

Notice and Motion for Review/Appeal on
Inquiry Number 05-2875
Addressed To
Audit & Review
Office of the Chief Trial Counsel
State Bar Of California
1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Respondents (9): (1) Richard E Drooyan, (2) Natalie Page Stone,
(3) Susan R. Szabo, (4) Donovan J Cocas, (5) Steve Kim,
(6) Jeffrey I Weinberger, (7) Marc A. Becker,
(8) Barbara P. Banez, (9) Tracy D. Mansfield

I do not agree to close my complaint 05-2875 because of the following reasons which show that the nine Respondent Attorneys Violated the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct:

1. The State Bar Analysis dated April 8, 2005 and author by Complaint Analyst Ms. Rosemary Almaguer is inaccurate; she mischaracterized what I wrote; misquoted and modified my complaint; altered the Respondents list of attorneys; and much more;
2. The number of respondent attorneys on my complaint is nine (9); however surprisingly on April 8, 2005 Ms. Rosemary Almaguer identified only "Respondents (7)"; it lists eight Respondents attorneys, one of them twice [Drooyan].
 - a. Are two of the respondents attorneys on my complaint deceased?
3. On page 1 paragraph 4 Ms. Rosemary Almaguer states:

"The court, in the context of ongoing litigation, is the more appropriate forum to raise these issues."

 - a. This is absolutely wrong statement; my complaint Exhibit A states that there is NO ongoing litigations with the first seven Respondents attorneys identified as (1) Richard E Drooyan, (2) Natalie Page Stone, (3) Susan R. Szabo, (4) Donovan J Cocas, (5) Steve Kim, (6) Jeffrey I Weinberger, (7) Marc A. Becker; The case that these attorneys acted [96-3065 RSWL] was terminated on 1-12-05, one month prior to my filing a complaint with the state bar on 2-8-05. I quote the docket Exhibit A header:

“ **2:96-cv-03065-RSWL-RC** Nira Schwartz, et al v. TRW Inc, et al
S.W. Lew, presiding
Date filed: 04/29/1996
Date terminated: 01/12/2005 **Date of last filing:** 01/25/2005 “

- b. The statement made by Ms. Rosemary Almaguer is in error and prejudice to me to get rid of my complaint. This office should take the job of identifying Violation of the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct made by these 1-7 attorneys listed in Exhibit A, and identified as Respondents 1-7.
4. Ms. Rosemary Almaguer also mischaracterized my complaint in accordance with Respondent (5) Steve Kim, a Government attorney. Ms. Rosemary Almaguer declines to address in her April 8, 2005 response the key issue in accordance with Government Attorney Kim;
 - a. Was it a Violation of the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct that Government Attorney Kim became a member of the Defendant team in a qui-Tam case were I am the Relator legally representing the US Government interest? [See Exhibit A]
 - b. Was it a Violation of the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct that Government Attorney Kim wrote letters using Monger, Tolls, Olson, LLP letterhead, pretending to be a member of this office when he was a government attorney? [See Exhibit D]
 - c. Was it a Violation of the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct that Government Attorney Kim wrote letters using Monger, Tolls, Olson, LLP letterhead, when his office address [Exhibit A] is the Courthouse where the case took place?
 - d. Was it a Violation of the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct that Government Attorney Kim used Courthouse Government property office for the benefit of Monger, Tolls, Olson, LLP?
 - e. Was it a Violation of the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct of Respondents (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), and (7) to allow Respondent (5) to what is in paragraphs a - e above?
 - f. Did Respondent (5) steal the stationary of Monger, Tolls, Olson, LLP? He used it!!
5. Was it a Violation of the State Bar Act and/or the Rules of Professional Conduct of Respondents 7-9 to transfer medical records of Schwartz to Respondents 1-7; and Respondents 1-7 exchange it with sealed documents without Schwartz authorization, violating privacy and privileged rights? Ms. Rosemary Almaguer alleges that the transfer does not point “intentional misconduct”. Are Attorneys educated to know that medical records cannot be acquired without Schwartz permission, and that I do not want my privacy and privilege of WCAB case to be in

the public domain of case 96-3065? Does Ms. Rosemary Almaguer believe that this is right and or legal to do? And/or Respondents 1-9 does not deserve disciplinary action?

6. I understand that the "State Bar is limited by law" as Ms. Rosemary Almaguer stated. But I do believe that in my complaint an easy way out was taken to close the case.
7. There are sealed documents in case 96-3065 RSWL that I wish to provide this office with. I do not know if I am entitled to disclose to you documents that are sealed in a sealed envelope. Please advise. If I am allowed to do so, I would like to provide these documents to this office as well.
8. I request that disciplinary action will be taken against Respondents 1-9.

Respectfully submitted

Dated: May 7, 2005

Dr. Nira Schwartz

Plaintiff Schwartz
2550 PCH # 68, Torrance, CA 90505
Tel: 310-326-6174

PROOF OF SERVICE

We, NIRA SCHWARTZ, do swear or declare that on this date May 7, 2005, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29, we have served by first class mail the enclosed:

Notice and Motion for Review/Appeal on
Inquiry Number 05-2875
Addressed To
Audit & Review
Office of the chief Trial Counsel
State Bar Of California
1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

and others; Memorandum of Points and Authorities on each party to the above proceeding or party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by personally serving through their lawyers. The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Audit & Review
Office of the chief Trial Counsel
State Bar Of California
1149 South Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Dated: May 7, 2005

Dr. Nira Schwartz

Plaintiff Schwartz
2550 PCH # 68, Torrance, CA 90505
Tel: 310-326-6174