

1 FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA (41059)
CRAIG C. CORBITT (83251)
2 CHRISTOPHER T. MICHELETTI (136446)
JANE YI (257893)
3 ZELLE HOFMANN VOELBEL & MASON LLP
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
4 San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 693-0700
5 Facsimile: (415) 693-0770
fscarpulla@zelle.com
6 ccorbitt@zelle.com

7 *Lead and Liaison Counsel for*
Indirect Purchaser Class

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

13 IN RE STATIC RANDOM ACCESS
14 MEMORY (SRAM) ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

Case No. 4:07-md-1819 CW

MDL No. 1819

**DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER T.
MICHELETTI IN SUPPORT OF FINAL
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENTS
(MICRON, HYNIX, RENESAS-HITACHI-
MITSUBISHI, ETRON, TOSHIBA, NEC)**

16 This Document Relates to:
17 ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

Hearing Date: September 30, 2010
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Courtroom: 2, 4th Floor
Judge: Hon. Claudia Wilken

21
22 I, Christopher T. Micheletti, declare:

23 1. I am a member in good standing of the State Bar of California and am a member of
24 the firm Zelle Hofmann Voelbel & Mason LLP, Lead and Liaison Counsel for the Indirect Purchaser
25 Class. I am duly licensed to practice before the Supreme Court of the State of California and all
26 other inferior courts of this State. I am admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court,
27 the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the Federal District Court for the Northern District of
28 California. I am also admitted to practice before the United States Court of Appeal for the Sixth

1 Circuit. This Declaration is based on personal knowledge, except where specified that information is
2 based on information and belief, and if called to testify, I could and would do so competently as to
3 the matters set forth herein.

4 2. I am familiar with the account into which settlement payments have been made and
5 understand that \$25,422,000 in settlement payments have already been paid by the Micron, Hynix,
6 Renesas-Hitachi-Mitsubishi, Etron, Toshiba, and NEC Defendants (“Settling Defendants”) and
7 placed in escrow earning interest. Micron made its Settlement payment of \$1,550,000 to an interest-
8 bearing escrow account on January 8, 2010; Hynix made its Settlement payment of \$950,000 to an
9 interest-bearing escrow account on January 7, 2010; Renesas-Hitachi-Mitsubishi made its Settlement
10 payment of \$4,497,000 to an interest-bearing escrow account on December 14, 2009; Etron made its
11 Settlement payment of \$2,000,000 (in two parts) to an interest-bearing escrow account on January
12 11, 2010; Toshiba made its Settlement payment of \$1,525,000 to an interest-bearing escrow account
13 on January 8, 2010; and NEC made its Settlement payment of \$14,900,000 to an interest-bearing
14 escrow account on April 19, 2010.

15 3. My firm, working with the Larkspur Design Group (“LDG”) and its sister company,
16 Gilardi & Co. LLC (“Gilardi”) (collectively, the “Settlement Administrator”) caused notice of the
17 Settlements to be issued in the manner provided by this Court’s June 10, 2010 order (Docket Entry
18 (“DE”) 1013), including sending direct mail notice to Direct Mail Recipients on June 18, 2010. The
19 Declaration of Dennis A. Gilardi Re Dissemination of Notice to Class Members, filed
20 simultaneously herewith, describes the dissemination of such notice. The notices that the Settlement
21 Administrator disseminated were also posted on the website established for this case,
22 www.indirectsramcase.com, on June 14, 2010. In addition, the content of the long-form notice was
23 published on the website of my firm, Zelle Hofmann Voelbel and Mason LLP, along with
24 information on the case website and toll-free phone number, in June 2010.

25 4. At my direction, personnel at my firm contacted the Clerk’s office for the United
26 States District Court for the Northern District of California regarding the attorney admission status
27 of Cash Joseph Bonas. While public records are not available, they were advised that Mr. Bonas has
28 been disbarred from practicing law in the Northern District of California as well.

EXHIBIT 1

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

Thursday, September 2, 2010

[State Bar Home](#)

[Home](#) > [Attorney Search](#) > [Attorney Profile](#)

ATTORNEY SEARCH

Cash J Bonas - #179837

Current Status: Disbarred

This member is prohibited from practicing law in California by order of the California Supreme Court.

See below for more details.

Profile Information

Bar Number	179837	Phone Number	(805) 688-2059
Address	639 Roskilde Drive Solvang, CA 93463	Fax Number	Not Available
		e-mail	Not Available
District	District 6	Undergraduate School	San Diego State Univ; San Diego CA
County	Santa Barbara	Law School	Univ of Idaho COL; Moscow ID
Sections	None		

Status History

Effective Date	Status Change
<i>Present</i>	Disbarred
6/18/2005	Disbarred
9/1/2001	Not Eligible To Practice Law
12/6/1995	Admitted to The State Bar of California

[Explanation of member status](#)

Actions Affecting Eligibility to Practice Law

Effective Date	Description	Case Number	Resulting Status
Disciplinary and Related Actions			
6/18/2005	Disbarment	03-C-03750	Disbarred
1/2/2005	Ordered inactive	03-C-03750	Not Eligible To Practice Law
9/4/2004	Ordered inactive	03-C-03750	Not Eligible To Practice Law

3/20/2004	Interim suspension after conviction	03-C-03750	Not Eligible To Practice Law
2/1/2002	Ordered inactive		Not Eligible To Practice Law

Administrative Actions

9/1/2001	Admin Inactive/MCLE noncompliance		Not Eligible To Practice Law
9/1/2001	Suspended, failed to pay Bar membr. fees		Not Eligible To Practice Law

Copies of official attorney discipline records are [available upon request](#).

[Explanation of common actions](#)

State Bar Court Cases

NOTE: The State Bar Court began posting public discipline [documents](#) online in 2005. The format and pagination of documents posted on this site may vary from the originals in the case file as a result of their translation from the original format into Word and PDF. Copies of additional related documents in a case are [available upon request](#). Only [Opinions](#) designated for publication in the [State Bar Court Reporter](#) may be cited or relied on as precedent in State Bar Court proceedings. For further information about a case that is displayed here, please refer to the State Bar Court's online docket, which can be found at: <http://apps.statebarcourt.ca.gov/dockets/dockets.aspx>

DISCLAIMER: Any posted Notice of Disciplinary Charges, Conviction Transmittal or other initiating document, contains only allegations of professional misconduct. The attorney is presumed to be innocent of any misconduct warranting discipline until the charges have been proven.

Effective Date	Case Number	Description
6/18/2005	03-C-03750	Decision [PDF]

California Bar Journal Discipline Summaries

Summaries from the California Bar Journal are based on discipline orders but are not the official records. Not all discipline actions have associated CBJ summaries. Copies of official attorney discipline records are [available upon request](#).

March 20, 2004

CASH J. BONAS [#179837], 35, of Solvang was placed on interim suspension March 20, 2004, following convictions on three counts of stalking and one count of making a criminal threat. He was ordered to comply with rule 955.

[Start New Search >](#)

[Contact Us](#) [Site Map](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Notices](#) © 2010 The State Bar of California

EXHIBIT 2

PUBLIC MATTER



FILED

DEC 30 2004

STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE
SAN FRANCISCO

**STATE BAR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
HEARING DEPARTMENT – LOS ANGELES**

In the Matter of

**CASH JOSEPH BONAS,
No. 179837,**

A Member of the State Bar.

Case No. 03-C-03750 JMR

**DECISION AND ORDER
OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE
ENROLLMENT**

INTRODUCTION

This default conviction referral proceeding arises out of the criminal conviction of Respondent Cash J. Bonas on December 30, 2003, in the San Diego County Superior Court, of three felony violations of Penal Code section 646.9, subdivision (a) [stalking] and one felony violation of Penal Code section 422 [making a criminal threat].

For the reasons stated below, this Court finds that the facts and circumstances surrounding Respondent's conviction of the above-referenced offenses involved moral turpitude. In light of those convictions and the egregious nature of Respondent's misconduct, the Court recommends that Respondent be disbarred from the practice of law in the State of California and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys in this State.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6101, subdivision (c), on February 4, 2004, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of the State Bar of California ("State Bar") transmitted the record of Respondent's convictions to the State Bar Court. Thereafter, by order filed February

1 19, 2004, the State Bar Court Review Department placed Respondent on interim suspension from
2 the practice of law pending the final disposition of this proceeding, in accordance with Business and
3 Professions Code section 6102, subdivision (a) and rule 951(a) of the California Rules of Court,
4 since the crimes of which Respondent was convicted are felonies and the Review Department
5 concluded that Penal Code section 422 is a felony which probably involves moral turpitude.

6 On June 11, 2004, following its receipt of evidence that Respondent's criminal convictions
7 had become final, the Review Department ordered the above-entitled matter to be referred to this
8 Court for a hearing and decision as to whether the facts and circumstances surrounding Respondent's
9 convictions involved moral turpitude or other misconduct warranting discipline and, if so, the
10 discipline to be imposed or recommended to the Supreme Court.

11 On June 28, 2004, this Court filed a Notice of Hearing on Conviction and caused it to be
12 properly served upon Respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, at his official State Bar
13 membership records address.¹ A Notice of Assignment and Notice of Initial Status Conference was
14 also properly served upon Respondent at the same time. These documents notified Respondent that
15 the Court had scheduled that initial status conference for August 16, 2004, at 9:30 a.m. and directed
16 Respondent to participate in the status conference by telephone.

17 Respondent did not file a response to the Notice of Hearing, either within the time provided
18 in rule 601 of the Rules of Procedure or at any time thereafter. Respondent appeared by telephone
19 at the initial status conference on August 16, 2004, but the Court was compelled to terminate the
20 status conference because of Respondent's inappropriate and disruptive behavior, including
21 repeatedly interrupting and talking over the Court.

22 In light of Respondent's failure to file a response to the Notice of Hearing on Conviction, the
23 State Bar filed a Notice of Motion and Motion for Entry of Default on August 18, 2004, and properly
24 served them on Respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed to him at his
25

26 ¹ At all times since February 19, 2004, Respondent's official address has been 639 Roskilde
27 Drive, Solvang, California 93463.

1 official membership address.

2 The Court entered Respondent's default on September 1, 2004, due to his continued failure
3 to file a response to the Notice of Hearing on Conviction. The Court further ordered Respondent to
4 be involuntarily enrolled as an inactive member of the State Bar pursuant to Business and
5 Professions Code section 6007, subdivision (e) and rule 602 of the Rules of Procedure. The Order
6 of Entry of Default was properly served upon Respondent on September 1, 2004, and was actually
7 received at Respondent's official membership address on September 3, 2004.

8 Respondent has neither sought relief from default nor attempted to participate further in this
9 proceeding. On September 30, 2004, Deputy Trial Counsel Charles A. Murray submitted the State
10 Bar's Brief Re Level of Discipline, along with numerous exhibits, on September 30, 2004.

11 This matter was taken under submission, without a hearing, on October 1, 2004.

12 **FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

13 Respondent's culpability in this proceeding is conclusively established by the record of his
14 conviction. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6101, subd. (a); *In re Crooks* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 1090, 1097.) He
15 is presumed to have committed all of the elements of the crimes of which he was convicted. (*In re*
16 *Duggan* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 416, 423; *In the Matter of Respondent O* (Review Dept. 1993) 2 Cal. State
17 Bar Ct. Rptr. 581, 588.)

18 **A. Jurisdiction**

19 Respondent was admitted to the practice of law in California on December 6, 1995, and has
20 been a member of the State Bar of California at all times since that date.

21 **B. Respondent's Convictions**

22 Pursuant to an Information filed on October 15, 2003, in *People v. Cash Joseph Bonas*, San
23 Diego County Superior Court Case No. SCD 159416, Respondent was charged with three felony
24 violations of Penal Code section 646.9, subdivision (a) [stalking] and one felony violation of Penal
25 Code section 422 [making a criminal threat].

26 ///

1 On December 30, 2003, Respondent entered guilty pleas to all four felony charges and
2 specifically stipulated that there was a factual basis for his guilty pleas. The court accepted
3 Respondent's pleas and he was convicted on the basis of those pleas.

4 On March 22, 2004, the court suspended imposition of sentence and placed Respondent on
5 formal probation for a period of five years on conditions which included his incarceration for 218
6 days²; participation in treatment, therapy and/or counseling as recommended and abstinence from
7 alcohol and all controlled substances, completion of an anger management course and a prohibition
8 upon contacted, annoying or molesting any person or firm involved in either his state criminal
9 proceeding or a dismissed federal case.

10 Respondent did not appeal his criminal conviction.

11 **C. Facts and Circumstances Surrounding Respondent's Convictions**

12 Following Respondent's graduation from law school, he became a partner in the law firm of
13 Kendrick, Bonas and Nutley. Commencing in approximately 1998, Respondent represented his
14 sister and another plaintiff in a civil action against three major California grocery stores. The
15 plaintiffs alleged that the grocery stores had engaged in price fixing with respect to the price of eggs.
16 The plaintiffs ultimately lost their case and were ordered by the court to pay \$120,000 to \$150,000
17 to cover the legal costs of the three defendant grocery stores.

18 After the egg case was lost, Respondent engaged in a pattern of harassment against numerous
19 attorneys and law firms, many of whom had some involvement in the egg case. During February and
20 March 2001, Respondent made between 300 and 1,000 harassing and/or threatening telephone calls
21 to at least eleven law firms. The anger and threats expressed by Respondent in these telephone calls
22 increased over time. In addition, Respondent sent more than 1,000 e-mails to several of the same
23 attorneys that he had been calling on the telephone. He also personally appeared at three of the law
24 firms that were the targets of his threats and harassment, but was either denied access to the buildings

25
26 ² Respondent received credit for 146 actual days of incarceration and for 72 days of custody
27 credits as authorized by Penal Code section 4019 (totaling the 218 days of incarceration ordered by the
28 court).

1 Although it did not form any part of the basis for Respondent's criminal convictions, there
2 is also evidence that, between March 18, 2001 and March 27, 2001, Respondent made voice mail
3 and/or e-mail threats to kill three other attorneys who had been involved in the egg case, i.e., Gregory
4 Stone, Don Howarth and Andrew Hale.

5 Respondent's threats and harassment caused significant fear and concern to Respondent's
6 victims and to other employees of the law firms at which his threats were directed. Noonan's law
7 firm hired a security guard for a period of three weeks as a direct result of Respondent's threats.
8 Mogin issued several memoranda to his staff about Respondent and about security practices. Several
9 members of Mogin's staff expressed fear for their safety to the police. Lerach hired security officers
10 to protect both his law firm and his family as a result of Respondent's threats.

11 Respondent was arrested by the FBI on April 5, 2001, and remained in federal custody until
12 August 2003, when he was released to the custody of the San Diego County Sheriff's Department
13 to face trial for the criminal charges against him in San Diego County Superior Court Case No. SCD
14 159416.³ Respondent remained in custody at the San Diego County Jail until December 31, 2003,
15 the day following the acceptance of his guilty pleas in the state criminal proceeding.

16 The Court concludes that the facts and circumstances surrounding Respondent's commission
17 of the offenses for which he was convicted involved moral turpitude. "Moral turpitude" has been
18 defined by the California Supreme Court as "an act of baseness, vileness or depravity in the private
19 and social duties which a man owes to his fellowmen, or to society in general, contrary to the
20 accepted and customary rule of right and duty between man and man." (*In re Craig* (1938) 12 Cal.2d
21 93, 97.) Holding that an attorney's act constitutes moral turpitude characterizes the attorney as
22 unsuitable to practice law. (*In re Strick* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 891, 902; *In re Higbie* (1972) 6 Cal.3d
23 562, 570.)

24 ///

25
26 ³ In an indictment filed in the U.S. District Court (Case No. CR 01-334(a) GAF), Respondent
27 was charged with eight violations of 18 United States Code section 875(c) [making criminal threats].
28 The indictment was subsequently dismissed on September 17, 2003, on grounds of double jeopardy.

1 In *In the Matter of Frascinella* (Review Dept. 1991) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 543, 550-551,
2 the State Bar Court Review Department concluded that the attorney's conviction of a violation of
3 Penal Code section 417.2, subdivision (a) [exhibiting a replica of a firearm in a threatening manner
4 to cause fear of bodily harm] involved moral turpitude where the attorney pointed what appeared to
5 be a gun at a building receptionist and pulled the trigger after she had delivered to him a three-day
6 notice to quit the premises for failure to pay his office rent. After leaving the reception area, the
7 attorney went to another reception area on the third floor of the building and said, "[e]verybody
8 freeze" while holding what appeared to be a gun pointed first at the receptionist and then at others
9 in the room. In finding that the attorney's conduct involved moral turpitude, the Review Department
10 stated that the attorney's acts were intended to be perceived as life-threatening and that he could have
11 provoked heart attacks or an armed response to the perceived threat, thereby demonstrating a flagrant
12 disregard toward human life. The Review Department also noted that the attorney's acts were not
13 the result of an act of uncontrollable anger but, rather, the attorney had time and opportunity to
14 ponder his acts and to reconsider them before acting further.

15 In the present case, Respondent made specific threats to kill numerous people. They were
16 sufficiently fearful of the legitimacy of Respondent's threats that they felt compelled to take
17 additional measures to protect their families and their law firms. Respondent intended his threats
18 to be taken seriously. When he was escorted from the premises of Lerach's law firm and was asked
19 about the threats, Respondent admitted to them and stated, "Good. They were supposed to upset
20 people."

21 Thus, the Court concludes that the egregious conduct that led to Respondent's criminal
22 convictions clearly involved moral turpitude.

23 LEVEL OF DISCIPLINE

24 A. Factors in Mitigation

25 Respondent has no record of prior discipline. However, he was only admitted to practice for
26 slightly more than five years at the time of his misconduct. Respondent's lack of prior discipline
27

1 over such a short period of time is not entitled to any weight as a mitigating factor. (*In the Matter*
2 *of Duxbury* (Review Dept. 1999) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 61, 66 [five years of practice without
3 prior discipline does not entitle attorney to mitigation]; *In the Matter of Hertz* (Review Dept. 1991)
4 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 456, 473 [four years of practice is insufficient for mitigation].)

5 There are no other mitigating circumstances.

6 **B. Factors in Aggravation**

7 Respondent was convicted of criminal offenses involving threats and harassment that
8 victimized at least three different individuals. (Standard 1.2(b)(ii).)

9 Respondent's threats and harassment caused significant fear and concern to his victims,
10 compelling them to take measures to protect themselves and their families. (Standard 1.2(b)(iv).)

11 Respondent failed to cooperate in this proceeding prior to the entry of his default. He failed
12 to file a response to the Notice of Hearing on Conviction and the Court was compelled to terminate
13 the telephonic status conference on August 16, 2004, as a result of Respondent's disruptive behavior.
14 (Standard 1.2(b)(vi).)

15 **C. Discussion**

16 Standard 3.2 of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct provides
17 that the final conviction of a member of a crime which involves moral turpitude, either inherently
18 or in the facts and circumstances surrounding its commission, shall result in disbarment and that a
19 discipline other than disbarment shall be imposed only when the most compelling mitigating
20 circumstances are present. No such mitigating circumstances have been presented in this case.

21 The Supreme Court has specifically stated that "adherence to the standards in the great
22 majority of cases serves the valuable purpose of eliminating disparity and assuring consistency, that
23 is, the imposition of similar attorney discipline for instances of similar attorney misconduct." (*In*
24 *re Naney* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 186, 190; *In re Brown* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 205, 220.)

25 ///

26 ///

1 It is also recommended that Respondent be ordered to comply with rule 955 of the Rules of
2 Court and that he be ordered to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule
3 within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, of the effective date of the Supreme Court's final
4 disciplinary order in this proceeding.

5
6 **COSTS**

7 It is recommended that costs be awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and
8 Professions Code section 6086.10 and that such costs be made payable and enforceable in
9 accordance with Business and Professions Code sections 6086.10, subdivision (a) and 6140.7.

10
11 **ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT**

12 In light of this Court disbarment recommendation, it is hereby ordered that Respondent be
13 transferred to involuntary inactive enrollment status under Business and Professions Code section
14 6007, subdivision (c)(4) and rule 220(c) of the Rules of Procedure. The inactive enrollment shall
15 become effective three calendar days after this Order is filed.

16
17
18 Dated: December 30, 2004


JOANN M. REMKE
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. 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 December 30, 2004, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

DECISION AND ORDER OF INVOLUNTARY INACTIVE ENROLLMENT

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:

**CASH J. BONAS
639 ROSKILDE DRIVE
SOLVANG CA 93463**

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

CHARLES MURRAY, Enforcement, Los Angeles

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on **December 30, 2004.**



**George Hue
Case Administrator
State Bar Court**

EXHIBIT 3

BONAS, CASH J

[» New Search](#)

Case Name:	Bonas, Cash J	Case Number:	03-C-3750
Member #:	179837	Venue:	LA
Status:	Closed	Case Filed:	02/19/2004
Counsel:	Pro Per		
Assigned Judge:	Joann Remke (HRG)		

Date	Description	Notes
05/19/2005	Supreme Court Order	DISBARMENT EFFECTIVE DATE: 06/18/2005
01/06/2005	Ruling On Motion Filed 09/30/2004 Granted	MOTION TO SEAL PORTION OF THE RECORD
12/30/2004	Hearing Decision	
12/30/2004	Hearing Order	TRANSFER INACTIVE 6007(C) EFFECTIVE DATE: 01/02/2005
09/30/2004	Motion Seal Documents by Examiner	MOTION TO SEAL PORTION OF THE RECORD
09/30/2004	Document	STATE BAR'S BRIEF RE LEVEL OF DISCIPLINE SUBMISSION OF EXHIBITS, DEC C. MURRAY
09/30/2004	Ruling On Motion Filed 09/21/2004 Moot Motion	MTN TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE INFORMATION AND LEGAL ARGUMENT, DEC OF C. MURRAY
09/21/2004	Motion Extend Time by Examiner	MTN TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE INFORMATION AND LEGAL ARGUMENT, DEC OF C. MURRAY
09/01/2004	Hearing Order	TRANSFER INACTIVE 6007(E) EFFECTIVE DATE: 09/04/2004
09/01/2004	Ruling On Motion Filed 08/18/2004 Granted	
08/18/2004	Motion Default/Inactive pur. 200/201/602 by Examiner	
08/16/2004	Document	STATUS CONFERENCE ORDER
08/16/2004	Status Conference	HELD, NOT SUBMITTED
08/03/2004	Document	SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL
06/28/2004	Document	NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT/INITIAL STATUS CONF NOTICE OF HEARING ON CONVICTION
06/22/2004	Document	NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT OF DEPUTY TRIAL COUNSEL
06/11/2004	Review Department	TRANSMIT FINAL
06/11/2004	Review Department Order	CONVICTION REFERRED
02/19/2004	Review Department Order	INTERIM SUSPENSION

[» New Search](#)

EXHIBIT 4



1 of 3 DOCUMENTS

BONAS ON DISCIPLINE

S132030

SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

2005 Cal. LEXIS 5861

May 19, 2005, Filed

OPINION

[*1] Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred.

It is hereby ordered that **CASH J. BONAS, State Bar No. 179837**, be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. **Cash J. Bonas** is also ordered to comply with *rule 955*

of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar. *(See *Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).*)