

as sole guardian. It changed the order to include the mother only after her attorney strenuously objected to the court's action of disregarding preference rights of parents under California law.

For his "services" in the matter, Hollowell, in April 1966, filed a petition requesting attorney fees and expenses of \$632.68. The court allowed him \$532.68. Exhibit 28. Under the circumstances the award of this fee was clearly an unconscionable milking of the assets of the ward. It should be added that the estate was further burdened by the necessity of retaining counsel to defend against this unauthorized intrusion by Mr. Hollowell. Exhibit 29.

(3) Fee Splitting

In the fourth accounting in the Estate of John Joseph Patencio (Indio No. 787), attorney Hollowell and conservator Therieau requested fees in the amount of \$15,000 each for assisting in the negotiation of a lease to the Sunquitz Corporation. The court approved the \$15,000 fee requested by Judge Therieau, but later after objection by the Bureau reduced it to \$11,000. The court refused to allow the \$15,000 fee requested by Hollowell. Judge McCabe, however, did allow attorney fees to Hollowell in the amount of \$2,000, but specifically disallowed fees for the Sunquitz lease matter. The order states:

Repetitively the duties of the Conservator are not delegable. The relationship of the conservator with his attorney is that of Attorney-client. Any work done by the attorney must have been ordered done by the conservator for legal work.

Exhibit 30.