# ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE LIFE CYCLE OF THE BUSINESS ENTITY

Washington State Bar Association CLE
June 22, 2010
Seattle

Mark J. Fucile
Fucile & Reising LLP
mark@frllp.com
503.224.4895
www.frllp.com



### **INTRODUCTION**

1. At the beginning

2. Along the way

3. At the end

4. Consequences



#### **PERSPECTIVE**

Managing risk in conflicts & fees

Consequences beyond Bar discipline



#### **AT THE BEGINNING**

- ► RPC 1.13
  - Entity client rule
  - New to the RPCs in 2006
  - Generally defines client as the entity
- Importance of defining client in the engagement agreement



#### **AT THE BEGINNING**

Eriks v. Denver,118 Wn.2d 451, 824 P.2d 1207 (1992)

- Conflicts
- Breach of fiduciary duty
- CPA claim



#### **AT THE BEGINNING**

► RPC 1.8(a) and investing with/in clients

► ABA Formal Ethics Op. 00-418 (2000)

Holmes v. Loveless,
 122 Wn. App. 470, 94 P.3d 338 (2004)



#### **ALONG THE WAY**

▶ Back to RPC 1.13: Who is your client?

- ► RPC 1.7: Multiple client conflicts
- Hicks v. Edwards,75 Wn. App. 156, 876 P.2d 953 (1994)



#### **ALONG THE WAY**

► RPC 1.8(a) and modifying fee agreements

Valley/50<sup>th</sup> Avenue, L.L.C. v. Stewart, 159 Wn.2d 736, 153 P.3d 186 (2007)



### AT THE END

► Back to RPC 1.13: Who is your client?

► RPC 1.7: Multiple client conflicts

Bertelsen v. Harris,
 459 F. Supp.2d 1055 (E.D. Wash. 2006)



#### AT THE END

► RPC 1.5 and collecting fees

Simburg, Ketter, Sheppard & Purdy, LLP v. Olshan, 97 Wn. App. 901, 988 P.2d 467 (1999), amended, 109 Wn. App. 436, 33 P.3d 742 (2000)



## CONSEQUENCES: Back to Eriks v. Denver

- Civil damage claims for breach of fiduciary duty
- Fee disgorgement/denial
- CPA claims



#### FOR FURTHER READING

- "The 'Who is the Client?' Question Revisited" August 2006 WSBA Bar News
- ► "Taking Stock: Investing in Clients"

  November 2005 WSBA Bar News
- "Managing Conflicts"
  October 2004 WSBA Bar News



### **QUESTIONS?**

