

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Meeting Agenda – Monday, September 28, 2015

Arizona Supreme Court -1501 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007 – 10:00 A.M. – Conference Room 109

General Inquiries Call: (602) 452-3378 (Certification and Licensing Division Line)

Members of the Public May Attend Meeting in Person

For any item listed on the agenda, the Board may vote to go into Executive Session for advice of counsel and/or to discuss records and information exempt by law or rule from public inspection, pursuant to the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration, Code Section 1-202(C).

CALL TO ORDER.....*Mary Carlton, Chair*

1) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES*Mary Carlton, Chair*

1-A: Review, discussion, and possible action regarding approval of the regular session minutes of the meeting of July 20, 2015.

2) PENDING COMPLAINTS *Division Staff*

2-A: Review, discussion and possible action regarding complaint number 14-L050, involving Aldo Castaneda.

2-B: Review, discussion and possible action regarding Order of Default in complaint number 14-L040 involving Trina MacPhail.

2-C: Update regarding complaint number 14-L039 involving Arizona Family Law Center, LLC.

2-D: Review, discussion and possible action regarding Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation in complaint numbers 14-L048/14-L049 involving Rae MacLean and Arizona Document Services.

2-E: Review, discussion and possible action regarding complaint number 14-L053, involving Grace Beltran.

3) INITIAL CERTIFICATION AND ELIGIBILITY *Division Staff*

3-A: Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following applications for initial individual and/or business entity legal document preparer certification.

1. Charlotte Anthony

2. Southwest Legal Documents, LLC (Stephen Martin)
3. Alyson Dawson
4. Dawson Document Preparation, LLC (Alyson Dawson)
5. Gwyndolen Kemnitz
6. Express Legal Documents (Gwyndolen Kemnitz)
7. Johanna Fierstein
8. Daniel Carrasco
9. Association for Retired Citizens (Tyrone Wiedrich)
10. Stacey Hobrath
11. Angelica Tresvik
12. Erik Rivera
13. Katie Meredith
14. David White
15. Teresa Henderson
16. Janice Schoepfel
17. Robert Joseph Smith
18. Wendy Brown
19. Maria Rosas Lopez

3-B: Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following Business Entity Exemption Requests for the 2015-2017 certification period.

1. Southwest Legal Documents, LLC (*Stephen Martin*)
2. Dawson Document Preparation, LLC (*Alyson Dawson*)
3. Express Legal Documents (*Gwyndolen Kemnitz*)

4) RENEWAL CERTIFICATION APPLICATIONS.....*Hal White*

4-A: Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following applications for renewal of business entity and/or individual legal document preparer certification:

1. Alta Estate Services, LLC.
2. Arizona CLDP, LLD
3. Arizona Legal Ease, Inc, DBA Arizona Legal Smart
4. Arizona Medical Liens
5. Arizona Paralegal Services, Inc.
6. AZ Legal Documents by Jojo, LLC
7. AZ Legal Documents Solutions, LLC
8. Cano Medication Services, LLC
9. Capital Consultants Management Corporation
10. Cautela Corporation
11. Center for Divorce Resolution
12. Chatfield Legal Doc Service, LLC
13. Cheaper than a Lawyer, LLC
14. Cheryl A. Wall PL
15. Discount Divorce Professional, LLC
16. Divorce Packet Processing LLC

17. Document Preparation Specialists, LLC
18. Dunn Right Document Services, Inc
19. Eastlack Paralegal Services, LLC
20. East Valley Estate Planning, LLC
21. East Valley Senior Services, LLC
22. Edward F. Daily CPA P.C.
23. Family First Estate & Corporate Services, LLC
24. Financial Security Group of Arizona, Inc.
25. Four Peaks Planning, Inc.
26. Grand Canyon Planning Associates LLC
27. Guardian Doc Prep PLLC
28. Heritage Legal Service, LLC
29. James L. Bruce Enterprises, Inc.
30. K.A. Lindow, CPA, P.C.
31. Legal Document Preparer, LLC
32. Living Estae Solutions, Inc.
33. Metro Association Management
34. My Arizona Paralegal, LLC
35. Nancy L. Anderson LLC
36. Paralegal Consultants, Inc.
37. Paralegal in Motion, LLC
38. Preliminary Notice Company, LLC
39. Professional Escrow Resources
40. Rapid RPS(AZ)LLC
41. Saguario Lien Service, LLC
42. Sandra Mejia, LLC
43. Southwest Legal Document Services, LLC
44. Spann Estate Planning Services LLC
45. SRF Enterprises, LLC
46. Suzette M. Brown, PC
47. T.F.C. Ventures, Inc.
48. 123 The Document Tree, LLC dba The Document Tree
49. Tucson Managerial Solutions and Services, LLC
50. Valley Docs & Paralegal Services, LLC
51. Valley Immigration Solutions, LLC
52. Valley Wide Legal Documents, LLC
53. Why Pay Attorneys, LLC.
54. Georgiana Aguilar (Willis)
55. Nancy L. Anderson
56. Marley Beard
57. Cynthia Bowman
58. Suzette Brown
59. James Bruce
60. Mary Carlton
61. Antoine Cobb
62. Christina Collura
63. Karen Cooley

64. Marcie Davies
65. Mayela De La Torre
66. Marie Disney
67. Tracey Dombroski
68. Mary Dunn
69. Angela Eastlack
70. Cynthia Felton
71. Edil Fernandez
72. Patricia Gaynor
73. Barry R. Goldman
74. Mary A. Hopf
75. Michael A. Ivanich
76. Chung-ing Jean-Oase
77. James Jennings
78. Sumer Jennings
79. Jeremy Kahn
80. Denisa Kaporalis
81. Minzell Kelly
82. Linda G. Kellogg
83. Cherie Koch
84. Tracey Kokumo Craig
85. Lori C. Kort
86. Marlene F. Leatherwood
87. Jessica R. Lenocho
88. Kenneth A. Lindow
89. Rosalie P. Lines
90. Catherine J. Longman
91. Maria D. Lungo
92. Michael T. Mahoney
93. Jeanne Malys
94. Alyssa A. Marino
95. Dawn K. Martin
96. Stephen J. Martin
97. Jesus A. Martinez-Vargas
98. Meagan N. McCraw
99. Sandra G. Mejia
100. Jessica Mendez
101. Nadia R. Meza
102. Elizabeth A. Miller-Spann
103. Lupita M. Navarro
104. Shari L. Nestor
105. James A. Nielsen
106. Kristel M. Nielsen
107. Dottie L. Ohe
108. Karen S. Paschall
109. Laura J. Pavey
110. Pamela J. Poetker

111. Claudia J. Plotnick
112. Saydee I. Ramos
113. Rosemary R. Razo
114. John E. Rhoads
115. Susan C. Rhoads
116. Amy A. Richardson
117. Nicole Y. Roberson
118. Richard E. Rochford
119. Victoria Roff
120. Eric Schoeller
121. Mark A. Schmit
122. Linda M. Seger
123. Ranae P. Settle
124. Josie A. Sorensen
125. Thomas L. Steele
126. Silvano I. Tanori
127. Eleanor M. Tarman
128. Sonya L. Torres
129. Leonard R. Trujillo
130. Betty E. Ulibarri
131. Amy Vilarreal-Orantez
132. Mark C. Vincent
133. Loray E. Walker
134. Cheryl A. Wall
135. Christina L. Webster
136. Cynthia Wood
137. Karyn M. Wright

4-B: Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following applications for renewal of individual legal document preparer certification and continuing education audit submissions:

1. Jeannie N. Collins
2. Edward F. Daily
3. Gina E. Decker
4. Deborah I. Moldovan
5. Joann Regan
6. Jaime S. Rippey
7. Aubree S. Roach
8. Trenton Seay
9. Christian A. Soto
10. Jesse V. Torres
11. Kenda Trimpe
12. Stephanie Villalobos
13. Sheila Webster

4-C: *Review, discussion and possible action regarding request for withdrawal of application for renewal of business entity legal document preparer certification regarding Arizona Divorce Center LLC.*

5) ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES.....Debbie MacDougall

5-A: *Review, discussion, and possible action regarding the establishment of the 2016 Board meeting schedule.*

CALL TO THE PUBLICMary Carlton, Chair

ADJOURNMary Carlton, Chair

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS
Agenda Summary - Monday, September 28, 2015

1) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

1-A: Review, discussion, and possible action regarding approval of the regular session minutes of the meeting of July 20, 2015.

A draft of the regular session minutes for the meeting of July 20, 2015, is attached for the Board's review and consideration.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary – Monday, September 28, 2015

2) PENDING COMPLAINTS

2-A: Review, discussion and possible action regarding complaint number 14-L050, involving Aldo Castaneda.

The Division received complaint number 14-L050 on October 22, 2014, with the following allegations:

Allegation 1: Mr. Castaneda coerced the complainant into signing immigration paperwork for her husband.

Allegation 2: Mr. Castaneda is operating an uncertified document preparation business, “America’s Legal Group, LLC”.

Allegation 3: Mr. Castaneda is utilizing the legal designation of “JD” next to his name on his business website.

Recommendation:

It is recommended the Board accept the finding of the Probable Cause Evaluator and enter a finding Aldo Castaneda has not committed the alleged act(s) of misconduct as detailed in Allegation 1 of the Investigation Summary and Allegation Analysis Report in complaint number 14-L050.

It is recommended the Board accept the finding of the Probable Cause Evaluator and enter a finding Aldo Castaneda has committed the alleged act(s) of misconduct as detailed in Allegations 2 and 3 of the Investigation Summary and Allegation Analysis Report in complaint number 14-L050.

It is recommended the Board enter a finding grounds for informal disciplinary action exists pursuant to Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (“ACJA”) § 7-201(H)(6)(a) for act(s) of misconduct involving violation of ACJA § 7-208(J)(5) for using the term “JD” in advertising and ACJA § 7-208(E)(3)(d) for failing to certify his business “Americas Legal Group, LLC”.

It is further recommended the Board issue a Letter of Concern.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary - Monday, September 28, 2015

2) PENDING COMPLAINTS

2-B: Review, discussion and possible action regarding Order of Default in complaint number 14-L040 involving former certificate holder, Trina MacPhail.

This complaint was initially presented to the Board on July 20, 2015, at which time the Board moved to accept staff's recommendations for filing and service of Notice of Formal Statement of Charges and Right to Hearing imposing formal discipline issuing a Censure to Ms. MacPhail.

On August 21, 2015, Ms. MacPhail was served with the Notice of Formal Statement of Charges and Right to Hearing and she failed to file an Answer and did not request a hearing.

On September 15, 2015, the Honorable William O'Neil filed an Order of Default, forwarding this matter back to the Board with a recommendation that the Board formally enter the proposed sanction and issue a Censure to Ms. MacPhail pursuant to ACJA § 7- 201(H)(24)(a)(6)(b).

Therefore, it is recommended the Board adopt the Formal Charges contained in the Notice of Formal Statement of Charges as the Conclusions of Law and issue a Final Order imposing a Censure to Trina MacPhail.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS
Agenda Summary – Monday, September 28, 2015

2) PENDING COMPLAINTS

2-C: Update regarding complaint number 14-L039 involving Arizona Family Law Center, LLC.

Staff will provide an update to the Board.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS
Agenda Summary – Monday, September 28, 2015

2) PENDING COMPLAINTS

2-D: Review, discussion and possible action regarding Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation in complaint numbers 14-L048/14-L049 involving Rae MacLean and Arizona Document Services.

This complaint was initially presented to the Board on March 23, 2015, at which time the Board accepted staff's recommendation and the Probable Cause Evaluator's determination that Rae MacLean and Arizona Document Services violated ACJA § 208(F)(1)(b).

On April 22, 2015, the Board filed the Notice of Formal Statement of Charges in complaint numbers 14-L048 and 14-L049 involving Rae MacLean and Arizona Document Services. Division records reflect Ms. MacLean was served on May 3, 2015 and that she timely filed an Answer but failed to request a hearing.

On July 27, 2015, Judge O'Neil filed a Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation in complaint numbers 14-L048 and 14-L049 recommending that the Board issue a censure.

Therefore, it is recommended the Board adopt the Hearing Officers Recommendation and issue a Final Order imposing a Censure to Rae MacLean and Arizona Document Services.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary – Monday, September 28, 2015

2) PENDING COMPLAINTS

2-E: Review, discussion and possible action regarding complaint number 14-L053, involving Grace Beltran.

The Division received complaint number 14-L053 on December 24, 2014, with the following allegations:

Allegation 1: Ms. Beltran prepared the wrong or inadequate legal documents for Petitioner/Mother in Superior Court Case #FC2013-008854 filed September 24, 2014.

Allegation 2: Ms. Beltran should have prepared a Spanish version of the documents as the customer was Hispanic and apparently challenged by the language barrier.

Brief synopsis of the investigation:

Sandra Garcia (Petitioner) had Ms. Beltran prepare a “Petition to Enforce Parenting Time (or “Visitation if for Non- Parents)”. Petitioner claimed her husband was not picking up and spending time with their children, according to the Parenting Plan currently in place by the Court. Complainant, a Commissioner on the Maricopa County Superior Court, contends Ms. Beltran prepared an inappropriate document and has a duty to prepare relevant documents for Court. The document filed is intended to enforce the petitioner’s rights of visitation not to force the respondent to visit the children.

Ms. Beltran contends that she prepared the documents that her client chose. Ms. Beltran says the client chose the petition, because the petition had the opportunity for mediation and Garcia wanted the Court to work out the issues with the Father under mediation. Ms. Beltran stated she knew that the Court could not grant the relief requested in the Petition. Ms. Beltran replies that she recommended a Spanish version of the supplied document, but the client chose the English version.

The Commissioner contends that the licensed document preparer should have selected the correct form of document and included language in the documents that would have explained the problems in sufficient enough detail which would have made the Court able to remedy the issues. The Petition as drafted did not provide the father with sufficient notice of the issues to satisfy father’s due process rights. The work by Ms. Beltran resulted in a dismissal. The Commissioner also stated that the Petitioner needed a Spanish interpreter and the documents should have also been bilingual (an option supplied by the Court), so the Petitioner could follow the questions easier.

It is recommended the Board accept the finding of the Probable Cause Evaluator and enter a finding Grace Beltran has not committed the alleged act(s) of misconduct as detailed in Allegation 2 the Investigation Summary and Allegation Analysis Report in Complaint number 14-L053.

It is recommended the Board accept the finding of the Probable Cause Evaluator and enter a finding Grace Beltran has committed the alleged act of misconduct as detailed in Allegation 1 the Investigation Summary and Allegation Analysis Report in complaint number 14-L053.

It is recommended the Board enter a finding grounds for informal disciplinary action exists pursuant to Arizona Code of Judicial Administration (ACJA) § 7-201 (H)(6)(a) for act(s) of misconduct involving (ACJA) § 7-208 (J)(1)(a) and 7-208 (J)(4)(b) by preparing a document that she knew was not suitable for the intended purpose.

It is further recommended the Board issue a Letter of Concern.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary - Monday, September 28, 2015

3) INITIAL CERTIFICATION AND ELIGIBILITY

3-A: *Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following applications for initial individual and/or business entity legal document preparer certification.*

1. Charlotte Anthony
2. Southwest Legal Documents, LLC (*Stephen Martin*)
3. Alyson Dawson
4. Dawson Document Preparation, LLC (*Alyson Dawson*)
5. Gwyndolen Kemnitz
6. Express Legal Documents (*Gwyndolen Kemnitz*)
7. Johanna Fierstein
8. Daniel Carrasco
9. Association for Retired Citizens (*Tyrone Wiedrich*)
10. Stacey Hobrath
11. Angelica Tresvik
12. Erik Rivera
13. Katie Meredith
14. David White
15. Teresa Henderson
16. Janice Schoepel
17. Robert Joseph Smith
18. Wendy Brown
19. Maria Rosas Lopez

The following applicants have submitted applications for initial certification. In the opinion of staff, the applications are complete and no information has been presented during the background investigation which is contrary to certification being granted. The applicants have demonstrated they meet the minimum eligibility requirements for certification.

1. Charlotte Anthony
2. Southwest Legal Documents, LLC (*Stephen Martin*)
3. Alyson Dawson
4. Dawson Document Preparation, LLC
5. Gwyndolen Kemnitz
6. Express Legal Documents (*Gwyndolen Kemnitz*)

Division Staff has processed the following applications for initial certification which are being submitted to the Board for additional review and consideration. In the event the recommendation is to grant with additional non-disclosure language, the following language would be used:

The Board of Legal Document Preparers ("Board") has concluded its review of your application and determined you have satisfied the eligibility requirements for certification. Although the Board is granting you certification, the Board members have concerns regarding the failure to disclose <insert failure of disclosure>. Lack of diligence is not a quality embraced by the Board or your colleagues in the profession, and may jeopardize your success. The Board and the Division place the highest priority on honesty and candor. Your failure to disclose information on future applications may result in denial of your renewal of certification or disciplinary action.

7. Johanna Fierstein – The applicant disclosed a 2007 misdemeanor conviction out of Orange County, CA for driving while blood alcohol level is 0.08% or more for which she paid fines, took classes and completed 3 years of unsupervised probation. Staff's recommendation is to grant initial certification to applicant, Johanna Fierstein.

8. Daniel Carrasco – Mr. Carrasco submitted a complete application for legal document preparer certification on February 13, 2015 demonstrating that he meets the minimum eligibility requirements for certification. On the application, Mr. Carrasco disclosed previous discipline against and subsequent suspension of his license to practice law in Arizona and multiple civil suits to which he was a party.

Division staff reviewed the applicant's attorney discipline record and the underlying complaints filed against him between 1989 and 1996. Out of the six complaints, two complaints resulted in informal discipline and four complaints resulted in formal discipline. Common themes running throughout the complaints were lack of diligence in representation, the failure to communicate with his clients and the failure to participate in the disciplinary process and respond to inquiries from the State Bar. Additional issues identified throughout the disciplinary proceedings were dishonesty and non-disclosure regarding an attempted settlement with a complainant, the failure to appropriately withdraw from pending cases and notify his clients when he was suspended from the practice of law, and bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary process.

Briefly, Mr. Carrasco's State Bar discipline history is as follows: (i) 1992 informal reprimand; (ii) 1993 six month suspension; (iii) 1994 three month suspension, and (iv) 1996 three years suspension retroactive to the expiration of his 1994 suspension. The 1994 suspension provided that should Mr. Carrasco desire reinstatement to the State Bar, he would be required to file a formal application and provide proof of a minimum of a good faith effort to satisfy an \$85,000.00 malpractice judgment awarded to one of his former clients/complainants in Superior Court.

The civil litigation disclosed by the applicant involved four civil suits in which Mr. Carrasco was the defendant. Two of the civil suits, both from 1992, concerned debts incurred by the applicant through his law practice. Both civil suits resulted in judgments against Carrasco and per the applicant, one of the two judgments was satisfied. A third suit, also filed in 1992, was the previously mentioned malpractice action in which the complainants received a judgment of \$85,000.00. Per Mr. Carrasco, he has made no attempt to satisfy the judgment. The fourth civil suit filed in 2008 resulted from a motor vehicle accident in which the applicant and his family were involved and was resolved through settlement agreement. None of the aforementioned suits involved allegations of fraud, misrepresentation or conversion.

In developing a recommendation regarding Mr. Carrasco's application, Division staff considered the seriousness of the allegations brought forth in the State Bar complaints, the degree of injury to his clients and the significance of the State Bar sanctions. In addition, with regards to those complaints, staff considered Mr. Carrasco's failure to attempt to satisfy the judgment. Also considered was the extensive length of time that has passed since Mr. Carrasco's final suspension in 1996, the fact that Mr. Carrasco was employed as a paralegal in a local law office for a period of 19 years as well as Mr. Carrasco's candor in both his application for certification and his interview with Division staff. The length of time that has passed since the offenses as well as Mr. Carrasco's 19 year employment as a paralegal for the same attorney do allay some of staff's concerns regarding the applicant's ability to professionally and ethically perform the duties of a legal document preparer. However, during Mr. Carrasco's employment as a paralegal he was closely supervised by a lawyer, and working in an environment where one is closely supervised does not demonstrate the ability to perform in an unsupervised environment.

Given the relationship of the ethical violations to the certification sought, the extent of the injury to the public, the repetitive nature of the violations and failure of the applicant to demonstrate the ability to perform in an unsupervised environment, staff's recommendation is to deny certification to applicant Daniel Carrasco pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(ii) *The applicant or an officer, director, partner, member, trustee, or manager of the applicant: Has committed any act constituting material misrepresentation, omission, fraud, dishonesty or corruption in business or financial matters* for a 1993 Disciplinary Commission Report finding that the applicant led a client to believe that her case was being actively pursued when, in fact, it had been dismissed in violation of an ethical rule which prohibits conduct involving dishonesty or misrepresentation; pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(iii) *Has conduct showing the applicant or an officer, director, partner, member, trustee, or manager of the applicant is incompetent or a source of injury and loss to the public* as detailed specifically in the 1993 Disciplinary Commission Report for injury to a client due to lack of diligence, a violation which was acknowledged by the applicant in his certification application; pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(vii) *Has a censure, probation or any other disciplinary action of any professional or occupational license or certificate by other licensing or regulatory entities if the underlying conduct is relevant to the certification sought* for the 1993, 1994 and 1996 suspensions of the applicant's license to practice law in Arizona with Disciplinary Commission findings of dishonesty, misrepresentation, source of injury to the public, and disobeying court orders; and pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(xi) *Has violated any decision, order, or rule issued by a professional regulatory entity* for the failure to cease practicing law as ordered upon suspension in 1993 and 1994 as noted in the 1996 Disciplinary Commission Report.

9. The Association for Retired Citizens, Inc. (*Tyrone Wiedrich*) - The business entity submitted an application for legal document preparer certification on November 10, 2014. The applicants disclosed a 2004 State of Arizona Department of Insurance disciplinary action, a total of three bankruptcies in which no adversarial petitions were filed and a dissolution of marriage proceeding. Division staff's background investigation found three additional civil suits which were not disclosed in the application.

The disclosed 2004 State of Arizona Department of Insurance (“AZDOI”) Consent Order was the resolution of two complaints filed with the AZDOI against applicant, Jeffrey Wiedrich and his insurance business, Oasis Asset Planning, Inc. The complaints alleged 1) “misrepresentation for the purposes of inducing a policyholder to lapse, forfeit, surrender, retain or convert any insurance policy” for having inaccurately stated that a client’s current carrier had been downgraded to encourage the client to purchase a replacement annuity and, 2) the “direct or indirect offering of an inducement” not otherwise specified in a contract for the offering of a bonus to a client to transfer her annuities in contravention of statute. The AZDOI ordered that Wiedrich and the business cease and desist from violations of A.R.S. Title 20 and ordered a civil penalty in the amount of \$3,000.00, which was satisfied.

The civil litigation that had not been disclosed on the application involved two justice court cases, one in which Jeff and Mercedes Wiedrich were the defendants and a second in which they were the plaintiffs, and a 2014 Superior Court case in which Jeff and Mercedes Wiedrich and their business, Oasis Wealth Management, LLC (“Oasis”) were all named as defendants.

The 2014 Maricopa County Superior Court case was filed by clients of the Wiedrich’s insurance business, Oasis. The complaint (CV2014-052480) alleges multiple counts of fraud, misrepresentation, and negligence on the part of the applicants, the business entity and the insurance companies who issued the annuities in question. The applicants stated that they did not disclose the civil suit because they were instructed by their attorney not to discuss the case, as it was still pending at the time of the application. Division staff interviewed Tyrone Wiedrich, Jeff Wiedrich, the plaintiffs in CV2014-052480, the attorney for the plaintiffs and an insurance professional who consulted with the plaintiffs, as well as conducting a review of the available court documents, the plaintiff’s exhibits and the applicants’ client files for the plaintiffs. The case was resolved through settlement agreement and staff had significant concerns regarding the allegations set forth in the suit, the supporting documentation provided for those allegations as well as the testimony given by Jeff Wiedrich during his interview with Division staff.

The plaintiffs’ complaint in CV2014-052480 claimed that in May of 2010, Jeff Wiedrich (“Wiedrich”) accompanied by Eric Jacobson (“Jacobson”), the plaintiffs’ agent of record, sold the plaintiffs replacement annuities which were unsuitable, for the sole purpose of generating a commission. The complaint alleges multiple violations of insurance laws in the sale of the replacement annuities, citing failures to disclose pertinent information about surrender fees, taxes, and waiting periods, in addition to the inappropriateness of the annuities for what the plaintiffs intended to accomplish with the investment.

The complaint alleged that at the time that Wiedrich accompanied Jacobson to the plaintiffs’ house in May of 2010, Jacobson had been convicted of felony insurance fraud/theft and that his insurance producer’s license had been revoked for almost 18 months. In addition, having compared the copies of the applications provided to the clients/plaintiffs and the copies submitted by Oasis to the insurance company, it appears that on the plaintiffs’ copies the sections in which the producer would identify if the annuities were replacements were left blank, while on the copies of the

applications submitted to the insurance company, those sections were completed stating that the annuities were not replacements. Oasis, having sold the clients annuities in 2008 were aware that the 2010 annuities were replacements. The submission of the annuity applications that did not accurately identify the annuities to be purchased as replacements, appears to be in violation of A.R.S § 20-463 (A)(1) which states, *“It is a fraudulent practice and unlawful for a person to knowingly: present, cause to be presented or prepare with the knowledge or belief that it will be presented and oral or written statement including computer generated documents, to or by an insurer, reinsurer, purported insurer or reinsurer, insurance producer or agent of a reinsurer that contains untrue statements of material fact or that fails to state an material fact with respect to any of the following: (a) application for the issuance or renewal of an insurance policy...”*

The insurance producer’s identification of annuities as replacements on the application is significant in the insurer’s regulation of producers in that it initiates a compliance review process by the insurer to ensure suitability of the replacement product, thereby protecting the clients from producers selling unsuitable products solely to generate a commission as required by A.R.S. § 20-1241.04. When asked about the inaccuracies on the applications and the failure to identify the annuities as replacements, Mr. Wiedrich initially stated that the plaintiffs had manipulated the applications in order to “scam” the insurance producer. When it was pointed out that the insurance company had a copy submitted by his office that specifically indicated the annuities were not replacements, he stated that the only thing he had done was sign the application, that it had “99% been completed” by Jacobson and another office employee.

Staff had additional concerns regarding Wiedrich’s candor during his interview with staff. In discussing the allegations of the plaintiffs that the 2010 sale of the annuities was merely to generate a commission, Wiedrich stated that he did not receive a commission for that sale. The denial of commission was also found in correspondence between Mr. Wiedrich and the plaintiff in which the client questions his motives in selling the annuities. Wiedrich states that he did not make a commission on the 2010 sale. In reviewing the documentation submitted by Oasis, staff found a “Delivery Receipt” provided by Jeff Wiedrich from the plaintiffs’ client file which indicates that the commission from the sale of the 2010 annuities was to be split 20% to Jacobson and 20% to Wiedrich. Also during the interview, Wiedrich stated that the plaintiffs were “lying” when they stated that Jacobson’s license had been revoked when Jacobson and Wiedrich went to the plaintiffs’ house in 2010. As previously mentioned, the AZDOI reports that Jacobson’s insurance producer’s license was revoked in December of 2008 and the court record shows he was convicted of insurance fraud/theft in 2009, both in advance of the Wiedrich’s 2010 visit to the plaintiffs.

In developing a recommendation regarding the Association for Retired Citizens, Inc.’s application for legal document preparer certification, staff considered: i) the nature of the allegations and the age of the 2004 AZDOI Consent Order, ii) the materiality of the applicants’ non-disclosed litigation and iii) the nature recency of the allegations set forth in the 2014 Maricopa County Superior Court case. Staff found that although the AZDOI Consent Order was issued in 2004, the allegations of misrepresentation are material to the certification sought and that a finding of civil liability in a complaint involving misrepresentation was not disclosed on the application as

required. With regards to the non-disclosed litigation, though the 2001 and 2010 justice court cases hold no allegations of concern relating to certification, the failure to disclose the Maricopa County Superior Court case, CV2014-052480, however, is significant in that the allegations of fraud and misrepresentation against the applicants are both serious and relevant to certification. Although CV2014-052480 was settled out of court, Oasis and the Wiedrichs did pay a total of \$58,000.00 in settlement costs and evidence appears to exist that supports the plaintiffs' claim of fraud on the part of the applicants, at the very least in the failure to disclose that the 2010 annuities were replacements on the applications, pursuant to A.R.S § 20-463 (A)(1).

Taking the nature of the allegations of the 2004 AZDOI complaints, the applicant's failure to disclose material civil litigation and a finding of misrepresentation in business matters, the nature of the allegations set forth in CV2014-052480, the evidence of insurance practice in violation of A.R.S § 20-463 (A)(1) in submitting an inaccurate application for annuities and the seemingly inaccurate testimony of Jeff Wiedrich into consideration, staff believes that the applicants and the business entity have demonstrated a pattern of practice both in the application process and business matters that is inconsistent with certification being granted. Therefore, staff's recommendation is to deny certification to the Association for Retired Citizens, LLC pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(vii) "*The applicant or an officer, director, partner, member, trustee or manager of the applicant: has a censure, probation or any other disciplinary action of any professional or occupational license or certificate by other licensing or regulatory entities if the underlying conduct is relevant to the certification sought*" for the 2004 Consent Order issued by the Arizona Department of Insurance against Jeff Wiedrich and his business entity; pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(xv) "*The applicant or an officer, director, partner, member, trustee or manager of the applicant: failed to disclose information on the certification application subsequently revealed through the background check*" for the failure to disclose the 2014 civil suit to which the applicants were a party as well as a finding of misrepresentation in the 2004 AZDOI Consent Order; pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(ii) "*The applicant or an officer, director, partner, member, trustee or manager of the applicant: has committed any act constituting material misrepresentation, omission, fraud, dishonesty or corruption in business or financial matters*" for the violation of A.R.S § 20-463 (A)(1) in submitting an erroneous application for the purchase of annuities that misrepresented facts integral to the oversight of the process; and pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(xiv) "*The applicant or an officer, director, partner, member, trustee or manager of the applicant: has made a false or misleading oral or written statement to division staff or the board*" for statements made by Jeff Wiedrich during his interview with staff that appear to contradict the evidence presented by the plaintiffs in CV2014-052480 with regards to Jeff Wiedrich's receipt of a commission in the sale of the annuities and the information regarding Mr. Jacobson and his licensure status at the time the annuities were sold to the plaintiffs in 2010.

10. Ms. Stacey Hobrath – Ms. Hobrath applied for initial legal document preparer certification on December 11, 2014. The issues related to Ms. Hobrath's application revolve around two general topics: her failure to disclose a bankruptcy and her failure to answer or to provide consistent answers regarding her experience preparing documents.

Ms. Hobrath disclosed fourteen civil suits on her application: divorce proceedings, four traffic violations, a dismissed civil suit with an automobile insurance company, six dismissed cases from 1991 to 2004, and two restraining orders from a later determined vexatious litigant.

As to her failure to disclose her 2003 bankruptcy, Ms. Hobrath contends this was an oversight. More troubling than the failure to disclose the bankruptcy is her description of her experience working with a licensed attorney. Ms. Hobrath has a high school diploma and therefore must demonstrate she has two years' experience working with a licensed lawyer. On her application Ms. Hobrath stated she had no experience working under the supervision of a licensed attorney. In Ms. Hobrath's application she listed two past employers: 1. her husband's company, Clear Choice Photo Booth, from March of 2011 to the present and 2. Self-employment with Notetrackers, LLC from 2004 to 2014.

After reviewing her application, Division staff requested proof of two years of supervision in the preparation of legal documents as required by code. Ms. Hobrath amended her application, stating she had three years of experience working under the supervision of a licensed attorney and revealed a third employer, Bell Law, PLC, working for Emily Bell from 2009 to 2012. The Division questioned Ms. Hobrath concerning her amended application and the experience. In February 2015, Division staff requested Ms. Hobrath supply an affidavit from Attorney Emily Bell explaining the circumstances of her amended application. On April 6, 2015 Division asked Ms. Hobrath to withdraw her application or produce her response by April 20, 2015, or the Division would forward the application to the next board meeting with a recommendation to deny pursuant to ACJA § 7-201 (E)(2)(c)(1) as she does not meet the qualifications described in ACJA § 7-208 (E)(3)(b)(6)(a).

During these exchanges, Division staff also contacted Ms. Bell who confirmed that between February 2009 and February 2012, Ms. Hobrath had done some volunteer work with Ms. Bell but stated to Division staff that she could not describe how many hours or how much time. Subsequent to this conversation and Ms. Bell's assertions concerning how many hours Ms. Bell could account for, Ms. Hobrath provided to Division staff an unsigned affidavit from Emily Bell. Upon questioning by Division, Bell admitted writing the affidavit and said Ms. Hobrath worked the required 4,160 hours (or full time from February 2009 to February 2012). Division noticed that the times overlapped when Ms. Hobrath was working for Notetrackers and Clear Choice Photo Booth and when she was working for Bell.

On August 6, 2015 as the Division continued its investigation, it had a conversation with Ms. Hobrath regarding a possible Criminal Theft in the first degree from Washington State, September 24, 1997, case number 97-1-03884-9. Ms. Hobrath asked if that was related to when she worked for Target. Division staff responded that Ms. Hobrath's application only listed three employers, and did not have her working at Target. The end result of the phone conversation was that Ms. Hobrath offered to provide to Division staff the following by Monday, August 10, 2015:

- An amended application with complete employment history,
- A list of the companies Ms. Hobrath owned in the last seven years, and a short narrative about each company,
- An explanation of Ms. Hobrath's relationship with Emily Bell,

- Evidence that Ms. Hobrath did the legal document work (normally Division accepts pay stubs, tax records, invoices, timesheets, etc.).

Ms. Hobrath has not yet produced those documents. The Division recommends that the Board deny Ms. Hobrath's certification pursuant to ACJA § 7-201 (E)(2)(c)(1) as she has not demonstrated that she meets the minimum eligibility requirements described in ACJA § 7-208 (E)(3)(b)(6)(a) and pursuant to ACJA § 7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(xvi) has failed to provide the Division with information legally requested.

11. Angelica Tresvik – Ms. Tresvik has demonstrated she meets the minimum eligibility requirements for certification, however, she failed to disclose a 2004 civil suit regarding the purchase of land. Ms. Tresvik stated her husband bought some land in Southern Arizona and her husband hired a lawyer to get clear title. Ms. Tresvik simply did not know the lawyer initiated a civil suit to clear the title to the property. Staff's recommendation is to grant initial certification to Angelica Tresvik, but include the aforementioned language regarding the failure to disclose in her notification of certification.

12. Erik Rivera – Mr. Rivera has demonstrated he meets the minimum eligibility requirements for certification. The applicant answered "yes" to the question, "Have you ever been convicted of a misdemeanor regardless of whether your civil rights have been restored?" and provided an affidavit with supporting paperwork disclosing a misdemeanor complaint arising out of a domestic dispute where he was charged with criminal damage and disorderly conduct. After diversion, the charges were dismissed. Mr. Rivera also answered yes to the background question, "Have you ever been a party to or claimed interest in a civil proceeding?" which included the new language but did not tell about his divorce or provide his divorce paperwork with his affidavit. Mr. Rivera ultimately did produce the paperwork and there is nothing in the provided documents that precludes him from certification. Staff's recommendation is to grant initial certification to Erik Rivera but include the aforementioned language regarding the failure to disclose in his notification of certification.

13. Katie Meredith – Ms. Meredith has submitted a complete application for Standard Certification demonstrating that she meets the educational/experiential requirement for certification as she has an Associates of Applied Science in Paralegal Studies from Rio Salado College and has provided copies of transcripts indicating 24 semester units in legal specialization. On her application for certification, Ms. Meredith disclosed a 2015 termination from employment. Per the applicant, the termination was a result of miscommunication between her and her employer relative to applicant's timekeeping and reporting her time on her timecard and software issues with the digital timecard program.

Division Staff contacted her former employer who explained that Ms. Meredith's timecard reflected time she did not work. In addition to the timecard issue, her former employer stated that she had concerns with applicant (i) discussing cases outside the office, (ii) advising family members regarding family law matters, and (iii) advising people in town about family law matters when they didn't have money to see an attorney.

The background investigation revealed a non-disclosed 2011 Justice Court civil action in which applicant was named as a defendant. When questioned about the civil action, applicant stated that the civil action pertained to a debt for a lease of a residence. She stated that she did not intentionally leave the information out of her application; that it was a simple case of being forgetful, and she apologized.

In making a recommendation to the Board, Division staff considered the nature of the evidence related to the timecard issue and issues related to providing advice and breaching client confidences. In addition, Division Staff contacted two former employers, including one in which she worked for approximately six years immediately prior to her employment with attorney Vork and no issues relative to her integrity or ethics were revealed.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Board grant initial certification to applicant Katie Meredith and include the following language:

The Board of Legal Document Preparers ("Board") has concluded its review of your application and determined you have satisfied the eligibility requirements for certification. Although the Board is granting you certification, the Board members have concerns regarding the failure to disclose the 2011 Justice Court civil action. The Board and the Division place the highest priority on diligence, honesty and candor. In addition the Board cautions you as a legal document preparer to treat information received from the consumer as confidential [ACJA § 7-208(J)(2)(a)] and further cautions you not to provide any kind of specific advice, opinion, or recommendation to a person or entity about possible legal rights, remedies, defenses, options, or strategies [ACJA § 7-208(F)(1)]. Lack of diligence, not maintaining consumer confidence, and providing legal advice are actions and characteristics not embraced by the profession and any complaints related thereto may result in denial of your renewal of certification or disciplinary action.

14. David White - Mr. White has submitted a complete application demonstrating that he meets the educational requirements for licensure. Mr. White disclosed a civil suit filed in the US District Court of Utah in which he was named as a defendant. The cause of action was identified as Racketeering (RICO) Act and the nature of the suit was securities/commodities. Division Staff reviewed court the court's ruling dismissing the complaint with prejudice. In the ruling, the Judge found no fact in the complaint from which there can be a finding that there was an opportunity to commit a fraud and that there was nothing that identifies any of the individual defendants' connection in a way that could be perceived as an opportunity to commit fraud. The parties thereafter entered into a settlement agreement which dismissed the federal case in Utah and the related civil action pending in Maricopa County Superior Court. Although Mr. White did not disclose the Maricopa County Superior Court case which came to light as part of the aforementioned proceedings, Mr. White was not served with the complaint.

Mr. White is a partner in the business Miller White & Associates, LLC, a limited liability company ("MWA"). His application indicates that he is an "Executive VP" of the business since April 2014

and that his job duties are: “Responsible for marketing, lead acquisition and client representation. I also assist with credit repair consultation and education. Other responsibilities include information technology management and website development.” The investigative review revealed that on April 28, 2014, the Certification and Licensing Division received a Complaint alleging that an attorney’s client received a solicitation from MWA with a quote to handle a Chapter 7 bankruptcy. The Division Director reviewed the complaint and found that the matter fell outside the jurisdiction of the Board of legal Document Preparers and referred the matter to the State Bar of Arizona. On May 19, 2015, State Bar Unauthorized Practice of Law Counsel sent a cease and desist letter to MWA. Through their legal counsel, MWA acknowledged that they performed bankruptcy related document preparation services in Arizona from April 25, 2014 to July 8, 2014, and that MWA “no longer performs bankruptcy petition preparation in Arizona or in any other state.” On June 8, 2015, State Bar UPL Counsel sent another letter to counsel for MWA directing MWA to cease activities involved in negotiating debt settlements through a power of attorney. Counsel for MWA via correspondence to the State Bar UPL Counsel dated June 9, 2015, asserted disagreement that MWA was engaging in UPL “when its services are limited to financial negotiations” as MWA “does not and will not give any legal advice or negotiate legal rights...” Counsel for MWA stated that notwithstanding their position, MWA “is ceasing such operations in Arizona effective immediately. If and when it decides to reinstate those operations in Arizona, we will advise the State Bar.” The State Bar subsequently closed the complaint.

In making a recommendation to the Board, Division Staff has considered: (i) the civil action was dismissed with prejudice with no finding of fraud or misrepresentation by applicant, (ii) the UPL issue, although currently resolved, remains of concern to Division Staff, (iii) no other information has been presented or obtained during the background investigation which precludes certification. Therefore, staff’s recommendation is that the Board grant initial certification to David W. White with the following language to be used:

The Board of Legal Document Preparers (“Board”) has concluded its review of your application and determined you have satisfied the eligibility requirements for certification. Although the Board is granting you certification, the Board members have concerns regarding the Unauthorized Practice of Law complaint against Miller White & Associates, a limited liability company in which you are a partner. The Board cautions you and any corporation under which you are conducting business as a certified legal document preparer, including Miller White & Associates from engaging in the unauthorized practice of law as defined in Rule 31, Arizona Supreme Court Rules, and Arizona Code of Judicial Administration § 7-208(J)(5), including negotiating debts through a power of attorney. Future complaints may result in denial of your renewal of certification or disciplinary action.

15. Teresa Henderson – Ms. Henderson has submitted a complete application for legal document preparer certification demonstrating she meets the educational/experiential requirement for certification. Aside from responding “Eviction for nonpayment of rent 2011”, on her application, applicant failed to disclose eight civil cases on her application and a 2006 misdemeanor conviction, all of which were subsequently revealed through a back ground investigation. The criminal

misdemeanor conviction was for an “inducing panic” charge filed in Lakewood, Ohio Municipal Court in 2006. Applicant was found guilty and sentenced to one year of probation. When initially questioned by staff about the case, although she acknowledged specific details referenced in the court file, she was unwilling to take responsibility for the criminal court case. During an interview with Division Staff, applicant acknowledged certain details of the related police report, however, she didn’t want to confirm or deny anything until she could get a copy of the police report for herself. In regards to the eight civil cases, five are forcible detainer actions, one is for a car debt, one is for municipal income taxes, and one is for a case filed by applicant requesting restricted driving privileges which were suspended as a result of an accident and her not having the proper insurance. Initially applicant stated that she was unaware that the tax case and the case to restore her driving privileges were actual court cases. She acknowledged, the car debt case, but gave conflicting responses to the forcible detainer actions. Initially she denied and/or disputed some of the cases and in an interview acknowledged some of the same cases she previously denied as being hers and vice-versa. After an interview with court staff, applicant stated by email, “Thanks for the chance to interview for the cdpl. As we discussed I needed to provided answers to the questions regarding court cases. At this time I have not been able to obtain an actual copy of the case or report as a fee is required for those copies to be provided to me. As you stated these cases are associated with me. I cannot prove otherwise at this time.” (sic). Division Staff has been able to verify each of the cases are in fact cases in which applicant has been named as a party. In addition, Division Staff obtained a copy of the booking picture related to her arrest for the criminal charge and was able to confirm that the person in the interview was the same person in the booking picture. Applicant has provided a statement to the Board relative to the cases in which she appears to reluctantly accept responsibility for the court cases in order to move forward with the process.

In making a recommendation to the Board, Division Staff has considered that the misdemeanor conviction was more than nine years ago. However, Division Staff has grave concerns that applicant does not recognize the significance of her extensive non-disclosures, diligence, and lack of candor relative to the court cases and the misdemeanor charge. Therefore, staff’s recommendation is to deny the applicant, Teresa Henderson, certification for *failure to disclose information on the certification application subsequently revealed through the background check, for the 2006 inducing panic conviction and eight civil cases pursuant to ACJA § 7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(xv), and for making false or misleading oral or written statements to division staff regarding the misdemeanor conviction as well as the civil cases pursuant to ACJA § 7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(xiv).*

16. Janice Schoepfel – Ms. Schoepfel has submitted a complete application for legal document preparer certification. On the application under Section III: Eligibility for Certification, Ms. Schoepfel answered “Yes” to having a high school diploma or GED; she indicated that she has 26 years of law-related experience under the supervision of a licensed attorney; and she answered “Yes” to having a certificate of completion from a paralegal or legal assistance program that is institutionally accredited but not approved by the American Bar Association and answered that the name of the institution is Denver Paralegal Institute and the date of the certificate is February 1989. Under Section IV: Employment History, Ms. Schoepfel provided all of her employment history which support her 26 years of law-related experience. Under Section V: Background Information, Ms. Schoepfel answered “No” to all questions.

The background investigation, correspondence with Division Staff, and an interview with Division Staff revealed that:

(1) Contrary to her response on the application, Ms. Schoeppel does not have a paralegal certificate. During an interview, applicant informed Division Staff that she does not have a paralegal certificate from Denver Paralegal Institute as indicated on her application. She stated that she attended classes at Denver Paralegal Institute but did not actually receive a certificate.

(2) Contrary to her response on the application, Ms. Schoeppel was found to be a party to four civil proceedings which include three bankruptcies: a Chapter 7 bankruptcy filed in 1997 with a related adversarial proceeding filed in 1998, a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy filed in 1999, a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy filed in 2014, and a dissolution of marriage filed in 2010.

(3) Contrary to her response on the application, Ms. Schoeppel had a professional license revoked. Her Notary Public license was revoked on April 17, 2007. The letter from the Secretary of State, indicates that a complaint was filed by ADOT alleging that (i) the notary notarized an undated motor vehicle title transfer of ownership that contained several blank lines, including the buyers name, odometer reading, sellers name and signature, etc., (ii) the Notary journal was not accurate, and (iii) the notary did not have a current address on record with the Secretary of State.

(4) Contrary to her response on the application, Ms. Schoeppel is a member of two undisclosed business entities.

In considering a recommendation to the Board, Division Staff took into account the following:

1. Applicant's response to the non-disclosures: (i) that she did not see anywhere on the application where it questioned bankruptcy; (ii) she assumed the question applied to 'current' pending actions; (iii) she did not see anywhere in the application where it asked for information regarding a notary revocation, and (iv) since the business entities had not been active for some time, she thought the issue would be moot. However, whether for lack of diligence for failing to disclose information due to misunderstanding a question or for denying a question that is known to be true both are both grounds for denial of an application.

2. Applicant meets eligibility requirements without having a certificate of completion from a paralegal program. While she did tell Division Staff when questioned relative to the certificate in an interview that she did not have a certificate, she represented she did have a certificate on her application. In addition she had an opportunity to rectify her inaccurate answer to having a certificate of completion from a paralegal program prior to the interview, but instead alluded to trying to obtain a certificate that did not exist when she responded to Division Staff's initial request for a copy of the certificate, "...I no longer have this information and have tried to request my Certificate, however, their archives do not go back that far and they are unable to provide that to me."

3. The Notary revocation was more than eight years ago, applicant was required to attend notary training and her notary license was reinstated January 14, 2013. However, of grave concern to Division Staff is (i) revocation of a professional license, (ii) the underlying issue of the revocation, (iii) and the letter from the Secretary of State which notes that Applicant acknowledged

she notarized an undated document, however, “she does not seem to realize more is at stake than only its date...”

Division Staff’s recommendation is to deny initial certification to Janice Schoepel for the following:

1. Applicant made false or misleading oral or written statements to division staff regarding her paralegal certificate pursuant to ACJA § 7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(xiv).

2. Applicant has committed material misrepresentation, omission, fraud, dishonesty, or corruption in the application form by (i) indicating that she has a paralegal certificate when in fact she does not pursuant to ACJA §7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(i).

3. Applicant failed to disclose information on the certification application subsequently revealed through the background check regarding five civil actions, a notary license revocation, and two business entities pursuant to ACJA § 7-201 (E)(2)(c)(2)(b)(xv).

17. Robert Joseph Smith – Staff will provide materials and a recommendation at the Board Meeting.

18. Wendy Brown – Ms. Brown submitted an application for legal document preparer certification on January 16, 2015. The applicant failed to provide the requisite application fee. Division staff made multiple attempts to contact Ms. Brown: January 26, 2015, via email, March 5, 2015, via email, March 16, 2015, via phone, July 21, 2015, via email and letter, August 14, 2015, via letter and via email, and August 17, 2015, via letter. The emails and letters were sent to Ms. Brown at the addresses provided in her application. None of the emails or letters were returned as undeliverable. Therefore, staff’s recommendation is to deny legal document preparer certification to applicant, Wendy Brown, pursuant to ACJA § 7-201(E)(2)(c)(1) *The board shall deny certification of the applicant if the applicant does not meet the qualifications or eligibility requirements at the time of the application described in this section or the applicable section of the ACJA; or has not submitted a complete application with all deficiencies corrected, the applicable documents and fees for the failure to provide the requisite application fee.*

19. Maria Rosas Lopez – Ms. Lopez submitted an application for legal document preparer certification on November 21, 2014. The applicant failed to provide the requisite fingerprint card and fee. Division staff made multiple attempts to contact Ms. Lopez: January 6, 2015 via letter, March 9, 2015 via email and letter, April 10, 2015 via email, July 17, 2015 via phone, July 21, 2015 via certified letter and via email, August 14, 2015, via letter and via email, and August 17, 2015, via letter. On March 9, 2015, Ms. Lopez responded by email stating: “I will be mailing the required documents soon.” On July 19, 2015, she again responded by email stating, “I will most definitely be submitting my fingerprint card and the fee as soon as possible.” On August 14, 2015, Ms. Lopez contacted Division staff via phone and stated that she could not locate the fingerprint card and that she wanted to get it taken care of right away. Division staff sent another fingerprint card to her on August 17, 2015. The fingerprint card and fee were never received. Therefore, staff’s recommendation is to deny legal document preparer certification to applicant, Maria Lopez, pursuant to ACJA § 7-201(E)(2)(c)(1) *The board shall deny certification of the applicant if the applicant does not meet the qualifications or eligibility requirements at the time of the application*

described in this section or the applicable section of the ACJA; or has not submitted a complete application with all deficiencies corrected, the applicable documents and fees for the failure to provide the requisite fingerprint card and fee.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS
Agenda Summary - Monday, September 28, 2015

3) INITIAL CERTIFICATION AND ELIGIBILITY

3-B: Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following Business Entity Exemption Requests for the 2015-2017 certification period.

It is recommended the following Business Entity Exemptions be granted:

1. Southwest Legal Documents, LLC (*Stephen Martin*)
2. Dawson LV Document Preparation, LLC (*Alyson Dawson*)
3. Express Legal Documents (*Gwyndolen Kemnitz*)

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary - Monday, September 28, 2015

4) RENEWAL CERTIFICATION APPLICATIONS

4-A: Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following applications for renewal of business entity and/or individual legal document preparer certification:

The following business entities have submitted applications for renewal of standard certification. The applications are complete; no information has been presented during the background which is contrary to renewal certification being granted. The business entities have demonstrated they meet the minimum eligibility requirements for renewal certification. It is recommended the Board grant renewal of standard certification to the following business entities:

1. Alta Estate Services, LLC.
2. Arizona CLDP, LLD
3. Arizona Legal Ease, Inc, DBA Arizona Legal Smart
4. Arizona Medical Liens
5. Arizona Paralegal Services, Inc.
6. AZ Legal Documents by Jojo, LLC
7. AZ Legal Documents Solutions, LLC
8. Cano Medication Services, LLC
9. Capital Consultants Management Corporation
10. Cautela Corporation
11. Center for Divorce Resolution
12. Chatfield Legal Doc Service, LLC
13. Cheaper than a Lawyer, LLC
14. Cheryl A. Wall PL
15. Discount Divorce Professional, LLC
16. Divorce Packet Processing LLC
17. Document Preparation Specialists, LLC
18. Dunn Right Document Services, Inc
19. Eastlack Paralegal Services, LLC
20. East Valley Estate Planning, LLC
21. East Valley Senior Services, LLC
22. Edward F. Daily CPA P.C.
23. Family First Estate & Corporate Services, LLC
24. Financial Security Group of Arizona, Inc.
25. Four Peaks Planning, Inc.
26. Grand Canyon Planning Associates LLC
27. Guardian Doc Prep PLLC
28. Heritage Legal Service, LLC
29. James L. Bruce Enterprises, Inc.
30. K.A. Lindow, CPA, P.C.

31. Legal Document Preparer, LLC
32. Living Estae Solutions, Inc.
33. Metro Association Management
34. My Arizona Paralegal, LLC
35. Nancy L. Anderson LLC
36. Paralegal Consultants, Inc.
37. Paralegal in Motion, LLC
38. Preliminary Notice Company, LLC
39. Professional Escrow Resources
40. Rapid RPS(AZ)LLC
41. Saguaro Lien Service, LLC
42. Sandra Mejia, LLC
43. Southwest Legal Document Services, LLC
44. Spann Estate Planning Services LLC
45. SRF Enterprises, LLC
46. Suzette M. Brown, PC
47. T.F.C. Ventures, Inc.
48. 123 The Document Tree, LLC dba The Document Tree
49. Tucson Managerial Solutions and Services, LLC
50. Valley Docs & Paralegal Services, LLC
51. Valley Immigration Solutions, LLC
52. Valley Wide Legal Documents, LLC
53. Why Pay Attorneys, LLC.

The following individual certificate holders have submitted applications for renewal of standard certification. The applications are complete, no information has been presented during a background review which is contrary to standard certification being granted and the certificate holders have demonstrated they meet the minimum eligibility requirements for standard certification. It is recommended renewal of standard certification be granted to the following individuals:

54. Georgiana Aguilar (Willis)
55. Nancy L. Anderson
56. Marley Beard
57. Cynthia Bowman
58. Suzette Brown
59. James Bruce
60. Mary Carlton
61. Antoine Cobb
62. Christina Collura
63. Karen Cooley
64. Marcie Davies
65. Mayela De La Torre
66. Marie Disney
67. Tracey Dombroski
68. Mary Dunn

69. Angela Eastlack
70. Cynthia Felton
71. Edil Fernandez
72. Patricia Gaynor
73. Barry R. Goldman
74. Mary A. Hopf
75. Michael A. Ivanich
76. Chung-ing Jean-Oase
77. James Jennings
78. Sumer Jennings
79. Jeremy Kahn
80. Denisa Kaporalis
81. Minzell Kelly
82. Linda G. Kellogg
83. Cherie Koch
84. Tracey Kokumo Craig
85. Lori C. Kort
86. Marlene F. Leatherwood
87. Jessica R. Lenocho
88. Kenneth A. Lindow
89. Rosalie P. Lines
90. Catherine J. Longman
91. Maria D. Lungo
92. Michael T. Mahoney
93. Jeanne Malys
94. Alyssa A. Marino
95. Dawn K. Martin
96. Stephen J. Martin
97. Jesus A. Martinez-Vargas
98. Meagan N. McCraw
99. Sandra G. Mejia
100. Jessica Mendez
101. Nadia R. Meza
102. Elizabeth A. Miller-Spann
103. Lupita M. Navarro
104. Shari L. Nestor
105. James A. Nielsen
106. Kristel M. Nielsen
107. Dottie L. Ohe
108. Karen S. Paschall
109. Laura J. Pavey
110. Pamela J. Poetker
111. Claudia J. Plotnick
112. Saydee I. Ramos
113. Rosemary R. Razo
114. John E. Rhoads

115. Susan C. Rhoads
116. Amy A. Richardson
117. Nicole Y. Roberson
118. Richard E. Rochford
119. Victoria Roff
120. Eric Schoeller
121. Mark A. Schmit
122. Linda M. Seger
123. Ranae P. Settle
124. Josie A. Sorensen
125. Thomas L. Steele
126. Silvano I. Tanori
127. Eleanor M. Tarman
128. Sonya L. Torres
129. Leonard R. Trujillo
130. Betty E. Ulibarri
131. Amy Vilarreal-Orantez
132. Mark C. Vincent
133. Loray E. Walker
134. Cheryl A. Wall
135. Christina L. Webster
136. Cynthia Wood
137. Karyn M. Wright

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary - Monday, September 28, 2015

4) RENEWAL CERTIFICATION APPLICATIONS

4-B: Review, discussion and possible action regarding the following applications for renewal of individual legal document preparer certification and continuing education audit submissions:

The following individual certificate holders have submitted applications for renewal of standard certification. These individuals were also audited for the continuing education compliance required pursuant to ACJA§ 7-208(G) and (L). The renewal applications are complete, no information has been presented during a background review which is contrary to standard certification being granted and the certificate holders have demonstrated they meet the minimum eligibility requirements for standard certification. The certificate holders have also demonstrated they have completed the required continuing education during the renewal period. It is recommended renewal of standard certification be granted to the following individuals:

1. *Jeannie N. Collins*
2. *Edward F. Daily*
3. *Gina E. Decker*
4. *Deborah I. Moldovan*
5. *Joann Regan*
6. *Jaime S. Rippey*
7. *Aubree S. Roach*
8. *Trenton Seay*
9. *Christian A. Soto*
10. *Jesse V. Torres*
11. *Kenda Trimpe*
12. *Stephanie Villalobos*
13. *Sheila Webster*

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary - Monday, September 28, 2015

4) RENEWAL CERTIFICATION APPLICATIONS

4-C: Review, discussion and possible action regarding request for withdrawal of application for renewal of business entity legal document preparer certification regarding Arizona Divorce Center LLC.

On June 29, 2015 Arizona Divorce Center, LLC submitted an application for renewal of legal document preparer business entity certification. On August 17, 2015, Division staff was notified by the designated principal of the business entity that she was no longer willing to serve as designated principal due to the demands of her own business entity. The owner of the Arizona Divorce Center, LLC, Oscar Miller, notified Division staff on September 22, 2015 that he was unable to replace the designated principal at this time and has chosen to withdraw his application for renewal of certification. Staff's recommendation is that the Board grant the business entity's request to withdraw.

BOARD OF LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS

Agenda Summary – Monday, September 28, 2015

5) ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

5-A: Review, discussion, and possible action regarding the establishment of the 2016 Board meeting schedule.

The Board of Legal Document Preparers is asked to consider and approve the 2016 meeting calendar.

Therefore, it is recommended the 2016 meeting calendar be set as follows:

January 25, 2016

March 28, 2016

May 23, 2016

July 18, 2016 (July 25, 2016 - Bar Exam week)

September 26, 2016

November 28, 2016