ETHICS - Double Jeopardy! : Ethics Update 2017

Rules and Authorities Referenced

Billing Issues:

"Billing judgment" is the "winnowing [of] hours actually expended down to the hours that should reasonably be expended" when preparing a bill or fee request. Case v. Unified Sch. Dist. No. 233, 157 F.3d 1243, 1250 (10th Cir. 1998). Courts require it. See, e.g., Hensley v. Eckerhart, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983); In re NRF, 294 P.3d 879, 883-84 (Wyo. 2013).

Unlicensed Practice of Law and Multi-Jurisdictional Practice Issues:

Probably ok to provide solely advice about another state's laws even though not admitted:

ABA Model Rule 5.5. Restatement (Third) of Law Governing Lawyers, section 3, comment e (2000). Pennsylvania LEO 90-32 (3/2/90).

<u>Practicing Across State Lines:</u> ABA Model Rule 5.5; Restatement (Third) of Law Governing Lawyers, section 3, Illus. 5 (2000); New Jersey UPL Op. 49 (10/13/12).

In-House Lawyers Practicing in States Where Not Licensed: ABA Model Rule 5.5 (d) (1); N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. Tit. 22, pt. 522.4.

Conflicts Issues:

<u>Hot Potato Conflict Doctrine</u>: Cannot drop a client "like a hot potato," in order to take on a more lucrative assignment from another client against the "dropped" client: *Markham Concepts, Inc. v. Hasbro, Inc.*, 2016 WL 3976632 (D.R.I. July 22, 2016); *Western Sugar Coop. v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, No. CV 11-3473 CBM (Manx) (C.D. Cal. Feb. 13, 2015) (firm dropped client when conflict raised).

<u>"Thrust Upon" Exception:</u> *In re Sandahl*, 980 F.2d 1118 (7th Cir. 1992); *Tipton v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, 872 F.2d 1491 (11th Cir. 1989); *Microsoft Corp. v. Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Org.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91550 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 13, 2007) (one-off application of exception).

<u>Client Insurer Insuring Adversary:</u> California RPC 3-310 (C) (3) that it is not a conflict when an attorney pursues an action against a party whose insurance company turns out to be a client of the attorney or his/her firm, but written notice should be given.

<u>Tripartite Relationship:</u> *Nationwide Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. Bourlon,* 617 S.E.2d 40 (N.C. App. 2005); *Hansen v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.,* 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 176057 (D. Nev. Dec. 12, 2012);

Doublevision Entm't, LLC v. Escrow Servs., Inc., 2015 WL 370111 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2015). ABA Model Rule 1.6.

<u>Client Business Transactions</u>: Rule 1.8 (a) ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct; McMahon v. Eke-Nweke, No. 06-CV-5762 (E.D.N.Y.).

ATTORNEY-CLIENT CONFIDENTIALITY: Duty of Confidentially is different than the attorney client privilege: Mine Safety Appliances Co. v. North River Ins. Co., 73 F. Supp. 3d 544 (W.D. Pa. 2014); A v. B, 726 A.2d 924 (N.J. 1999); Comments 30 and 31 to ABA Model Rule 1.7; Zador Corporation, N.V. v. Kwan, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 754 (Cal. App. Ct. 1995.

ATTORNEY BLOGGING (Advertising and Positional Conflicts): NY Eth. Op. 848, CA Proposed Formal Opinion Interim 12-0006. ABA Model Rule 1.6; J.M.J. v. L.A.M., 791 N.W.2d 573 (Minn. Ct. App. 2010).