Do not write above this line.)

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

☐ Substance Abuse Conditions ☒ Law Office Management Conditions

☐ Medical Conditions ☐ Financial Conditions

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-15865 archived on September 16, 2008

F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

(1) ☒ **Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination:** Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. **Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 951(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 321(a)(1) & (c), Rules of Procedure.**

☐ No MPRE recommended. Reason: _____

(2) ☒ **Rule 955, California Rules of Court:** Respondent must comply with the requirements of rule 955, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.

(3) ☐ **Conditional Rule 955, California Rules of Court:** If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 days or more, he/she must comply with the requirements of rule 955, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.

(4) ☐ **Credit for Interim Suspension [conviction referral cases only]:** Respondent will be credited for the period of his/her interim suspension toward the stipulated period of actual suspension. Date of commencement of interim suspension: _____

(5) ☐ **Other Conditions:**

In the Matter of RITA MAHDESSIAN A Member of the State Bar, Bar #141901	Case Number(s): 02-O-14349; 02-O-15643

Law Office Management Conditions

a. ☒ Within ____ days/ ____ months/ 1 years of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent shall develop a law office management/ organization plan, which must be approved by respondent's probation monitor, or, if no monitor is assigned, by the Probation Unit. This plan must include procedures to send periodic reports to clients; the documentation of telephone messages received and sent; file maintenance; the meeting of deadlines; the establishment of procedures to withdraw as attorney, whether of record or not, when clients cannot be contacted or located; and, for the training and supervision of support personnel.

b. ☒ Within ____ days/ ____ months/ 1 years of the effective date of the discipline herein, respondent shall submit to the Probation Unit satisfactory evidence of completion of no less than 6 hours of MCLE approved courses in law office management, attorney client relations and/ or general legal ethics. This requirement is separate from any Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) requirement, and respondent shall not receive MCLE credit for attending these courses (Rule 3201, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar.)

c. ☒ Within 30 days of the effective date of the discipline, respondent shall join the Law Practice Management and Technology Section of the State Bar of California and pay the dues and costs of enrollment for 1 year(s). Respondent shall furnish satisfactory evidence of membership in the section to the Probation Unit of the Office of Chief Trial Counsel in the first report required.

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: RITA MAHDESSIAN

CASE NUMBER(S): 02-O-14349; 02-O-15643

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

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

CASE No. 02-O-14349

FACTS

1. In or about 1996, Respondent met Rosa Urbina ("Urbina") and in or about 1997, Respondent employed Urbina as Paralegal. In or about March 2001, Urbina applied for and received a business license to operate a business called Last Resource Attorney Services at 38338 9th Street East in Palmdale, California.

2. In or about 2001, Respondent's primary law office was in Glendale, California. In or about November 2001, Respondent applied for and later obtained a business license to provide legal services from 38338 9th Street East in Palmdale, and its adjoining office at 38340 9th Street East in Palmdale.

3. At various times from in or about 2001 through in or about 2003, Respondent and Urbina hired contract paralegals to assist from time to time with some of the work in the Palmdale office.

4. In or about early or mid January 2002, John Elliott ("Elliott") called Respondent's Palmdale office for the purpose of retaining Respondent to bring a lawsuit against the County of Los Angeles. Thereafter, Elliott met with Urbina and other paralegals in the Palmdale office.

5. On or about January 26, 2002, Elliott gave Urbina a check made payable to Respondent for $2,000. Between on or about January 26 and January 29, 2002, Urbina wrote her

name above Respondent's name on the "payee" portion of the check Elliott wrote to Respondent and the check was deposited into a Wells Fargo Bank account in Urbina's name.

6. On or about March 7, 2002, Elliott sent a facsimile to Respondent in which he stated that he would report her to the State Bar if she did not reply. Respondent called Elliott back that day and left a message asking to meet with him on Friday, March 8, 2002, at 4:00 p.m.

7. On or about March 14, 2002, Elliott went to Respondent's office where a paralegal asked him to sign a complaint and a verification to the complaint. The verified complaint which listed Elliott "in pro per" was filed on or about March 18, 2002.

8. On June 4, 2002, at 7:45 a.m., Elliott went to Respondent's office with his parents. Urbina told Elliott to sign a substitution of attorney substituting Respondent into Elliott's case. Urbina told Elliott to take the substitution to Respondent at the court house. Elliott met Respondent in the parking lot at the court house where he gave her the substitution of attorney.

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

9. On or about June 4, 2002, there was a hearing on a demurrer filed by one of the defendants. Respondent appeared and represented to the court that she had "just been hired" and needed more time to prepare an opposition to the demurrer. The court granted the demurrer with 20 days leave to amend the complaint. At the time Respondent told the court she had just been hired, Respondent knew that her office had been representing Respondent since January 2002.

10. On or about June 24, 2002, Respondent filed a First Amended Complaint on Elliott's behalf.

11. On or about January 4, 2003, Elliott sent Respondent a certified letter in which he stated that he understood that Respondent was filing a request for entry of default as to one of the defendants. On or about January 9, 2003, Respondent sent Elliott a letter in which she informed him that her office is filing requests for entry of default against "the defendants." Respondent never filed a request for entry of default against any defendant.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

12. When a paralegal evaluated and accepted Elliott's case in the name of Respondent without Respondent's prior review of the case, when Urbina received and deposited the unearned attorney's fees paid by Elliott into a bank account in Urbina's name, when a paralegal prepared and filed a verified complaint stating that Elliott was in pro per after

Elliott had hired Respondent to act as his attorney, and when the paralegals were the only individuals to meet with Elliott for the first several months after Elliott had hired Respondent, Respondent abdicated control of her Palmdale law office to her staff and therefore aided them in the unauthorized practice of law, in wilful violation of rule 1-300(A), Rules of Professional Conduct.

13. By failing to file one or more requests for entry of default judgment after she wrote to Elliott that she would, Respondent intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failed to perform legal services with competence, in wilful violation of rule 3-110(A), Rules of Professional Conduct.

14. By failing to return Elliott's numerous telephone calls, facsimiles, and letters in which he requested the status of case, and by failing to meet with Elliott to discuss his case until several months after she was hired by him, Respondent failed to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client and failed to keep a client reasonably informed of significant developments in a matter in which Respondent had agreed to provide legal services in wilful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

15. By informing the court on June 4, 2002, that she had "just been hired" when Elliott had actually hired her almost six months before that date, Respondent employed, for the purposes of maintaining the causes confided in her, means which were inconsistent with truth, in wilful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(d).

CASE No. 02-O-15643

FACTS

16. In or about February 2000, Susanna Abrahamyan ("Abrahamyan") and her husband Karo Zakharyan ("Zakharyan") retained Respondent to handle an immigration matter on their behalf. At the time of employment, Abrahamyan and Zakharyan paid Respondent $1,000 advanced attorney's fees. They also provided Respondent with original documents, such as Abrahamyan's and Zakharyan's passports, their marriage certificate, their birth certificates and their daughters' naturalization certificate.

17. From March to August 2000, Abrahamyan and Zakharyan called Respondent's office on many occasions, each time leaving a message requesting a status update. Respondent failed to return her clients' messages.

18. In late August 2000, concerned that the time for their stay was expiring and by Respondent's failure to respond to their inquiries, Abrahamyan and Zakharyan decided to get a new attorney and went to Respondent's office to retrieve their original documents.

Respondent could not locate the original documents.

19. In late August 2000, Respondent's office sent Abrahamyan and Zakharyan a letter, informing them that their passports "were lost in May 2000".

20. On or about May 19, 2002, Abrahamyan and Zakharyan filed a Small Claims action for the costs incurred in replacing the lost documents and obtained a $390 judgment against Respondent in June 2002. After the Court's issuance of an OSC against her on February 11, 2004, Respondent paid the judgment owed to her clients with interest on February 19, 2004 with a $450 money order.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

21. By losing Abrahamyan's and Zakharyan's original documents, Respondent failed to identify and label securities and properties of a client promptly upon receipt and place them in a safe deposit box or other place of safekeeping as soon as practicable, in wilful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(4).

Cited in Karapetyan v. Murkasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 10, 2008

22. By failing to return Abrahamyan's and Zakharyan's status inquiries and by waiting until August 2000 to inform them of the loss of their passports which occurred in May 2000, Respondent failed to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client and failed to keep a client reasonably informed of significant developments in a matter in which Respondent had agreed to provide legal services, in wilful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m).

PENDING PROCEEDINGS.

As of May 3, 2005, the disclosure date referred to, on page one, paragraph A.(7), there are no pending investigation matters pending against Respondent.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct (the standards):

Standard 1.2(b)(i) - Respondent has a record of one prior instance of discipline.

Standard 1.2(b)(iii) - Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.

Standard 2.3 - An attorney's culpability of an act of moral turpitude shall result in actual suspension or disbarment depending upon the extent of harm, the magnitude of the act, and the degree to which it relates to the attorney's practice of law.

Standard 2.4(b) - Culpability of a member of wilfully failing to perform services in an individual matter or matters not demonstrating a pattern of misconduct or culpability of a member of wilfully failing to communicate with a client shall result in reproval or suspension.

Standard 2.6(a) -A violation of Business and Professions Code section 6068 shall result in disbarment or suspension depending on the gravity of the offense or the harm to the victim.

Case Law:

In *In the Matter of Farrell* (1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 490, Farrell, admitted to the Bar in 1972, had been previously disciplined in one matter. In this matter, he was charged with violating B&P Code sections 6068(d), 6068(i) and 6106. Respondent also violated former rule 7-105(1) (now rule 5-200). Farrell wilfully misled the court when he told the judge that he was waiting on a witness who had already been served with a subpoena when in fact the witness ha not actually been served. Respondent received a 2 years stayed suspension, 3 years probation and 6 months actual suspension.

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

In *In the Matter of Dahlz* (2001) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 269, the respondent violated rule 3-110(A), failure to perform, B&P Code section 6068(m), failure to respond to reasonable status inquiries by the client, Rule 3-700(A)(2), failure to properly withdraw from employment, former Rule 3-700(D)(1), failure to return file to client and B&P Code section 6106, misrepresentation to a claims adjuster that the client no longer wished to pursue her claim. In aggravation, the respondent had a prior and showed lack of candor. Respondent received 4 years stayed suspension and 4 years probation with the first year served as actual suspension.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed Respondent that as of April 20, 2005, the estimated prosecution costs in this matter are approximately $2,615.47. Respondent acknowledges that this figure is an estimate only and that it does not include State Bar Court costs which will be included in any final cost assessment. 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	Case number(s):
RITA MAHDESSIAN, Bar #141901	02-O-14394; 02-O-15643

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.

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

5/9/05 Date	Respondent's signature	RITA MAHDESSIAN Print name
5/10/05 Date	Respondent's Counsel's signature	ERICA TABACHNICK Print name
5/12/05 Date	Deputy Trial Counsel's signature	MONIQUE T. MILLER Print name

(Do not write above this line.)

In the Matter of RITA MAHDESSIAN, Bar #141901	Case number(s): 02-O-14394; 02-O-15643

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.

Cited in Karapetyan V. Mukasey, No. 05-75865 archived on September 16, 2008

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 135(b), Rules of Procedure.) The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after file date. (See rule 953(a), California Rules of Court.)

6/9/05
Date

Judge of the State Bar Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rule 62(b), Rules Proc.; Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of Los Angeles, on June 10, 2005, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING, filed June 10, 2005

in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:

[X] by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

Cited in Karapetyan v. Mukasey, No. 05-73865 archived on September 16, 2008

ERICA ANN TABACHNICK
ATTORNEY AT LAW
900 WILSHIRE BLVD #1000
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

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

Monique T. Miller, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in Los Angeles, California, on **June 10, 2005**.

Milagro del R. Salmeron
Case Administrator
State Bar Court