AUTO ACCIDENT ATTORNEYS, PLLC

Brent F. Sitto
Marcia Pupkiewicz
Sandy S. Sitto

24100 Southfield Rd., Ste. 116
Southfield, MI 48075
(248) 809-6789
(248) 809-6040 Fax
www.paid4pain.com

Auto Personal Injury
Motorcycle Accidents
Truck Accidents
Pedestrian Accidents
Hit-and-Run Accidents

December 15, 2023

Office of Administrative Counsel
PO Box 30052
Lansing, MI 48909

Re: **2022-19;**
Proposed Amendment of MRPC 1.15 and
Proposed Additions of MRPC 1.15B and 1.15C

I believe much of the proposed amendments and the suggested edits set forth in the Comment by Attorney Frances Rosinski are appropriate and bearable. However, I write separately to (1) suggest further edits to the Comment to MRPC 1.15 as it relates to fees paid in advance, and (2) to express my distaste as to the proposed addition of MRPC 1.15B.

<u>MRPC 1.15</u>
Ms. Rosinski's version of MRPC 1.15(c) states:

> A lawyer must deposit into a client trust account legal fees and expenses that have been paid in advance of services rendered, which only can be withdrawn by the lawyer as fees are earned or expenses incurred. Earned fees, which belong to the lawyer, must be withdrawn from the client trust account within a reasonable time after the fee is earned and the client has been billed and a reasonable time to dispute the bill has passed, or the client otherwise has agreed to the payment of the bill from their funds in the client trust account.

I believe Ms. Rosinski's version of MRPC 1.15(c) is well-stated. For the reasons set forth in ABA Formal Opinion 505 issued May 3, 2023 (copy attached), I would make the following changes to Ms. Rosinski's corresponding Comment to MRPC 1.15:

> **Fees Paid in Advance.** Whether titled a<u>n advanced fee</u>, flat fee, fixed fee, <u>nonrefundable fee</u>, retainer, deposit, or other title, if the ~~funds are~~ <u>fee paid in advance is</u> not yet earned because legal services have not yet been rendered, the funds must be deposited into an IOLTA or non-IOLTA. An agreement for delivery of legal services for a ~~fixed~~ fee <u>paid in advance</u> may provide that certain portions of the fee are earned by the lawyer based upon the passage of time, the completion of certain tasks, or any other basis mutually

> agreed upon by the lawyer and client. When a ~~fixed or flat~~ fee paid in advance of legal services was collected and the lawyer-client relationship is terminated before all agreed-upon services are rendered, the lawyer must refund any portion of the ~~fixed or flat~~ fee which has not been earned.

MRPC 1.15B

The proposed addition of MRPC 1.15B is unduly burdensome, impractical to lawyers running a law firm, and wholly unnecessary. Much of what is included in the proposed rule is already contained in bank records held by the State bar approved financial institution (e.g., a record of deposits and withdrawals, dates, amounts, account statements). These bank records can easily be obtained in the event there is any issue. I keep adequate records and have never had an issue (in nearly 15 years as the owner of a law firm) in which anything required by MRPC 1.15B was not easily obtainable in the firm's records or through the bank. I cannot imagine that there exists such an overwhelming problem that every lawyer should suffer this unnecessary burden that specific recordkeeping requirements must take place despite the records being easily obtainable in the event an issue arises. Further, this burden that every lawyer would be required to endure in attempting to maintain all of the requirements of MRPC 1.15B far outweighs any benefit.

Suggestion: The current rule states that "A lawyer shall: preserve complete records of such account funds and other property for a period of five years after termination of the representation." MRPC 1.15(b)(2). This was sufficient for years and is still sufficient. This language minus the ":" is all that is necessary and can be inputted as MRPC 1.15(f) in the proposed amendment of MRPC 1.15. Accordingly, MRPC 1.15B should be eliminated in toto. MRPC 1.15C would then become the new MRPC 1.15B. Also as a result, the final sentence of the proposed amendment to MRPC 1.15(a) should be changed to state MRPC 1.15(f) rather than MRPC 1.15B.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

AUTO ACCIDENT ATTORNEYS, PLLC

/s/ *Brent F. Sitto*

BFS/
Attachment

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Formal Opinion 505 **May 3, 2023**

Fees Paid in Advance for Contemplated Services

Under the Model Rules of Professional Conduct, a fee paid to a lawyer in advance for services to be rendered in the future must be placed in a client trust account and may be withdrawn only as earned by the performance of the contemplated services. This protects client funds and promotes client access to legal services in the event the representation terminates before all contemplated services have been rendered. All fees must be reasonable, and unearned fees must be returned to the client. Therefore, it is not accurate to label a fee "nonrefundable" before it actually has been earned, and labels do not dictate whether a fee has been earned.

This opinion examines a lawyer's obligations under the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct with respect to fees paid in advance for legal work to be performed by the lawyer in the future.[1] In particular, this opinion seeks to clarify the proper handling and disposition of fees paid in advance for legal work to be performed in the future, including where the lawyer must deposit and maintain the funds and when the lawyer may treat them as earned. The opinion also explains when a lawyer must refund all or a portion of fees paid in advance and discusses whether such a payment may be, or can even be labeled, "nonrefundable." The answers are derived from the application of several Model Rules, including: 1.5(a), 1.5(b), 1.15(a), 1.15(c), 1.15(d), and 1.16(d).

Fees for services may be paid after completion of the services, of course. However, for certain matters, many lawyers request or require that funds in a certain amount be paid to the lawyer at the outset of the representation to secure payment for the lawyer's later work. Under the Model Rules such fees must be placed in a Rule 1.15-compliant trust account, to be disbursed to the lawyer only after the fee has been earned. This is to protect the client from the risk that the lawyer may not be able to refund the prepaid fee in the event the representation terminates before the contemplated work is completed. The Model Rules protect the lawyer from the risk of nonpayment by allowing advance fees to be received and protect the client by requiring that the funds are kept safe and separate from the funds of the lawyer or firm.

I. Terminology

As a preliminary matter, it is useful to define terms commonly used to label certain client-lawyer fee arrangements: advances, retainers, flat or fixed fees, and "nonrefundable" or "earned-on-receipt" fees.

---

[1] This opinion is based on the American Bar Association Model Rules of Professional Conduct as amended by the ABA House of Delegates through August 2022. The laws, court rules, regulations, rules of professional conduct, and opinions promulgated in individual jurisdictions are controlling. This is especially noteworthy for this opinion as jurisdictions have adopted substantially different rules relating to the management of client property including fees paid in advance for legal work to be performed in the future.

A. Advances v. Retainers

Fees paid by a client to a lawyer in advance for legal work to be performed by the lawyer in the future are sometimes referred to as an "advance fee," an "advanced fee," an "advance fee payment," an "advance fee deposit," a "fee advance," or simply an "advance." Advances are also sometimes called "special retainers," "security retainers," or simply "prepaid fees." To be consistent and clear, this opinion will use the term "advance" when discussing fees paid to the lawyer for legal work to be performed in the future.

When a client pays an advance to a lawyer, the lawyer takes possession – but not ownership – of the funds to secure payment for the services the lawyer will render to the client in the future.

This opinion will also refer to the term "retainer" fee. Neither the term "retainer" nor "retainer fee" is found in the Model Rules of Professional Conduct. Regrettably, many lawyers use the term loosely to mean any sum of money paid to the lawyer at or near the commencement of representation.[2] Whereas an advance is a deposit of money with the lawyer to pay for services to be rendered in the future, there is another type of payment that is not for services. Rather, "[t]he purpose of [a retainer] is to assure the client that the lawyer will be contractually on call to handle the client's legal matters."[3] This type of agreement and payment is variously referred to as a "general retainer," "classic retainer," "true retainer," "availability retainer," or an "engagement retainer."[4] Because all of these terms mean the same thing, this opinion will use the term "general retainer" to refer to this arrangement.[5] A general retainer is paid – and deemed earned – upon the promise of availability to represent a client, whether or not services are actually needed or requested by the client.[6] Thus, a general retainer has been conceptualized as a form of an option

---

[2] There is widespread agreement that the word "retainer" has been used so inconsistently that is has practically lost all definable meaning. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY (11th ed. 2019) ("Over the years, lawyers have used the term 'retainer' in so many conflicting senses that it should be banished from the legal vocabulary.") (quoting Mortimer D. Schwartz & Richard C. Wydick, PROBLEMS IN LEGAL ETHICS 100, 101 (2d ed. 1988)).

[3] CHARLES W. WOLFRAM, MODERN LEGAL ETHICS 506 (West 1986).

[4] Some jurisdictions have commendably sought to define terms and draw distinctions in their court rules. *See* Ariz. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.5 cmt. [7] ("The 'true' or 'classic' retainer is a fee paid . . . merely to insure the lawyer's availability to represent the client and to preclude the lawyer from taking adverse representation. What is often called a retainer but is in fact merely an advance fee deposit involves a security deposit to insure the payment of fees when they are subsequently earned, either on a flat fee or hourly fee basis. A flat fee is a fee of a set amount for performance of agreed work, which may or may not be paid in advance but is not deemed earned until the work is performed. . . ."). *See also* Fla. State Bar R. 4-1.5(e)(2) (defining "retainer," "flat fee," and "advance fee") and Iowa R. Civ. P. 45.8-10 (defining "general retainer," "special retainer, and "flat fee").

[5] It is sometimes said that retainers come in two varieties: "general retainers" and "special retainers." A special retainer is simply an advance going by another, unfortunately misleading, name. *See* Lester Brickman & Lawrence A. Cunningham, *Nonrefundable Retainers Revisited*, 72 N.C. L. REV. 1, 5-6 (1993) ("A special retainer is an agreement between lawyer and client in which the client agrees to pay the lawyer a specified fee in exchange for specified services to be rendered. The fee may be calculated on an hourly, percentage or other basis and may be payable either in advance or as billed.") (footnotes omitted). The Committee is of the opinion that a special retainer is the same thing as an "advance." To be consistent and clear, this opinion will use the term "advance" when referring to such arrangements, although some of the cited sources and authorities may use the term "special retainer."

[6] "Because the general retainer is not a payment for the performance of services, but rather is compensation for the lawyer's promise of availability, the fee is earned by the lawyer at the time the retainer is paid and thus should not be deposited into a client trust account. The general retainer is not an advance deposit against future legal services, which instead would be separately calculated and charged should the lawyer actually be called upon by the client to

contract.[7] In other words, hourly time is not billed against a general retainer and a general retainer is not a flat fee for a specific amount of the lawyer's time – it is solely to reserve the lawyer's availability. An important result of these related features is that the money paid by the client in connection with a general retainer should not be placed in a trust account since it is considered earned upon the commencement of the contract.[8]

Some authorities treat the term "general retainer" or "true retainer," etc., as synonymous with "nonrefundable." This is not correct. A general retainer may, by custom, be considered earned when paid, but this does not mean that it is forever exempt from scrutiny under the Rules. It may be determined to be an unreasonable fee, or even unearned if the lawyer does not make himself or herself available. For example, if a company retains a lawyer to handle a hostile takeover bid should one arise and the lawyer does not, in fact, accept the engagement, then the fee, which may have been paid many months earlier and treated as the lawyer's own property, may be determined to be unreasonable and/or unearned and therefore the subject of an order requiring it to be returned, refunded, or repaid to the client. Other circumstances requiring refund might include the death, disability, suspension, or disbarment of the lawyer. Like all fees, a general retainer must be reasonable under the circumstances.[9]

General retainers "are quite rare,"[10] and have "largely disappeared from the modern practice of law."[11] However, attempts to cast what is actually an advance payment of fees for services to be performed later as a general retainer are very much present today. Given the rarity and unusual nature of a general retainer, and the fact that very few clients would actually need or benefit from one, the nature of the fee and lawyer's obligations and client's benefits under such an agreement must be explained clearly and in detail, including the fact that fees for legal services performed will be charged in addition to the general retainer,[12] and use of the term should be restricted to its traditional definition.

---

perform the legal services in the future." Gregory C. Sisk, *Duties to Effectively Represent the Client*, § 4-4.4(b) (A Retainer for Lawyer Availability), *in* LEGAL ETHICS, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, AND THE LEGAL PROFESSION (West 2016).

[7] Lester Brickman, *The Advance Payment Dilemma: Should Payments be Deposited to the Client Trust Account or to the General Office Account*, 10 CARDOZO L REV. 647, 649 n.13 (1989). *See also In re* O'Farrell, 942 N.E.2d 799, 803 (Ind. 2011).

[8] This opinion does not attempt to exhaustively discuss general retainers. Though they can and do have legitimate uses, for years they have been criticized, disfavored, and narrowly construed based on contract law, public policy, and contemporary ethics principles. *See, e.g.*, Charles J. McClain, Jr., *The Strange Concept of the Legal Retaining Fee*, 8 J. LEGAL PROF. 123 (1983) (common law of retainers "rests on rather shaky conceptual foundations" full of "inconsistencies and contradictions" and "contributing yet another irritant to the already strained relations between the legal profession and the public at large"); Pamela S. Kunen, *No Leg to Stand on: The General Retainer Exception to the Ban on Nonrefundable Retainers Must Fall*, 17 CARDOZO L. REV. 719 (1996) (discussing "historical and descriptive misconceptions" and arguing that, in many instances, such retainers generate the fiduciary obligations attending other lawyer-client fee agreements); and Joseph M. Perillo, *The Law of Lawyers' Contracts Is Different*, 67 FORDHAM L. REV. 443, 449-453 (1998).

[9] MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.5(a); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS § 34 (2001) [hereinafter RESTATEMENT].

[10] Douglas R. Richmond, *Understanding Retainers and Flat Fees*, 34 J. LEGAL PROF. 113, 116 (2009). *See also In re* O'Farrell, 942 N.E.2d at 804 n.5.

[11] Provanzano v. Nat'l Auto Credit, Inc., 10 F. Supp. 2d 44, 51 (D. Mass. 1998).

[12] MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.5(b); RESTATEMENT, *supra* note 9, § 38.

This opinion focuses on advance fees paid by individual clients, usually for a single legal matter (or related matters) that will not recur on a regular basis. Examples include a divorce, defense of criminal charges, and discharge from employment or other civil matters not handled on a contingent fee basis. However, some clients may need legal services of a certain type on a repeat basis and may contract for such services. For example, the client and lawyer may enter into a renewable one-year agreement providing for a monthly payment to handle any or all collections arising out of one or more of the client's businesses. Some lawyers and clients may use the term "retainer" or "general retainer" to refer to such an arrangement. Such arrangements may be perfectly appropriate although they may not meet the definition of a general retainer even if "availability" is said to be a part of the arrangement. Perhaps the arrangement may best be understood as a fixed fee agreement, except that instead of handling one matter for a set fee no matter what services end up being required, the lawyer is handling several matters (subject to whatever limitations the parties place on the number, type, geography, etc., of the matters).[13]

B. Flat or Fixed Fees

Some lawyers prefer to charge their clients a flat or fixed fee for discrete legal services they provide. Examples include closing the purchase of a single-family home, incorporating a small business, drafting a will, or providing a defined, limited-scope service, such as drafting a motion. A flat fee is one that "embraces all work to be done, whether it be relatively simple and of short duration, or complex and protracted."[14]

If a flat or fixed fee is paid by the client in advance of the lawyer performing the legal work, the fees are an advance. Use of the term "flat fee" or "fixed fee" does not transform the arrangement into a fee that is "earned when paid." "Flat" or "fixed" does not even mean that the fee must be paid at the commencement of the representation, although most lawyers who do not have an existing relationship with a client may want to ensure payment and may, therefore, ask for the fee to be paid in advance before committing to the representation. If they do, as will be emphasized below, then that fee must be placed in a Rule 1.15-compliant trust account, to be disbursed to the lawyer only after the fee has been earned.

Several courts and ethics opinions endorse the option of dividing the representation into segments such that certain portions of a flat fee advance are considered earned before completion

---

[13] As we have noted, courts scrutinize purported general retainers to ensure that the lawyer is not attempting to circumvent the ethics rules requiring refund of unearned fees upon termination of the representation. The same is true with what are sometimes called "hybrid" fees or retainers. Such a fee is "a putative general retainer that is denominated as both for availability and for services," and it is likely to be considered by courts to be "fully refundable to the extent not earned by services rendered." Lester Brickman & Lawrence A. Cunningham, *Nonrefundable Retainers: A Response to Critics of the Absolute Ban*, 64 U. CIN. L. REV. 11, 22 (1995). *See also* N.Y. City Bar Formal Op. 2015-2 (Nonrefundable Monthly Fee in a Retainer Agreement) (2015), *citing* Agusta & Ross v. Trancamp Contracting Corp., 193 Misc.2d 781, 785-86 (N.Y. Civ. Ct. 2002) for the proposition that "enforcement of a hybrid retainer 'should be subject to close scrutiny, governed by a rebuttable presumption that any moneys retained by counsel are for services, rather than availability.'"

[14] ABA Comm. on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, Informal Op. 1389 (1977).

of all the contemplated work.[15] Some jurisdictions have codified this approach in their rules.[16] Thus, if agreed to, the lawyer may remove such earned portions of a flat fee advance from trust prior to the completion of the full scope of the legal services to be performed as certain "milestones" or stages of the representation are reached or completed. This approach allows the lawyer to be paid in part before the end of the representation and provides some assistance in determining the refund amount in case of early termination. Of course, "extreme 'front-loading' of payment milestones in the context of the anticipated length and complexity of the representation" may not be reasonable.[17]

C. So Called "Nonrefundable" and "Earned Upon Receipt" Fees

Some lawyers use labels like "nonrefundable retainer," "nonrefundable fee," or "earned on receipt" in the body or title of a fee agreement. These are not actual types of fees. And use of these descriptors does not, in and of itself, make a fee arrangement a general retainer. In fact, these terms are most often used in an attempt to make an advance fee nonrefundable.

The Model Rules of Professional Conduct do not allow a lawyer to sidestep the ethical obligation to safeguard client funds with an act of legerdemain: characterizing an advance as "nonrefundable" and/or "earned upon receipt." This approach does not withstand even superficial scrutiny. A lawyer may not charge an unreasonable fee. See Model Rule 1.5(a) ("A lawyer shall not make an agreement for, charge, or collect an unreasonable fee or an unreasonable amount for expenses."). Comment [4] to Rule 1.5 provides this additional guidance: "A lawyer may require advance payment of a fee, but is obliged to return any unearned portion. See Rule 1.16(d)." See also, Model Rule 1.15(c) and others discussed in connection with Hypothetical 1 below. Therefore, under the Model Rules, an advance fee paid by a client to a lawyer for legal services to be provided in the future cannot be nonrefundable. Any unearned portion must be returned to the client. Labeling a fee paid in advance for work to be done in the future as "earned upon receipt" or "nonrefundable" does not make it so.[18]

Hypothetical scenarios illustrating these concepts and applying the Model Rules are discussed in Section IV below.

---

[15] *See, e.g.*, New Hampshire Bar Assoc. Ethics Committee Practical Ethics Article, *Practical Suggestions for Flat Fees or Minimum Fees in Criminal Cases* (Jan. 17, 2008). *See also In re* Mance, 980 A.2d 1196, 1202, 1204-1205 (D.C. 2009), *citing* Alec Rothrock, *The Forgotten Flat Fee; Whose Money is it and Where Should it be Deposited?*, 1 FLA. COSTAL L.J. 293, 323 (1999) for the proposition that some opinions "allow the lawyer to withdraw fees according to milestones 'based upon passage of time, the completion of certain tasks, or any other basis mutually agreed upon between the lawyer and client.'"

[16] *See, e.g.*, Colo. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.5(h) (defining a flat fee, explaining proper handling, setting forth required contents of the agreement, and appending an authorized form agreement).

[17] *In re* Mance, *supra* note 15.

[18] *See, e.g.*, *In re* O'Farrell, 942 N.E.2d 799, 803 (Ind. 2011) ("Regardless of the term used to describe a client's initial payment, its type is determined by its purpose, i.e., what it is intended to purchase."); Mo. Sup. Ct. Advisory Comm. Formal Op. 128 (Amended 2018) (labels not conclusive); *In re* Wintroub, 277 Neb. 787, 801; 765 N.W.2d 482 (2009) (citing cases from several jurisdictions for the proposition that "a lawyer may not retain an unearned fee, even if the fee agreement clearly provides that the fee is nonrefundable"); Iowa Sup. Ct. Att'y Disciplinary Bd. v. Turner, 918 N.W.2d 130, 147 (Iowa 2018) (simply labeling payment of advance fees as "nonrefundable" does not relieve attorney from obligation to deposit them into trust accounts).

II. Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.15: The Anti-commingling Rule and the Need to Protect Client Funds, Including Advances

Rules of professional conduct exist for the protection of the public. That purpose is well served when the rules are designed and enforced to prevent concrete financial harm to clients. The anti-commingling principle, embodied in Rule 1.15, is a longstanding and effective component in the client protection arsenal. This is why, since their inception in 1908, the American Bar Association's model codes and rules of ethics have prohibited lawyers from commingling their property (including funds) with the property of clients and third parties.[19]

Under the general anti-commingling rule, Model Rule 1.15(a), client property, which includes unearned fees paid in advance, must be held in an account separate from the lawyer's own property.[20] In 2002, Model Rule 1.15 was amended to address specifically the issue of advance fees in a new paragraph (c): "A lawyer shall deposit into a client trust account legal fees and expenses that have been paid in advance, to be withdrawn by the lawyer only as fees are earned or expenses incurred." Therefore, advances must be placed into a lawyer's trust account until those fees are earned.

The Commission on Evaluation of the Rules of Professional Conduct ("Ethics 2000 Commission"), which recommended the addition of this paragraph, did so in response to reports "that the single largest class of claims made to client protection funds is for the taking of unearned fees."[21] Accordingly, paragraph (c) "provides needed practical guidance to lawyers on how to handle advance deposits of fees and expenses."[22] Stated simply, under the Model Rules advance fees must be placed in a Rule 1.15-compliant trust account, to be disbursed to the lawyer only after the fee has been earned.

Some jurisdictions have authorized lawyers to treat advances as the lawyer's property upon payment, so long as the client signs a fee agreement designating the sum as "nonrefundable" or

---

[19] *See* ABA CANONS OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, Canon 11 (1908); ABA MODEL CODE OF PROF'L RESPONSIBILITY, DR 9-102 (1969); ABA MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.15 (1983, revised 2002). One treatise explains the nature and breadth of this key obligation:

> One of the core fiduciary duties of a lawyer is to safeguard the property that the lawyer receives from the client or from other sources but that belongs to the client or third persons. Property received from a client may include funds to be applied to a transaction, a payment in satisfaction of a judgment or settlement, an advance deposit against lawyer's fees, valuable documents to be analyzed, or property of evidentiary value. Under Rule 1.15(a) of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct, "[a] lawyer shall hold property of clients or third persons that is in a lawyer's possession in connection with a representation separate from the lawyer's own property." The lawyer therefore must keep the property in a secure location and segregate those assets from the lawyer's own property. Gregory C. Sisk, Duties to Effectively Represent the Client, § 4-5.6 (The Duty to Safeguard Client Funds and Property), in Legal Ethics, Professional Responsibility, and the Legal Profession (West Academic Publishing, 2016).

[20] *In re* Kendall, 804 N.E.2d 1152, 1161 (Ind. 2004). Also, Rule 1.15(a)'s predecessor was applied to advance fees. Iowa Sup. Ct. Bd. of Prof'l Ethics & Conduct v. Frerichs, 671 N.W.2d 470, 477 (Iowa 2003) (failure to place advance fee in a trust account violated DR 9-102(A)).

[21] A LEGISLATIVE HISTORY: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ABA MODEL RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, 1982–2005 342 (ABA 2006).

[22] *Id.*

"earned on receipt" or some other variation on this theme.[23] This approach departs from the safekeeping policy of the Model Rules described herein and creates unnecessary risks for the client.[24]

III. Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16: Declining or Terminating Representation

Model Rule 1.16(d) requires that, upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall refund "any advance payment of fee or expense that has not been earned or incurred." This Rule, and Rule

[23] *See, e.g.*, Or. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.5(c)(3). That jurisdiction's version of Rule 1.15(c) contains an exception to the anti-commingling rule for advance fees when "the fee is denominated as 'earned on receipt,' 'nonrefundable' or similar terms and complies with Rule 1.5(c)(3)." Or. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.15-1(c). A considerable minority of U.S. jurisdictions have authorized this variant approach to advances by rule, ethics opinion, or judicial decree. *See, e.g.,* State Bar of Ariz. Op. 99-02 (1999) (non-refundable, earned-upon-receipt fee is ethical if reasonable under Rule 1.5 and client is fully informed about and expressly agrees to such a fee, preferably in writing; such a fee does not go into a lawyer's trust account); Fla. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 4-1.5(e)(2)(B) and Comment (nonrefundable flat fee is the property of the lawyer and should not be held in trust); Wash. State Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.5(f)(2) (if agreed to in advance in a writing signed by the client, a flat fee is the lawyer's property on receipt and shall not be deposited into a trust account); and N.Y. St. Bar. Assn. Comm. Prof'l Ethics Op. 816 (2007) (reaffirming 1985 opinion concluding that "fees paid to a lawyer in advance of services rendered are not necessarily client funds and need not be deposited in client trust account"). Such jurisdictions typically provide, via rule or otherwise, that advance fees must be refunded if unreasonable or work remains to be done even if language to the contrary is used and the funds have been taken by the lawyer pursuant to a rule and/or agreement.

[24] See *In re* Long, 368 Or. 452, 455–56, 474-75, 491 P.3d 783, 788–89, 798-99 (2021), cert. denied 142 S. Ct. 2685 (2022), in which the court candidly discussed the rule and its fallout:

> Respondent's limited financial resources also led to his extensive use of fee agreements that allowed him to access advance fees before completing the promised services. . . . The [Oregon] Rules of Professional Conduct allow for alternative fee agreements, under which advance fees become the lawyer's property at the time the fees are received—that is, before the lawyer has performed the promised services. RPC 1.5(c)(3). In those instances, the advance fees are not placed in the lawyer's trust account and are sometimes referred to as "earned on receipt." Fees may be "earned on receipt" only pursuant to a written fee agreement disclosing that "the funds will not be deposited into the lawyer trust account" and that "the client may discharge the lawyer at any time and in that event may be entitled to a refund of all or part of the fee if the services for which the fee was paid are not completed." *Id.* [¶] According to respondent, because he frequently had pressing personal and business costs, he would not have been able to operate his legal practice if he could access a client's fees only after he completed the promised services. . . . [¶] Although respondent's handling of those advance fees did not itself violate a Rule of Professional Conduct, it nevertheless left respondent's clients vulnerable. "Earned on receipt" fee agreements shift the risk of loss to the client. If the client relationship ends before the lawyer has performed the services needed to keep the advance fees, then the lawyer is required to return the fees for the uncompleted work. If the lawyer has already spent the advance fees and has no other financial resources upon which to draw, then the lawyer may be unable to provide the client with the required refund. [¶] That is what happened to many of respondent's clients. . . . [¶] Respondent's misconduct caused extensive injuries, which were not merely financial. Many of respondent's clients had limited financial means and needed their advance fees returned before they could afford to hire new lawyers. When respondent failed to return those advance fees, some clients simply went without legal representation.

1.15, work in tandem to achieve the regulatory objective of protection of the public from financial harm caused by inattentive or unscrupulous lawyers.[25]

Advances are unearned because they are payment today for work to be performed in the future. They were unearned upon receipt and remain unearned until the work is performed. The Model Rules mandate that advances belong to the client, must be preserved until they are actually earned, and must be refunded if the representation terminates before the fees are earned.

As a practical matter it may be somewhat more difficult to determine what has been earned and what is unearned when a representation ends before completion of the contemplated services when the client pays a flat or fixed fee instead of an hourly rate. However, courts routinely apportion the services completed and sum earned when a representation terminates before a lawyer has completed all of the contemplated work.[26]

IV. Hypothetical Scenarios Involving Client Payments at the Commencement of a Specific Representation.

Hypothetical 1 ("Nonrefundable Retainer")

A lawyer is consulted by a client seeking to terminate her marriage. The lawyer informs the client that the lawyer requires a $6,000 "retainer" to cover the filing of a divorce complaint, preparing a motion to enjoin the transfer of assets and a possible motion for a protective order, attending hearings relative to those motions, and any negotiations or related work until the lawyer expends 20 hours. The client was also informed that additional "retainers" may be required to complete the matter, and that the retainers will be credited toward payment for the lawyer's services at the reasonable rate of $300 per hour. The lawyer's fee agreement states, in pertinent part:

> Client agrees to pay Lawyer a nonrefundable retainer fee of $6,000. Client understands that no portion of this fee shall be refunded or returned to Client for any reason.
>
> Client further agrees that should Lawyer expend more than 20 hours on Client's matter, Client shall pay additional retainers as requested by Lawyer which shall be

---

[25] Nothing tarnishes the profession's reputation like a lawyer who takes an advance fee for legal services to be performed in the future, does not complete the work contemplated by the fee arrangement, and does not refund the money, perhaps because he or she cannot. Once the money has been spent by the lawyer, it may never be recovered by the client (or by the client protection fund which may have reimbursed the client). Even if a civil judgment or disciplinary order of restitution is entered it may do little good if the lawyer is impecunious, judgment-proof, or bankrupt. Discipline in that case may offer a measure of public protection through deterrence, but it does not recompense the client. That client's access to justice may also be impeded. The client may be unable to pay another advance fee and may, therefore, be unrepresented if legal aid or pro bono assistance is unavailable. Model Rules 1.15 and 1.16 exist to protect a client from these consequences.

[26] *See, e.g., In re* O'Farrell, 942 N.E.2d 799, 808 (Ind. 2011) (quantum meruit available upon client termination of flat fee agreement). *Cf.* Plunkett & Cooney, PC v. Capitol Bancorp Ltd, 212 Mich. App. 325, 331; 536 N.W.2d 886 (1995) (discharged lawyer with fixed-fee agreement entitled to compensation for services rendered calculated by percentage of services required under contract, unless lawyer and client have agreed to other terms for valuing work completed).

applied to Lawyer's billing for this matter at a rate of $300 per hour and to any costs or expenses incurred in the representation.

Three weeks after signing the agreement and paying the $6,000, Client notified Lawyer that she wanted to reconcile with her husband and asked for an itemization of Lawyer's time and expenses and a refund of any unearned fees. Lawyer had filed the complaint, but it had not been served. Lawyer had also prepared but had not filed a motion to enjoin the transfer of certain assets. Lawyer had spent 5.5 hours on the file and $150 to file the complaint, but responded to the Client that no refund was due because the $6,000 was a nonrefundable fee.

Question: Does Lawyer owe Client a refund for any of the $6,000 paid to Lawyer and are any rule violations established by this scenario?

Answer: Yes, Lawyer owes Client a refund. First, the $6,000 paid by Client to the Lawyer are fees paid in advance not a general retainer. Under this agreement, Lawyer is rendering legal services at the rate of $300 per hour. This is true from the outset as is established by simply reading the portion of the agreement quoted above and performing some simple math. The $6,000 entitles Client to 20 hours of Lawyer's work on the matter.

Second, lawyer was required to have placed the $6,000 of advanced fees into the Lawyer's client trust account. Model Rule 1.15(c) provides that: "A lawyer shall deposit into a client trust account legal fees and expenses that have been paid in advance, to be withdrawn by Lawyer only as fees are earned or expenses incurred." The so-called nonrefundable fee here is an advance payment of fees that may only be withdrawn from the client trust account as earned by Lawyer. The facts of this hypothetical are silent as to whether Lawyer placed the $6,000 in the trust, operating, or personal account and as to whether it was spent in whole or in part. Lawyers may be disciplined for treating advance fees as their own property before the fees are earned, i.e., before the contemplated legal services are rendered.[27] Commingling and perhaps misappropriation may have occurred here if Lawyer deposited the $6,000 into an account other than a client trust account and spent it.

In this scenario, assuming that the legal work performed was appropriate and useful, Lawyer has earned $1,650.00 in legal fees. Lawyer also spent $150 for the expense of filing the complaint. Failure to return the balance of $4,200 is a violation of Model Rule 1.16(d) (upon termination of representation, a lawyer shall refund any advance payment of fee or expense that has not been earned or incurred). Comment [4] to Rule 1.16(d) explains the fundamental legal principle underlying this requirement: "A client has a right to discharge a lawyer at any time, with or without cause, subject to liability for payment for the lawyer's services." Lawyer's failure to provide an accounting for the fees paid in advance also constitutes a violation of Rule 1.15(d).

---

[27] "A lawyer misappropriates client funds in violation of DR 1–102(A)(3), (4), (5), and (6)DR 1–102(A)(3), (4), (5), and (6) when special retainers and flat fees paid in advance are treated as money belonging to the lawyer and not maintained in a trust account until the fee has been earned." Iowa Sup. Ct. Bd. of Pro. Ethics & Conduct v. Frerichs, 671 N.W.2d 470, 475 (Iowa 2003). *See also In re* Fazande, 290 So. 3d 178, 185 (La. 2020) (lawyer violated Rule 1.15(c) by failing to deposit into his client trust account advance fees and costs).

Model Rule 1.5(a) provides: "A lawyer shall not make an agreement for, charge, or collect an unreasonable fee or an unreasonable amount for expenses." Comment [4] to Rule 1.5 states: "A lawyer may require advance payment of a fee, but is obliged to return any unearned portion. See Rule 1.16(d)." Thus, keeping the balance ($4,200) violates Rule 1.5(a) on these facts. Because Rule 1.5 precludes a lawyer from agreeing to an unreasonable fee, it is also violated by the Lawyer's inclusion of the following provision in the fee agreement: "Client agrees to pay Lawyer a nonrefundable fee of $6,000. Client understands that no portion of this fee shall be refunded or returned to Client for any reason."[28]

Finally, because a lawyer may, in fact, be required to refund an advance payment of fees in various situations, characterizing such an advance as "nonrefundable" may also amount to a violation of Rule 1.4 (communication) and Rule 8.4(c) (misrepresentation) as the mischaracterization of the funds may have a chilling effect on a client seeking a refund of unearned fees upon termination of the representation.[29]

Lawyer and the fee agreement use the words "retainer" and "fee" interchangeably. In this hypothetical it appears that the word "retainer" is used incorrectly to refer to the advance payment of legal fees at the initiation of a matter, or, really, at any time during the representation as is suggested by the agreement's provision that additional "retainers" may be required.

Hypothetical 2 (Purported General Retainer)

The facts are the same as in Hypothetical 1, except that the lawyer's standard fee agreement states, in pertinent part:

> Client agrees to pay Lawyer a non-refundable engagement fee of $6,000 which shall be deemed earned upon receipt by Lawyer. This engagement fee is for the purpose of retaining Lawyer and assuring the availability of Lawyer in this matter. Client understands that no portion of the engagement fee shall be refunded or returned to Client for any reason.
>
> Client further agrees that should Lawyer expend more than 20 hours, Client shall pay upon request an additional retainer in an amount determined by Lawyer which shall be applied to Lawyer's billing for this matter at a rate of $300 per hour and to any costs or expenses incurred in the representation.

---

[28] *In re* Kendall, 804 N.E.2d 1152, 1160 (Ind. 2004) ("We hold that the assertion in a lawyer fee agreement that such advance payment is nonrefundable violates the requirement of Prof. Cond. R. 1.5(a) that a lawyer's fee 'shall be reasonable.'"). *See also* N.Y. City Bar Ass'n Formal Opinion 1991-3 (in light of reasonableness requirement, duty to refund unearned fees, and client's "essentially absolute" right to discharge counsel, "a lawyer may not properly denominate or characterize a fee as 'nonrefundable' or otherwise use words that could reasonably be expected to convey to the client the understanding that a fee paid before the services are performed will not be subject to refund or adjustment under any possible circumstance").

[29] *See, e.g.*, *In re* Sather, 3 P.3d 403, 415 (Colo. 2000) (knowing use of misleading language, i.e., describing flat advance fee as "nonrefundable," violated Colo. RPC 8.4(c)) and Ala. State Bar Op. RO-93-21 (1993) ("Any indication by the lawyer that the fee is non-refundable is inaccurate and inherently misleading and would violate Rule 1.4(b) Communication; Rule 1.5(b) Fees; and Rule 8.4(c) Misrepresentation."). *See also* Mo. Sup. Ct. Advisory Comm. Formal Op. 128 (Amended 2018) (in various situations "the description of the fee as 'nonrefundable' is misleading").

Again, the facts are the same: Lawyer spent 5.5 hours and a filing fee for the complaint, and Client reconciles and seeks a refund. Lawyer declines to refund any portion of the fee, claiming it is nonrefundable.

Question: Does Lawyer owe Client a refund for any of the $6,000 paid to Lawyer and are any rule violations established by this scenario?

Answer: Yes. The answer and analysis for Hypothetical 1 apply here as well. The only difference ("retainer" and "engagement fee" language) makes no difference at all. The fee arrangement still has the same basic structure and, for the reasons discussed above, the $6,000 is clearly an advance payment for the future performance of legal services, not an actual "retainer" because the lawyer contemplates billing time against the advance.[30] Accordingly, the $6,000 must be held in trust until earned and any unearned portion properly refunded to the client.

Under the Model Rules, there are no magic words that a lawyer can use to change what is actually an advance payment for fees into a general retainer: "an attorney cannot treat a fee as 'earned' simply by labeling the fee 'earned on receipt' or referring to the fee as an 'engagement retainer.'"[31] Notwithstanding the use of the terms "engagement fee," "retainer," and "availability," the fee in Hypothetical 2 is still not a general retainer fee and is, therefore, not deemed earned on receipt. The purpose of the fee dictates its character and treatment irrespective of labels or terminology used.

Courts examine the transaction and agreement very carefully to ensure that the purported general retainer is not an attempt to charge and retain unearned advance fees.[32] Accordingly, a lawyer claiming to have a general retainer must be prepared to demonstrate a valuable benefit to the client and/or an actual detriment to the lawyer.[33] It is easy to recite that the lawyer is prioritizing the client's work, turning away other work, keeping up on the relevant law, etc. However, it must be shown that such things were not only actually done, but that they were necessary for the representation and not part of the lawyer's basic responsibilities.[34]

---

[30] *Cf. In re* Lais, No. 91-O-08572, 1998 WL 391171, at *14-15 (Cal. Bar Ct. July 10, 1998) (characterization as "'fixed, non-refundable retaining fee' paid 'for the purpose of assuring the availability of [respondent] in this matter'" was "not determinative" and the fee was not a "true" (general) retainer, but actually payment for the first 10 hours of lawyer's services).

[31] *In re* Sather, 3 P.3d 403, 412 (Colo. 2000). *See also* note 18, *supra*.

[32] Richmond, *supra* note 10, at 116: "As a practical matter, general retainers are rare. . .. The types of representations that justify or require general retainers are also scarce. Courts hearing fee related controversies are therefore properly skeptical of general retainer claims." *See also* RESTATEMENT, *supra* note 9, § 34 ("Engagement-retainer fees agreed to by clients not so experienced should be more closely scrutinized to ensure that they are no greater than is reasonable and that the engagement-retainer fee is not being used to evade the rules requiring a lawyer to return unearned fees.")

[33] Att'y Grievance Comm'n of Maryland v. Stinson, 428 Md. 147, 183-185, 50 A.3d 1222, 1244-1245 (2012) (purported engagement fee for "willingness and availability" to represent client not a true general retainer where no benefit to client or detriment to lawyer established and lawyer "produced no useable work").

[34] *See Stinson*, 50 A.3d at 1243 (benefits offered to the client in exchange for the nonrefundable fee were "nothing more than the ethical obligation imposed on all lawyers when they agree to provide legal services to a client. . . . A lawyer who agrees to perform legal services also necessarily agrees to be available to perform those services."), *citing* Lester Brickman & Lawrence A. Cunningham, *Nonrefundable Retainers Revisited,* 72 N.C. L. REV. 1, 24 (1993), and Iowa Sup. Ct. Bd. of Pro. Ethics & Conduct v. Frerichs, 671 N.W.2d 470, 477 (Iowa 2003).

Hypothetical 3 (Flat Fee)

A client seeks to hire a lawyer for representation in a criminal matter. The fee agreement provides: "Client shall pay Lawyer the sum of $15,000 for representation in the matter of State v Client, and that no part of the flat fee shall be refunded for any reason. Client understands that the flat fee is the agreed upon amount due Lawyer regardless of the time expended on the matter or how it is resolved." Client signed the agreement and paid the full $15,000. Lawyer deposited the $15,000 into his firm's operating account. Lawyer reviewed the police report, left a message for the prosecutor and law enforcement officer, appeared on behalf of the defendant at the arraignment, and filed an appearance with the court. A few weeks after the arraignment, Client discharged Lawyer and requested an accounting and partial refund. Lawyer refused, stating that the flat fee was earned when it was paid.

As we noted above, flat fees paid in advance of performing the work are subject to Rule 1.15(c) and the other rules set forth in the analyses in Hypotheticals 1 and 2. In other words, the foregoing rules regarding safekeeping, refundability, and reasonableness apply.

Flat fees are not general retainers and must not be treated as such. That the price set for the representation is not based on hours worked but is instead based on the completion of certain described services does not mean that the fee must be considered earned on receipt or nonrefundable when there is work yet to be done. Of course, if the flat fee is paid *after* the work is completed, the funds are earned and are not deposited into the trust account.

V. Conclusion

The Model Rules protect a client's right to terminate the fiduciary relationship with a lawyer and have the money to which the client is entitled available to obtain successor counsel if desired. Rule 1.15 requires that fees paid in advance must be held in a trust account until the services for which the fees will be paid are actually rendered, thereby allocating various risks to lawyer and client. The lawyer does not have to bear the risk of nonpayment after the work is completed; Rule 1.15 provides a process for withdrawal of earned fees and even for disputes, should they arise. And the client does not have to bear the risk that the funds will be spent, attached by the lawyer's creditors, or otherwise dissipated before the legal work is performed due to a lawyer's unwillingness or inability to do so.

Other ethics opinions and resources discuss good billing practices and fee agreement drafting tips. However, we offer the following suggestions in relation to the matters addressed in this opinion. Use plain language. Thus, instead of "retainer" say "advance" and explain that it is a "deposit for fees."[35] Explain that the sum deposited will be applied to the balance owed for work on the matter, and how and when this will happen. For example, the fee agreement could provide

---

[35] GEOFFREY C. HAZARD, JR., PETER R. JARVIS, TRISHA THOMPSON & W. WILLIAM HODES, THE LAW OF LAWYERING §9.07 (4th ed. 2022-2 Supp. 2014). Of course, the applicable Rules of Professional Conduct must be consulted, and it may be prudent or required to use certain terms. However, accurately translating legal terms of art is not only helpful to the client but also assists with interpretation and enforcement. So, if the term "advance" or "special retainer" is used in the applicable rules, the lawyer will want to use it in the fee agreement. However, consider also adding an explanation that it is functionally a deposit to cover fees for work in the future.

that on a monthly basis the client will be invoiced for the time expended by the lawyer and state when the sum reflected in the invoice will be withdrawn from the trust account. When the arrangement is for hourly billing, explain that if the deposit exceeds the final billing any balance will be remitted to the client. If the advance fee is fixed and the representation may continue for some time or involve several stages, consider dividing the representation into reasonable segments and providing for withdrawal of a reasonable portion of the deposited fee as the representation progresses and the fee becomes partially earned.[36] Finally, it may be wise to recognize the reality that many relationships do not last and include a provision explaining what will happen if the representation is terminated before the matter is completed.[37]

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

321 N. Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois 60654-4714 Telephone (312) 988-5328
CHAIR: Lynda Shely, Scottsdale, AZ ■ Mark A. Armitage, Detroit, MI ■ Melinda Bentley, Jefferson City, MO ■ Matthew Corbin, Olathe, KS ■ Robinjit Kaur Eagleson, Lansing, MI ■ Doug Ende, Seattle, WA ■ Hon. Audrey Moorehead, Dallas, TX ■ Wendy Muchman, Chicago, IL ■ Keith Swisher, Scottsdale, AZ ■ Charles Vigil, Albuquerque, NM

CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY: Mary McDermott, Lead Senior Counsel

[36] *See supra* notes 15 & 16.
[37] Again, see Colo. R. Prof’l Conduct R. 1.5(h) and accompanying flat fee form providing helpful language for dividing a representation into increments and explaining a method of calculating the fees the lawyer has earned should the representation terminate prior to completion of the tasks or events specified in the agreement.