

1 CHARLES DODGSON (SBN 999999)
2 123 Main Street
3 Walnut Creek, CA 94507
4 Ph: (510) 555-1212
5 Fx: (415) 555-1212
6 *charles@dodgsonlaw.com*

7 Respondent Pro Se

8
9 STATE BAR COURT

10 HEARING DEPARTMENT – SAN FRANCISCO

11
12
13 Case No. 13-O-1778506

14 In the matter of:

15 CHARLES DODGSON,
16 No. 999999,

17 A Member of the State Bar.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
ANSWER TO THE STATE BAR'S

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

1 violation whatsoever. Simply put, he fulfilled his ethical obligations to his client
2 on a case which was ultimately proven to have no merit. The loss is not a
3 violation.

4 No discipline is appropriate in this matter.

5 **ANSWER**

6 Respondent hereby answers the State Bar's NDC and admits, denies, and
7 alleges as follows:

8 1. Respondent admits that he "was admitted to the practice of law in
9 the State of California on March 8, 2000, was a member at all times pertinent to
10 these charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California."

11 COUNT ONE

12 Case No. 13-O-1778506

13 Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 3-110(A)

14 [Failure to Perform with Competence]

15 2. Respondent admits that on approximately September 15, 2011, Mr.
16 Singh retained Respondent with respect to an already-filed litigation captioned
17 *Singh v. MNL, Inc.*, which was then pending in the United States District Court
18 for the Central District of California, Case No. 11-EV-540101. Respondent denies
19 the remaining allegations of Paragraph 2. Respondent expressly denies that he
20 intentionally, recklessly or repeatedly failed to perform with competence.
21 Respondent denies that he violated Rule 3-110(A), willfully or otherwise.
22 Respondent specifically responds to the subparagraphs of Paragraph 2 as
23 follows:

24 A. Respondent denies that he failed to attempt to interview key
25 witnesses identified by Mr. Singh in support of his claim and
26 specifically denies that any such alleged failure is a violation of
27 Rule 3-110(A);

28 B. Respondent denies that he failed to appear at Mr. Singh's

1 deposition on March 17, 2012 until contacted by Mr. Singh and
2 specifically denies that any such alleged failure is a violation of
3 Rule 3-110(A);

4 C. Respondent denies that failure to file an opposition to
5 defendant's motion to compel discovery is a violation of
6 Rule 3-110(A);

7 D. Respondent denies that he failed to propound discovery on
8 behalf of Mr. Singh and specifically denies that any such alleged
9 failure is a violation of Rule 3-110(A);

10 E. Respondent denies that he made "inadmissible statements in
11 court pleadings regarding purported settlement agreements" and
12 specifically denies that any such alleged statements are a
13 violation of Rule 3-110(A);

14 F. Respondent denies that any failure to appear at a hearing on a
15 motion to quash filed by Respondent is a violation of
16 Rule 3-110(A);

17 G. Respondent denies that court imposition of sanctions resulting
18 from discovery constitutes a violation of Rule 3-110(A);

19 H. Respondent denies failing to oppose a motion for terminating
20 sanctions and alleges no such motion was filed.

21 COUNT TWO

22 Case No. 13-O-1778506

23 Business & Professions Code § 6068(m)

24 [Failure to Inform Client of Significant Development]

25 3. Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of the
26 NDC. Respondent denies that he willfully violated Business & Professions Code
27 § 6068(m).
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

COUNT THREE

Case No. 13-O-1778506

Business & Professions Code § 6103

[Failure to Obey a Court Order]

4. Respondent denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 4. Respondent denies that he willfully violated Business & Professions Code § 6103.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Failure to State a Violation of Rule 3-110(A)

5. Respondent alleges that even if the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 were true, they do not constitute a violation of Rule 3-110(A).

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Failure to State a Violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(m)

6. Respondent alleges that even if the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 were true, they do not constitute a violation of Business & Professions Code § 6068(m).

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Failure to State a Violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 6103

7. Respondent alleges that even if the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 were true, they do not constitute a violation of Business & Professions Code § 6103.

Dated: January 15, 2015

Charles Dodgson
Respondent