VANESSA L. HOLTON (111613) 1 General Counsel ROBERT G. RETANA (148677) Deputy General Counsel 3 JAMES J. CHANG (287008) **Assistant General Counsel** 4 OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA 5 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105-1639 6 Tel: (415) 538-2381 7 Fax: (415) 538-2321 Email: james.chang@calbar.ca.gov 8 Attorneys for Interested Party 9 State Bar of California 10 **Exempt from Filing Fees Pursuant to Government Code Section 6103** 11 12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 13 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** 14 15 Case No. 21STPB00413 16 VERIFIED OBJECTION OF CONSERVATORSHIP OF THOMAS V. INTERESTED PARTY STATE BAR OF **GIRARDI** 17 CALIFORNIA TO PETITION FOR TEMPORARY CONSERVATORSHIP OF 18 PERSON AND ESTATE; DECLARATION OF MELANIE J. LAWRENCE; REQUEST 19 FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING AND NEUTRAL MEDICAL EVALUATION 20 March 15, 2021 Date: 21 Time: 1:30 p.m. Dept: 67 22 Hon. Daniel Juarez Judge: 23 Interested Party State Bar of California ("State Bar") respectfully submits this "Verified 24 Objection of Interested Party State Bar of California to Petition for Temporary Conservatorship 25 of Person and Estate; Declaration of Melanie J. Lawrence; Request for Evidentiary Hearing and 26 Neutral Medical Evaluation" and alleges as follows: 27 28

Verified Objection of State Bar of California to Petition for Conservatorship

CASE NO. 21STPB00413

I. INTRODUCTION

The State Bar hereby objects to the Petition for Temporary Conservatorship of Person and Estate ("Petition") and respectfully asks the Court to order further inquiry, order a neutral medical examination, and set an evidentiary hearing, for the reasons set forth herein.

Temporary Conservator's Petition was filed under highly unusual circumstances. It comes only after proposed conservatee Thomas V. Girardi ("Girardi") became enmeshed in mounting legal troubles and as he is facing imminent State Bar discipline. Although the Petition alleges that Girardi suffers from dementia and is unable to care for himself, as recently as November 2020—two months before the Petition was filed—Girardi was holding himself out as a legal expert and moderated a legal education panel discussion with leading trial attorneys and presented on complex litigation strategy. These facts, as detailed in the Declaration of State Bar Interim Chief Trial Counsel Melanie J. Lawrence ("Lawrence Decl."), filed herewith, belie allegations that Girardi is now incapable of caring for himself such that a conservator must be appointed. The evidentiary record in this proceeding is sparse, as the Capacity Declaration filed in support of the Petition is materially incomplete and does not provide the Court with the information required to decide the Petition.

Serious and inequitable consequences will result from granting the Petition based on the current record. If the Court proceeds to grant the Petition, it will impede the ability of the State Bar to prosecute Girardi for alleged serious violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and the State Bar Act, and undermine the State Bar's ability to protect the public and preserve confidence in the integrity of the legal profession.

In light of the unusual circumstances of this Petition and its potential impact to the State Bar's public protection mission, the State Bar respectfully requests that the Court allow a fuller record to be developed before deciding the Petition, order Girardi to be examined by an independent expert, and set an evidentiary hearing.

27 || /

///

28 | //

II. THE STATE BAR'S INTEREST IN PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESERVATION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE INTEGRITY OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION

A. The State Bar Prosecutes Attorney Misconduct to Protect the Public

The State Bar is the administrative arm of the California Supreme Court for attorney admissions and discipline. Cal. Const. Art. VI, §9; *In re Rose*, 22 Cal. 4th 430, 438 (2000). The State Bar's paramount statutory mission is to protect the public. Bus. & Prof. Code §6001.1. The Office of Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar ("OCTC") prosecutes attorneys for alleged violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and the State Bar Act. Bus. & Prof. Code § 6079.4. OCTC prosecutes attorneys to "fulfill the primary purposes of discipline, which includes 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." Standard 1.1 of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Following hearing, the State Bar Court may recommend to the California Supreme Court that an attorney be suspended or disbarred. Bus. & Prof. Code § 6078. The State Bar, as a state agency, is an "interested person" with standing to object to this Petition. Probate Code §§ 1424 and 1829 (d).

B. The State Bar's Imminent Charges Against Girardi Allege Misappropriation of Client Funds

OCTC is poised to file disciplinary charges against Girardi alleging that he has willfully misappropriated client funds and refused to obey a court order. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 6. Girardi has not asserted that he lacks capacity to participate in the State Bar proceeding. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 8. In fact, even after this Court issued a limited temporary conservatorship on February 2, 2021, Girardi continued to participate in the State Bar investigation, including on March 5, 2021, when, through counsel, Girardi requested to participate in a pre-filing settlement conference before a State Bar Court judge. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 7.

¹ This disclosure is made by the Chief Trial Counsel in the interests of public protection pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 6086.1(b)(2). Mr. Girardi is entitled to a fair hearing in the State Bar Court.

The State Bar has valid reason for concern that this conservatorship proceeding may interfere with the State Bar discipline process, as State Bar rules prevent a disciplinary matter from proceeding against a person judicially declared to be mentally incompetent. Rule 5.51 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California. Given the legitimate questions regarding the veracity of the Petition and the serious consequences that would result from an inaccurate finding, further inquiry by this Court is necessary.

III. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS FOR THE COURT TO FURTHER INQUIRE INTO THE UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS PETITION

The unusual timing and circumstances of the Petition also call for further inquiry before deciding whether petitioner has established by clear and convincing evidence that a conservatorship of Girardi is warranted.² There are facts not yet before the Court that are relevant to the capacity determination.

Shortly before this conservatorship Petition was filed, Girardi continued to make prominent public appearances at which he spoke at length on complex legal matters. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 9. For example, on October 6, 2020, Girardi gave a one-hour interview regarding trial strategy during which he spoke in detail regarding several trials he had litigated. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 10. On November 21, 2020, Girardi moderated a 1.5-hour long MCLE panel discussion sponsored by the Consumer Attorneys of California during which Girardi delivered advice regarding how to conduct a jury trial and engaged conversantly with the four other attorney panelists. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 11.

Despite these recent examples of Mr. Girardi's ready ability to engage in discussions of complex legal issues, the instant Petition (claiming that Girardi is unable to care for himself and unable to manage his financial resources) was filed only after Girardi's legal troubles began to mount.

² Probate Code § 1801(e) ("The standard of proof for the appointment of a conservator pursuant to this section shall be clear and convincing evidence."); *Conservatorship of O.B.*, 9 Cal. 5th 989, 998 n.2 (2020) ("The clear and convincing standard also has been described as requiring that the evidence be so clear as to leave no substantial doubt; sufficiently strong to command the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind.") (citations and quotations omitted).

On December 10, 2020, OCTC sent a letter to Girardi informing him that he that was under investigation and requesting a response. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 4.

On December 14, 2020, a United States District Court entered a \$2 million judgment against Girardi and ordered his assets frozen. *In re: Lion Air Flight JT 610 Crash*, N.D. Ill. Case No. 1:18-cv-07686, Dkt. 848.

On December 15, 2020, Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Holly Fujie issued an Order to Show Cause why Girardi "should not be reported to the California State Bar for misconduct and violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct for withholding settlement funds from Plaintiffs that were required to be maintained in Girardi & Keese's Client Trust Fund account and distributed in a timely manner to Plaintiffs," and on January 4, 2021, Judge Fujie stated that she would report Girardi to the State Bar. *Ruigomez et al. v. Girardi et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 19STCV22296 (Dec. 15, 2020 OSC and Jan. 4, 2021 Minute Order).

On January 15, 2021, the State Bar sent a letter to Girardi informing him that it had received and complied with an investigation request by the United States Bankruptcy Trustee for Girardi's client trust account records. Lawrence Decl., ¶ 5.

Just days later, on January 19, 2021, the instant Petition was filed.

These surrounding facts and circumstances should at least be examined more closely before the Court determines the veracity of the Petition.

IV. THE CAPACITY DELCARATION OF DR. NATHAN LAVID IS MATERIALLY INCOMPLETE AND LACKS NECESSARY INFORMATION

Notably, the Capacity Declaration by Dr. Nathan Lavid is materially incomplete. Although Dr. Lavid purports to state that Girardi has a major neurocognitive disorder, he has not submitted Form GC335A as required under these circumstances. *See* Capacity Declaration, page 1, Item C (requiring an attached signed Form GC-335A when the declarant has opined that the proposed conservatee "has a major neurocognitive disorder (such as dementia)"); page 3, Items D-F (opining that Girardi suffers dementia and Alzheimer's Disease). Another material omission in Dr. Lavid's declaration is the failure to state facts in support of the assertion that

Girardi is purportedly unable to attend the court hearing—at page 1, Item 5(b)(4), Dr. Lavid checked the box to indicate that additional facts would be provided in Attachment 5, yet did not submit that Attachment. And Dr. Lavid did not answer the question at page 1, Item 4(b), asking whether Dr. Lavid is currently providing Girardi with treatment and care.

Additionally, Dr. Lavid's minimal declaration lacks necessary information. The declaration does not demonstrate historical familiarity of any evidence of decline in the proposed conservatee or of any recent event that might suggest or cause a sudden, rapid change of Girardi's capacities warranting imposition of a conservatorship. And, Dr. Lavid's declaration does not state that Girardi has been prescribed medications commonly used for treatment of profound dementia and Alzheimer's disease such as Aricept, Namenda or the like.³

Because Dr. Lavid has failed to properly complete the Capacity Declaration and failed to provide necessary information, the Court is regrettably left with insufficient evidence to decide the Petition. Furthermore, Girardi's purported inability to be physically present at the hearing makes it impossible for the Court to make its own inquiry. That is why this matter must remain open so that the record may be further developed.

V. THE COURT SHOULD ORDER A NEUTRAL MEDICAL EVALUATION AND EVIDENTIARY HEARING, AND SHOULD DEFER RULING ON THE PETITION FOR TEMPORARY CONSERVATORSHIP

In light of the unique circumstances surrounding this Petition, the sparse and incomplete Capacity Declaration, and the objections filed herein by the State Bar, the State Bar respectfully asks that the Court:

(1) Defer consideration of the full temporary Petition for conservatorship to a future date, and extend only the temporary conservatorship with limited authority currently in place pending that future hearing;

³ Information regarding medications recommended to treat the proposed conservatee for treatment of major neurocognitive disorders is required to be provided at Question 9 of Form GC-335A, but this information is not in the record due to Dr. Lavid's failure to submit that required form.

1	(2) Order an independent evaluation of Girardi by Dr. Stacey Wood of Scripps College,	
2	Claremont, California, or another equally qualified expert selected by the Court, pursuant	
3	to Evidence Code section 730, and order that Girardi cooperate with such evaluation; and	
4	4 (3) Set a future evidentiary hearing. ⁴	
5		
6	OFF	pectfully submitted, FICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL ESTATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
7		
8		/s/ James J. Chang [AMES J. CHANG
9		Attorneys for Interested Party FHE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		03 1308-1310 (2008) (probate court committed

⁴ See, e.g., Estate of Bennett, 163 Cal.App.4th 1303, 1308-1310 (2008) (probate court committed reversible error in denying request for evidentiary hearing to resolve contested factual claims).

VERIFICATION

I, State Bar of California Interim Chief Trial Counsel Melanie J. Lawrence, am the Objector in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the entire Objection above and know the contents of it to be true of my own personal knowledge, except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I am informed and believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: March 12, 2021 at Los Angeles, California

Signature of Objector

3

5

6

8

9

10

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

27 28

- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before all courts of the State of California. I am Interim Chief Trial Counsel of The State Bar of California ("State Bar"). I am the Objector to the
- The facts stated in this declaration are true of my own personal knowledge, except as to any

Petition for Temporary Conservatorship of Thomas V. Girardi.

- matters stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I am informed and believe
 - them to be true. If called as a witness in this matter, I could and would competently testify to
 - the matters set forth below.

I, Melanie J. Lawrence, hereby declare:

- As Interim Chief Trial Counsel, I am the head of the Office of Chief Trial Counsel
- 11 ("OCTC") and in that capacity I direct and supervise investigations and prosecutions of
- California-licensed attorneys for alleged violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct and 12
 - the State Bar Act.
 - I am informed and believe that on December 10, 2020, pursuant to Rule 2409 of the Rules of
 - Procedure of the State Bar of California, OCTC sent a letter to Mr. Girardi informing him
 - that he was under investigation, stating the allegations, and requesting that he provide a
 - written response.
 - I am informed and believe that on January 15, 2021, pursuant to Rule 2302 of the Rules of
 - Procedure of the State Bar of California, OCTC sent a letter to Mr. Girardi informing him
 - that it had received and complied with an investigation request by the United States
 - Bankruptcy Trustee for Mr. Girardi's client trust account records.
- 22 6. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 6086.1(b)(2), in the interests of public
 - protection and without prejudice to the respondent's right to a fair hearing in State Bar Court,
 - I hereby inform the Court that the Office of Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California
- 25 ("OCTC") has prepared a draft Notice of Disciplinary Charges alleging that Thomas V.
- 26 Girardi, State Bar No. 36603, is culpable of misconduct relating to substantial
 - misappropriation of client funds and failure to obey a court order.

27

28

MELANIE J. LAWRENCE

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 2 I, Joan Randolph, hereby declare: that I am over the age of eighteen years and am not a 3 party to the within above-entitled action, that I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, that my business address is The State Bar of California, 180 Howard Street, San 4 5 Francisco, CA 94105. On March 12, 2021, I served the foregoing document described as: 6 7 VERIFIED OBJECTION OF INTERESTED PARTY STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA TO PETITION FOR TEMPORARY CONSERVATORSHIP OF PERSON AND 8 ESTATE; DECLARATION OF MELANIE J. LAWRENCE; REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING AND NEUTRAL MEDICAL EVALUATION 9 on the below-listed interested parties in this action via the following means: 10 11 Nicholas James Van Brunt Robert J. Girardi Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP 3662 Aquarius Drive 12 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1600 Huntington Beach, CA 92649 Los Angeles CA 90067 Petitioner/Temporary Conservator 13 nvanbrunt@sheppardmullin.com Via U.S. Mail Counsel for Petitioner/Temporary Conservator 14 Robert J. Girardi Thomas V. Girardi 15 Via email pursuant to Emergency Rule 12 of 100 Los Altos Dr. the California Rules of Court Pasadena, CA 91105 16 Proposed Conservatee R.M. Anthony Cosio Via U.S. Mail 17 Law Office of R.M. Anthony Cosio 18 520 Redondo Avenue Long Beach, CA 90814-1572 19 acosio@lawrmac.com and admin@lawrmac.com 20 Court-Appointed Counsel for Thomas V. Girardi 21 Via email pursuant to Emergency Rule 12 of 22 the California Rules of Court 23

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at San Francisco, California on March 12, 2021.

<u>/s/ Joan Randolph</u> Joan Randolph

2728

24

25

26