

National Client Protection Organization

STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING LAWYERS FUNDS FOR CLIENT PROTECTION

Enacted - June 2, 2006

Lawyers Funds for Client Protection ["Funds"] can only benefit from articulating standards to measure performance. There are four fundamental building blocks for any Fund that strives for excellence:

- (1) An organizational structure that secures the Fund's independence;
- (2) Steady, secure and adequate funding;
- (3) Accessibility; and
- (4) Responsiveness to the need.

On this foundation are constructed the 31 specific policy standards that follow. Because all four building blocks are necessary, they are interdependent, and their corresponding standards are interrelated. Cross-references are provided.

Standards in a developing field cannot be permanent. As progress is made and aspirations evolve, however, Funds must consider, in detail, what they can and should accomplish in order to offer a high level of protection to clients. The fundamental question will always be: "Is the need being met?" These standards provide an analytical framework for answering that question, and impetus thereafter to develop a plan of action for reaching the desired level of excellence. In short, these standards for evaluating Funds are presented to assist a Fund in determining whether it is truly protecting the law clients in its jurisdiction.

Over the last several decades, the American Bar Association has developed an evolving Model Rule for structuring and operating a Fund. The philosophical underpinnings of these standards are consistent with those of the Model Rule, the use of which is greatly encouraged. Even a cursory review of the ABA's Triennial Survey of Funds will show that there are many ways to structure Funds, however, and even more variability in the actual delivery of the services by Funds. These standards are intended to compliment the Model Rule by establishing aspirational criteria by which jurisdictions can evaluate the performance of their programs, whether they use the Model Rule or significantly depart from it.

1. Structure/Organization

1.1 The Fund should be an entity of the jurisdiction's highest court as an exercise of the Court's power and duty to regulate the practice of law.

1.2 The Fund should be created and maintained by court rule with enabling statute only where necessary under the jurisdiction's constitution.

Commentary

Regulation of the practice of law, including such things as admissions, rules of practice, rules of professional conduct, and discipline, are generally the responsibility of a jurisdiction's highest court ["Court"]. In that capacity, the Court should create and maintain the Fund by court rule. Some jurisdictions may prefer to have an enabling statute; in other jurisdictions an attempt to create a Fund by way of statute may be considered a violation of separation of powers.

In any event, the Court should create and maintain a Fund as a critical aspect of its professional responsibility rule making power, recognizing the appropriateness of creating a remedy for those who have had their trust violated by lawyers licensed by the Court.

Where statute vests authority for regulation of lawyers with a body other than the Court, as is the case with Canadian law societies, care must be taken to give the Fund the autonomy and independence it needs to ensure it meets these standards. "Court" as used in these standards shall be meant to include any governing body with the authority to create and maintain the Fund.

1.3 The Fund shall constitute a trust separate and independent from any other fund or entity of the Court, bar association, law society or government agency.

Commentary

It is essential to the success of a Fund that it constitute a trust, inviolate from other uses and unavailable to all other entities. Lawyers contribute to the Fund each year on the basis that the money will be used to pay victims of lawyer dishonesty, to administer the Fund, and to take steps to prevent such losses. To permit other agencies or organizations to utilize the money so collected for any other purpose, however meritorious, would be to countenance the sort of breach of trust for which lawyers are suspended or disbarred.

It is therefore appropriate to refer to those appointed by the Court to manage the Fund as "Trustees", which term is not used lightly. Funds that are nothing more than line items in bar associations' budgets, subject to political whim and competition for scarce resources, cannot be relied upon to fill the need or fulfill the purpose of the Fund.

1.4 The Court should appoint to the Fund's Board of Trustees only those individuals who have demonstrated a combination of achievement, professionalism and concern for the public. Diversity of background should also be a factor in Trustee selection, including members who are not lawyers.

1.5 The Fund's Trustees should have sole discretion to decide claims, make awards and determine the Fund's procedures and policies within the court rule.

Commentary

Apart from creating a truly independent Fund (see Standards 1.1 - 1.3, above), and providing it with appropriate funding (see Standards 2.1 - 2.5), the next most important thing that the Court can do to ensure a successful Fund is to appoint only outstanding individuals to serve as Trustees. Only those who have already distinguished themselves professionally and in service to the public should be considered for these appointments, whether they are positions for lawyers or non-lawyers.

Once outstanding persons have been selected to immerse themselves in the purpose and policies of the Fund, they should be permitted and expected to make all significant decisions on claims and policy in their sole discretion. Expertise borne of handling the Fund's matter combined with commitment to the Fund's purpose engender just and timely decisions.

Trustees should recuse themselves from consideration of matters in which they have a conflict of interest, or the potential for such conflict.

1.6 To manage the Fund's daily affairs, the Trustees should employ a staff sufficient to permit them to (a) render the most just and timely decisions attainable in all matters, and (b) efficiently implement their decisions. The staff should serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Commentary

However committed they may be to the Fund, the Trustees cannot be expected to manage every aspect of the Fund's business on a daily basis. The Trustees should not hesitate to employ such staff as is necessary to assist them in attaining just and timely results, and in protecting the Fund's rights. Full time staff devoted to the Fund's affairs is preferable. Where, as a practical reality, staff must be shared with other entities or functions within an organization, the independence of the staff in handling the Fund's affairs must be guaranteed.

1.7 Staff salaries and all other obligations of the Fund should be paid or reimbursed by the Fund out of its income and assets to maintain the Fund's independence.

Commentary

Once established on firm financial ground, the Fund should be financially beholden to no other entity. Rather, it should pay its own way, thus securing the Fund's independence.

2. Funding

2.1 The Fund must have a source of income that is steady, secure and adequate to meet its standards of accessibility and responsiveness.

Commentary

Client protection is a field in which good intentions are not enough. A Fund in hiding or

unable to meet the need (see Standards 3.1 - 3.6, and 4.1 - 4.10, below) cannot be considered a Fund at all. In many ways, funding is the ultimate Fund issue. Not only must funding be adequate, but it must be steady - every year or every other year - and secure. Given the Fund's importance to maintaining trust and respect within the legal profession, it cannot be permitted to go begging each year with clients' financial viability hanging in the balance.

2.2 Primary funding should be by regular, periodic assessment of lawyers. The assessment should be conducted by authority of the Court, with appropriate sanctions for non-compliance.

2.3 All, or nearly all, licensed members of the profession should pay into the Fund.

Commentary

Voluntary contributions should be gladly and thankfully accepted, but cannot be relied upon to maintain a fully accessible and responsive Fund. Funds are based on the principle of professionalism and are not insurance companies. Lawyers are not asked to pay the assessment on the basis that they "contribute to the risk covered by the Fund. To the contrary, it is a source of pride to note how few lawyers conduct themselves in a way that threatens Funds.

With the overwhelming majority of honest lawyers paying for the misdeeds of a few, the Fund is a testament to the bar's honesty and integrity. Just as instances of dishonesty by lawyers besmirch all lawyers, so too do payments by the Fund to rectify these situations result in benefits to all lawyers. Virtually all licensed members of the bar should participate in taking care of these debts of honor. Exemptions, if any, should be narrowly drawn.

2.4 The assessment should not be halted, suspended, or reduced because the Fund has a positive balance. To the contrary, a substantial reserve should be sought, as interest income will help the Fund meet the need in times of large or numerous claims.

2.5 There should be no cap on the Fund's reserve short of self-endowment with full reimbursement of victims.

Commentary

Because of the vagaries of lawyer misconduct, it is not possible to determine the exact amount a Fund will need to reimburse each year. Funds should neither be expected to spend everything it assessed for a given year, nor limited to reimbursing losses only up to the annual assessment. Comparisons with the operating budgets of state agencies are inappropriate. Sound financial health for Funds needs no apology; indeed, it is required for fiscal responsibility in the public interest. With the attainment of an adequate balance, the resulting interest income helps ensure the Fund's continued viability and the ability to meet unforeseen future needs.

Some Funds have a cap on the Fund's reserves whereby the periodic lawyer assessment is

halted, suspended or reduced when a certain level is attained. This is to be avoided for a number of reasons. The first is that halting an assessment short of providing full reimbursement of all victims misses the point of the Fund. Second, it is extremely difficult to know how much is “enough”. Over the years, some Funds have halted their assessment with a reserve less than the per claim maximum of other Funds. No jurisdiction’s Fund is self-endowed (that is, fully able to meet all obligations without infusion of fresh capital), and Funds that employ this mechanism are likely to regret it.

2.6 The Fund should take an assignment of each successful claimant’s rights and, within sound business judgment, pursue those rights in vigorous attempts to replenish the Fund with subrogation receipts.

Commentary

The Fund should take an assignment of claimants’ rights. Subrogation is a legal doctrine operating under common law. Inherent in the Fund having claimants’ rights is that claimants should not “double-dip”. The Fund as assignee and subrogee of its successful claimants is entitled to seek recovery for money paid on claims. Pursuit may be of both the wrongdoer and collateral sources of recovery. Funds have found it a sound business practice to pursue such rights with vigor. As to the potentially competing subrogation rights of Funds and their successful claimants, see Standard 4.3. Funds and their claimants should share information with prosecutors and discipline authorities, as permitted by law.

2.7 The Fund should seek implementation of appropriate loss prevention mechanisms. Among those that should be sought are trust account overdraft notification, minimum financial recordkeeping, random audits of trust accounts, insurance payee notification, and education of the bar and the public. Lawyer assistance and practice assistance programs should be encouraged and assisted in making their services known.

Commentary

While seeking to raise sufficient revenues to meet the need, the Fund must also strive to limit or prevent losses. In addition to participating in efforts to educate the bar and the public about sound practice and risk avoidance, the Fund should encourage the implementation of loss prevention mechanisms such as those listed above. Each is successfully operating in a number of jurisdictions, and each has a Model Rule of the American Bar Association available to support it.

3. Accessibility

3.1 The Fund should make every reasonable effort to make its existence, nature and purpose known to the bar and the public. In particular, the Fund should ensure that those most likely to be approached by victims of dishonest lawyers - such as prosecutors, ethics committee counsel and members, ombudsmen, receivers/custodians, bar associations and judges - understand the Fund and the importance of appropriate and timely referrals. Similarly, copies of claims should be provided to respondents

whose whereabouts are known, with invitations to respond.

3.2 The Fund should issue and publish an annual report. Quarterly or semi-annual news releases should be done as well, even in the absence of high volume activity.

Commentary

The Fund should not be the profession's secret. To the contrary, the profession should be proud to make its existence known to the public in the interests of transparency and accountability. A Fund fearful of receiving valid, compensable claims has a funding problem. (See Standards 2.1 - 2.7, above.) All reasonable measures should be taken to ensure that clients with compensable losses find their way to the Fund. Regular reports on the Fund's activity should come to be expected. A lack of activity may well be noteworthy in itself.

3.3 Ineligibility for classes of persons to qualify as claimants, like any limitation on the Trustee's discretion, is not to be favored.

3.4 Strict scrutiny in light of the Fund's purpose and mission should be applied to any suggested barriers to the Trustees' consideration of claims on their merits.

3.5 Claim forms and accompanying instructions should be in plain language and, where appropriate, available in other languages.

3.6 Time limitations on the filing of claims should be reasonable. Trustees should have the authority, in their discretion, to relax the time limitations for good cause.

Commentary

There are a number of ways to make a Fund inaccessible to those who need it, and none serve the Fund's purpose. Defining away claimants, imposing unrealistic time limitations, using incomprehensible forms and instructions, and setting up other impenetrable barriers have the same effect on otherwise deserving claimants as hiding from them.

While a Fund must be able to bring closure to matters within a reasonable time frame, doing justice to the claimants in the Trustees' discretion should remain paramount. Strict or automatic prohibitions from consideration for an award should therefore be avoided. Trustees may consider the following factors presented by claimants: relationship to the respondent, legal status, extent of need, education and sophistication, negligence, or unclean hands. Such factors should not be used harshly to deny meritorious claims, however. (See Standard 4.10.) Trustees should also recognize the particular vulnerability of claimants with limited, or no, ability with the English language, or the inability to read or write, and should provide reasonable accommodation as the circumstances warrant.

3.7 The Fund's rules should be supplemented with regulations and written procedures as needed.

Commentary

The Fund, its Trustees, staff, claimants and the public all benefit from having supplemental policies and procedures reduced to writing and made available on request. This also serves to enhance the Fund's transparency and accountability, as well as creating greater consistency in decision-making. Claimants and potential claimants should know what is expected of them and what limitations the Fund has established to address their needs.

4. Responsiveness To The Need

4.1 The ultimate goal of the Fund is to fully reimburse all clients victimized by the dishonest conduct of their lawyers in as timely a manner as possible.

Commentary

If a Fund is to be anything other than window dressing or a public relations ploy, no other ultimate goal makes sense. If full reimbursement is not possible at any given time, efforts should be redoubled to meet the Standards on Funding (2.1 -2.7, above).

4.2 Limitations on the payment of awards - whether per claim, per claimant, per year or in the aggregate against any one lawyer - are not to be favored. Every opportunity should be sought to eliminate such limitations on the Trustees' discretion to pay awards.

Commentary

Artificial limits on the payment of otherwise compensable claims are, at best, necessary evils. Their necessity should be questioned, and their impact lessened at every opportunity. Raising such limits is well worth doing when their elimination cannot be attained. High caps limit only the most catastrophic of claims and do the least damage to the Fund's mission, because they affect so few claimants. An acceptable dollar figure for an appropriate intermediate goal, short of doing away with all payment limitations, may vary considerably with jurisdictions' cost of living.

While it may not yet be attainable for many Funds to restore wealth to the wealthy, families of modest or average means should not face losing their homes for having trusted a lawyer. Therefore, an acceptable intermediate goal is to maintain the Fund's ability to save a middle-class family's home in the jurisdiction's economy.

Aggregate maximums are especially to be disfavored, there being little, if any, justification for disparate treatment of persons victimized by unusually prolific dishonest lawyers.

4.3 In the event awards must be made short of amounts otherwise compensable, the assignments taken by the Fund, under Standard 2.6 shall be limited to the amounts paid by the Fund. Further, the Fund shall work with the claimants to pursue

subrogation receipts, which shall be recovered for the benefit of claimants until all are made whole as to misappropriated principal, and then to the Fund to replenish awards made.

Commentary

Until the Fund reaches the goal of making all victims whole, the invoking of payment limitations raises an issue: Who collects first from subrogation receipts? Simply put, the claimants should, until made whole as to stolen principal, even if the Fund's efforts generate the recovery.

Where the source of the recovery is specific to one claimed transaction, that claimant should be made whole first out of the money recovered. Otherwise, claimants should share recoveries *pro rata* until all are made whole.

Then, the Fund should recover for the awards paid before claimants seek interest, consequential damages, lost opportunity, or other damages.

4.4 Claims should be decided, and compensable claims paid, as quickly as possible consistent with sound and just decision making, and in no event more than three months after claims are perfected. Claims are perfected when jurisdictional thresholds have been met and all reasonably obtainable proofs are received.

4.5 While a claimant has the burden of proving a claim's compensability, the Fund should not hesitate to use its subpoena power to expedite the perfection of a claim, without regard to whether the information obtained ultimately assists a claimant's position or that of the lawyer against whom the claim is filed.

4.6 The Board of Trustees should meet at least quarterly unless there is no claim or policy business requiring attention. If there is little or no claims activity, the Fund should examine whether it is adequately accessible. (See Standards 3.1 - 3.6, above.) While in-person meetings are to be favored, meetings may consist of teleconferences and mail ballots where appropriate.

4.7 Informal hearings should be held by the Fund where credibility is an issue, the claim presents novel issues, the facts remain unclear, or the claim is too close to decide on the papers.

4.8 Reimbursement checks should be issued as soon after approval of claims as is practicable, and in no event more than thirty days after receipt of papers assigning the successful claimants' rights to the Fund (Standard 2.6).

Commentary

A second aspect of a Fund's responsiveness to the need, beyond the amount paid, is the

timeliness of payment. The ameliorative effects of a Fund award can be greatly and tragically diminished with the passage of time. Claimants typically have had a problem or a transaction of great significance before they ever approached the defalcating attorney; where an award is to be paid, the respondent has, by definition, greatly added to the claimant's problems.

While the most important goal is to make the best and most just decision possible for each claim, doing so as quickly as possible is a close second. As suggested in Standard 3.3, jurisdictional barriers should only be those that are necessary. Once those barriers have been hurdled, resolution of the claim should follow as quickly as facts will permit.

Clearly compensable claims should not languish for want of a meeting, even if "meetings" must sometimes be by teleconference or mail ballot. Check-writing procedures should be streamlined to get relief into the hands of victimized clients. The Fund should have and use subpoena power where the claimants or respondents face difficulty in producing documentation. When needed, hearings should be conducted by the Board of Trustees after all reasonably available documentation has been produced. Hearings provide the Trustees an opportunity to consider the concerns of claimants and respondents in context and can help personalize the process to an appropriate extent.

4.9 A Fund is not a remedy of last resort, but claimants should be required to take reasonable steps to recover from wrongdoers or third parties to mitigate losses. The Fund should not hesitate to pay a claim and pursue a claimant's rights where such pursuit would place an undue burden or hardship on a claimant, or where it is in the Fund's own best interest to do so.

Commentary

Requirements such as the attaining of judgment against the respondent lawyer or full-fledged litigation against collateral sources in complex commercial matters are not to be favored. In some instances, such as where the respondent is known to be judgment proof, such a requirement is an empty formality for the claimant. Where claimants are incapable of such pursuit, requirements of this nature operate as the denial of remedy to the most vulnerable of such victims. Fund are best seen as remedies of last resort *vis-a-vis* collateral sources, not victimized clients. Furthermore, there are instances in which the Fund would be best served by controlling the litigation against a collateral source.

4.10 The Trustees should not utilize over-technical distinctions or harshly restrictive interpretations of the Fund's rules in an endeavor to deny or limit claims. The favored exercise of discretion is to seek opportunities to reimburse victims within the scope of the Fund's rules.

Commentary

It does not serve the public or the profession if Trustees utilize their discretion so as to deny claims in order to conserve Fund assets. Trustees' fiduciary duties to maintain the fiscal

integrity of the Fund are not properly carried out by avoiding the Fund's principal goal and reason for existence, that is, taking care of clients victimized by dishonest lawyers. If a Fund is running out of money, it needs to increase revenues (Standard 2.1) and limit losses (Standard 2.7) rather than reject claims for reasons incomprehensible to the average claimant and contrary to the philosophy of the Fund.

American Bar Association

Center for Professional Responsibility

Model Rules for Lawyers' Funds for Client Protection

Preamble

The Model Rules for Lawyers' Fund for Client Protection are intended to serve as a national model for establishment and administration of a client protection fund. However, they cannot expect to accommodate every need of each Fund in the diverse constituency of the legal profession. The Model Rules aspire to establish standards for effective financing and efficient administration of Funds to achieve the purpose of client protection. They continue the basic intent and aspiration of the original Model Rules: to provide meaningful, prompt, and cost-free reimbursement to clients who have been injured by a lawyer's dishonest conduct.

Despite the best attempts of the legal profession to establish high standards of ethics and severe disciplinary sanctions for their breach, it is a fact that some lawyers misappropriate money from their clients. Typically, those lawyers lack the financial wherewithal to make restitution to their victims.


The organized bar throughout the United States has responded by creating Client Protection Funds to provide necessary reimbursement. The funds were either created by court rule, legislation or by the voluntary action of bar associations. In jurisdictions in which the bar is unified (i.e., membership in the state bar association is required for a license to practice law), the Fund may be part of the unified bar, which performs a variety of functions related to professional responsibility (e.g., administration of the lawyer regulatory system).

Funding can be generated from a variety of sources including mandatory assessment, legislative budget appropriation, and voluntary contribution. Mandatory assessment by court rule has proven to be the preferred method of assuring continual funding and staffing. Funds that receive revenues through mandatory assessment are preferred because the result is a reliable and predictable source of income. This allows a Fund to fully reimburse losses and to engage in public information, continuing legal education programs, and related activities. Voluntary contribution is the weakest funding method; it does not provide the Fund with broad-based and permanent income.

Chart 1

Total Claims Paid FY 01- FY10

2001	252885.54
2002	130356.68
2003	118050.09
2004	83052.96
2005	187776.86
2006	465044.53
2007	227772.05
2008	203830.00
2009	181853.66
2010	501697.14



The line with the data point squares reflects actual claims paid.
The smooth line is the trendline based on those data points.

Chart 2 – Fund Balance Had the Assessment Been \$20/Year FY 05

	Actual Fund Balance	Claims Paid	Fund Balance/If \$20/yr
2006	94151.34	465,044.53	276641.34
2007	311475.84	227,772.05	401555.94
2008	418070.56	203,830.00	583532.91
2009	216923.57	181,853.66	771361.92
2010	-5311.86	501,697.14	626956.49

