

BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In re

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

WILLIAM R. BRENDGARD,

Lawyer (Bar No. 21254).

Proceeding No. 14#00039 STIPULATION TO SUSPENSION

(206) 727-8207

Under Rule 9.1 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC), and following a settlement conference conducted únder ELC 10.12(h), the following Stipulation to Suspension is entered into by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) of the Washington State Bar Association (Association) through disciplinary counsel Natalea Skvir and Respondent lawyer William Robert Brendgard (Respondent).

Respondent understands that he is entitled under the ELC to a hearing, to present exhibits and witnesses on his behalf, and to have a hearing officer determine the facts, misconduct and sanction in this case. Respondent further understands that he is entitled under the ELC to appeal the outcome of a hearing to the Disciplinary Board, and, in certain cases, the Supreme Court. Respondent further understands that a hearing and appeal could result in an outcome more favorable or less favorable to him. Respondent chooses to resolve this Stipulation to Discipline Page 1 DFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION 1325 4th Avenue, Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98101-2539

1 proceeding now by entering into the following stipulation to facts, misconduct and sanction to 2 avoid the risk, time, expense and publicity attendant to further proceedings. 3 I. ADMISSION TO PRACTICE 4 1. Respondent was admitted to practice law in the State of Washington on November 5 14, 1991. 6 **II. STIPULATED FACTS** 7 2. Gregorio Sicard (Dr. Sicard) contacted Respondent in or around late March 2013 to 8 discuss the advisability of executing a prenuptial agreement prior to his planned October 11, 9 2013 marriage. 3. On April 2, 2013, Respondent signed a Stipulation to Nine-Month Suspension to 10 11 resolve a disciplinary proceeding then pending against him. 12 4. On May 14, 2013, the Association's Disciplinary Board entered an Order approving 13 the Stipulation and a copy of the Order was served on Respondent by the Disciplinary Board 14 Clerk on the same day. 15 5. On May 22, 2013 the Stipulation was forwarded to the Washington Supreme Court for review and entry of an order. 16 17 6. Dr. Sicard met with Respondent on May 17, 2013 and hired him to prepare a 18 prenuptial agreement. 19 7. On May 29, 2013, the Supreme Court notified Respondent that the Stipulation was being circulated to the Court for review. 20 21 8. Respondent was aware that his license was about to be suspended. 22 9. Respondent did not inform Dr. Sicard of the possibility that his license to practice 23 would be suspended in the near future, which could preclude his ability to complete the task for 24 Stipulation to Discipline OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL Page 2 OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION 1325 4th Avenue, Suite 600

Seattle, WA 98101-2539 (206) 727-8207

1	which Dr. Sicard hired him.
2	10. Respondent agreed to perform the work for a \$750 "flat fee" in two installments.
3	11. There was no written fee agreement between Respondent and Dr. Sicard.
.4	12. Dr. Sicard paid Respondent \$350 on or about May 31, 2013.
5	13. Respondent did not deposit Dr. Sicard's \$350 fee payment into a trust account.
6	14. On or about June 1, 2013, Respondent e-mailed Dr. Sicard a rough draft of the
7	prenuptial agreement. As of this date, Respondent had performed approximately 4 hours of
8	legal work.
9	15. Not having heard from Dr. Sicard, on or about June 20, 2013, Respondent sent him
10	an e-mail asking whether he had received the draft and had any questions.
11	16. Dr. Sicard did not reply until July 8, 2013, when he sent Respondent a text message
12	asking him to suggest some lawyers his fiancée could consult to review the agreement.
13	17. Respondent did not respond to Dr. Sicard's July 8, 2013 text message.
14	18. On July 23, 2013, the Washington Supreme Court issued an Order suspending
15	Respondent's license to practice law for nine months, effective July 30, 2013.
16	19. Under former ¹ Rule 14.1 of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC),
17	Respondent was required to notify every client, within ten days of the effective date of his
18	suspension, that he was unable to act as the client's lawyer and the reason therefor, and advise
19	the client to seek legal advice elsewhere.
20	20. Respondent did not timely inform Dr. Sicard of his suspension, as required.
21	21. Respondent did not refund any portion of Dr. Sicard's \$350 fee.
22	22. On or about August 26, 2013, Respondent provided ODC an affidavit attesting to his
23	¹ ELC 14.1 has since been amended, effective January 1, 2014.
24	Stipulation to DisciplineOFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSELPage 3OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION1325 4th Average Suite 600

compliance with ELC Title 14 and stating he had provided all his clients written notice of his
 suspension.

3 23. Between June 20, 2013 and September 17, 2013, Respondent did not contact Dr.
4 Sicard.

24. On September 17, 2013, Dr. Sicard e-mailed Respondent to inquire about finalizing the prenuptial agreement.

7 25. Thereafter, Dr. Sicard learned on his own that Respondent was suspended from
8 practice.

26. On September 19, 2013, Respondent e-mailed Dr. Sicard, informing him that he would be unable to finish the prenuptial agreement because he had a "temporary license restriction from the state bar due to [his] failure to comply with recordkeeping rules for lawyer trust accounts."

27. Respondent's belated notice left Dr. Sicard too little time to find substitute counsel in order to finalize an agreement, and the couple married without executing a prenuptial agreement.

16

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

III. STIPULATION TO MISCONDUCT

28. By failing to inform Dr. Sicard in advance of his likely suspension and the effect it
might have on his ability to complete the work he had agreed to perform, and by failing to
respond to Dr. Sicard's July 8, 2013 communication, Respondent violated RPC 1.4.

20 29. By failing to refund the \$350 he had received for work which ultimately did not
21 benefit Dr. Sicard, Respondent violated RPC 1.5(a).

30. By failing to place Dr. Sicard's flat fee payment into trust in the absence of a fee
agreement complying with RPC 1.5(f)(2), Respondent violated RPC 1.15A(c)(2).

24 || Stipulation to Discipline Page 4 31. By failing to promptly notify Dr. Sicard of his suspension from the practice of law, and his inability to act as his lawyer in finalizing the prenuptial agreement, Respondent violated former ELC 14.1(c)(1).

IV. PRIOR DISCIPLINE

32. In 2003, Respondent was reprimanded for a lack of diligence, failing to keep his client informed of the status of her matter, failing to deposit client funds into his trust account, and failing to return unearned fees in a dissolution matter.

33. In 2004, Respondent was reprimanded for failing to abide by a client's decisions concerning the objectives of the representation, failing to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing the client, failing to keep his client reasonably informed about the status of her matter and promptly comply with reasonable requests for information, and failing to make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of the client in a post-dissolution matter.

34. In 2013, Respondent received a nine-month suspension for trust account irregularities, including a failure to deposit advance fees into his trust account, charging a flat fee without using a written fee agreement that complied with RPC 1.5(f)(2) and poor recordkeeping, and for his failure to communicate adequately with a client.

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

V. APPLICATION OF ABA STANDARDS²

35. The following American Bar Association <u>Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions</u> (1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) apply to this case:

36. ABA <u>Standard</u> 4.1 is most applicable to the duty to handle client funds properly.
37. Respondent's conduct in failing to deposit Dr. Sicard's funds into his trust account
Copies of the relevant ABA <u>Standards</u> are appended to this Stipulation.

24 || Stipulation to Discipline Page 5

1 || was knowing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

38. Dr. Sicard was harmed because he paid Respondent for work that could not be completed as agreed, and he received no refund.

39. The presumptive sanction is suspension.

40. ABA <u>Standard</u> 4.4 is most applicable to the duty to communicate adequately with a client.

41. Respondent acted negligently.

42. Dr. Sicard was harmed because he was unaware, until three weeks before his wedding, of the need to find other counsel to complete work on his prenuptial agreement, he was unable to hire other counsel, and the prenuptial agreement was not finalized or signed.

43. The presumptive sanction is reprimand.

44. ABA <u>Standard</u> 6.2 is most applicable to Respondent's failure to notify Dr. Sicard of his suspension.

45. Respondent acted negligently.

46. Dr. Sicard was harmed because he was unaware, until three weeks before his wedding, of the need to find other counsel to complete work on his prenuptial agreement, he was unable to hire other counsel, and the prenuptial agreement was not finalized or signed.

47. The presumptive sanction is reprimand.

48. ABA <u>Standard</u> 7.0 is most applicable to Respondent's conduct relating to his fee.

49. The presumptive sanction is reprimand.

50. ABA <u>Standard</u> 8.0 applies to engaging in the same or similar misconduct for which
one has previously received discipline.

51. The presumptive sanction is at least suspension.

24 || Stipulation to Discipline Page 6

1	52. The following aggravating factors apply under ABA Standard 9.22:
2	(a) prior disciplinary offenses (see paragraphs 32-34, supra);
3	(c) a pattern of misconduct (see paragraphs 32-34, supra);
4	(d) multiple offenses; and
5	(i) substantial experience in the practice of law: Respondent was admitted in
6	1991.
7	53. No mitigating factors apply under ABA Standard 9.32.
8	54. It is a mitigating factor that Respondent has agreed to resolve this matter at an early
9	stage of the proceedings.
10	55. On balance, the aggravating and mitigating factors do not require a departure from
11	the presumptive sanction of suspension, but do require a suspension of greater length.
12	VI. STIPULATED DISCIPLINE
13	56. The parties stipulate that Respondent shall receive a one-year suspension for his
14	conduct.
15	57. Respondent will be subject to probation for a period of two years, commencing upon
16	Respondent's reinstatement to the practice of law, with periodic reviews under ELC 13.8 of his
17	trust account practices, and shall comply with the specific probation terms set forth below:
18	a) Respondent shall carefully review and fully comply with RPC 1.15A and RPC 1.15B, and shall carefully review the current version of the publication, <u>Managing</u>
19	<u>Client Trust Accounts: Rules, Regulations, and Common Sense</u> .
20	b) For all client matters, Respondent shall have a written fee agreement signed by the client, which agreements are to be maintained for least seven years (see RPC
21	1.15B(a)(3)).
22	c) On a quarterly basis, Respondent shall provide ODC's audit staff with all trust- account records for the time period to be reviewed by ODC's audit staff and
23	disciplinary counsel for compliance with the RPC:
24	Stipulation to DisciplineOFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSELPage 7OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION 1325 4th Avenue, Suite 600

Seattle, WA 98101-2539 (206) 727-8207

.

- i) Months 1-3. By no later than the 30^{th} day of the fourth month after the commencement of probation, Respondent shall provide the trust account records from the date of his/her reinstatement to the end of the third full month.
- ii) Months 4-6. By no later than the 30^{th} day of the seventh month after the commencement of probation, Respondent shall provide the trust account records from the end of the previously provided quarter through the end of month six.
- iii) Months 7 9. By no later than the 30^{th} day of the tenth month after the commencement of probation, Respondent shall provide the trust account records from the end of the previously provided quarter through the end of month nine.
- iv) Months 10 12. By no later than the 30^{th} day of the thirteenth month after the commencement of probation, Respondent shall provide the trust account records from the end of the previously provided quarter through the end of month twelve.
- v) Months 13–15. By no later than the 30th day of the sixteenth month after the commencement of probation, Respondent shall provide the trust account records from the end of the previously provided quarter through the end of month fifteen.
- vi) Months 16 18. By no later than the 30^{th} day of the nineteenth month after the commencement of probation, Respondent shall provide the trust account records from the end of the previously provided quarter through the end of month eighteen.
- vii) Months 19 21. By no later than the 30^{th} day of the twenty-second month after the commencement of probation, Respondent shall provide the trust account records from the end of the previously provided quarter through the end of month twenty-one.

The trust account records Respondent provides to ODC for each quarterly review of his trust account will include: (a) a complete checkbook register for his trust account covering the period being reviewed, (b) complete individual client ledger records for any client with funds in Respondent's trust account during all or part of the period being reviewed, as well as for Respondent's own funds in the account (if any), (c) copies of all trust-account bank statements, deposit slips, and cancelled checks covering the period being reviewed, (d) copies of all trust account client ledger reconciliations for the period being reviewed, and (e) copies of reconciliations of Respondent's trust account check register covering the period being reviewed. The ODC's Audit Manager or designee will review Respondent's trust account records for each period.

24 || Stipulation to Discipline Page 8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Respondent will provide ODC's Audit Manager or designee with copies of any and all fee agreements entered into within the time period at issue. The ODC's Audit Manager or designee may request additional financial or client e) records if needed to verify Respondent's compliance with RPC 1.15A and/or 1.15B. Within twenty days of a request from ODC's Audit Manager or designee for additional records needed to verify Respondent's compliance with RPC 1.15A and/or RPC 1.15B, Respondent will provide ODC's Audit Manager or designee the additional records requested. f) Respondent will reimburse the Association for time spent by ODC's Audit Manager or designee in reviewing and reporting on Respondent's records to determine his/her compliance with RPC 1.15A and RPC 1.15B, at the rate of \$85 per hour. Respondent will make payment within thirty days of each written invoice setting forth the auditor's time and payment due. 58. During the two years of probation, Respondent shall be supervised by an active Washington lawyer to serve as a practice monitor to be approved by ODC. The practice monitor will be required to meet with Respondent every three months to review all active files on his caseload to determine that the matters are being appropriately handled, and to provide summary reports to ODC. Respondent will be responsible for paying any charges of the practice monitor. **VII. RESTITUTION** 59. Prior to reinstatement, Respondent shall be required to pay \$350 restitution, plus interest at the maximum rate permitted under RCW 19.52.020, to Dr. Sicard. 60. Reinstatement from suspension is conditioned on payment of restitution. **VIII. COSTS AND EXPENSES** 61. In light of Respondent's willingness to resolve this matter by stipulation at an early stage of the proceedings, Respondent shall pay attorney fees and administrative costs of \$1,000 in accordance with ELC 13.9(i). The Association will seek a money judgment under ELC Stipulation to Discipline OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OF THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION Page 9 1325 4th Avenue, Suite 600 Seattle, WA 98101-2539 (206) 727-8207

d) On the same quarterly time schedule set forth in the preceding paragraph,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

13.9(*l*) if these costs are not paid within 30 days of approval of this stipulation.

62. Reinstatement from suspension is conditioned upon payment of costs.

IX. VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT

63. Respondent states that prior to entering into this Stipulation he has had an opportunity to consult independent legal counsel regarding this Stipulation, that Respondent is entering into this Stipulation voluntarily, and that no promises or threats have been made by ODC, the Association, nor by any representative thereof, to induce the Respondent to enter into this Stipulation except as provided herein.

64. Once fully executed, this stipulation is a contract governed by the legal principles applicable to contracts, and may not be unilaterally revoked or modified by either party.

X. LIMITATIONS

65. This Stipulation is a compromise agreement intended to resolve this matter in accordance with the purposes of lawyer discipline while avoiding further proceedings and the expenditure of additional resources by the Respondent and ODC. Both the Respondent lawyer and ODC acknowledge that the result after further proceedings in this matter might differ from the result agreed to herein.

66. This Stipulation is not binding upon ODC or the respondent as a statement of all existing facts relating to the professional conduct of the respondent lawyer, and any additional existing facts may be proven in any subsequent disciplinary proceedings.

67. This Stipulation results from the consideration of various factors by both parties, including the benefits to both by promptly resolving this matter without the time and expense of hearings, Disciplinary Board appeals, and Supreme Court appeals or petitions for review. As such, approval of this Stipulation will not constitute precedent in determining the appropriate

24 || Stipulation to Discipline Page 10 sanction to be imposed in other cases; but, if approved, this Stipulation will be admissible in
 subsequent proceedings against Respondent to the same extent as any other approved
 Stipulation.

68. Under Disciplinary Board policy, in addition to the Stipulation, the Disciplinary Board shall have available to it for consideration all documents that the parties agree to submit to the Disciplinary Board, and all public documents. Under ELC 3.1(b), all documents that form the record before the Board for its review become public information on approval of the Stipulation by the Board, unless disclosure is restricted by order or rule of law.

69. If this Stipulation is approved by the Disciplinary Board and Supreme Court, it will be followed by the disciplinary action agreed to in this Stipulation. All notices required in the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct will be made.

70. If this Stipulation is not approved by the Disciplinary Board and Supreme Court, this Stipulation will have no force or effect, and neither it nor the fact of its execution will be admissible as evidence in the pending disciplinary proceeding, in any subsequent disciplinary proceeding, or in any civil or criminal action.

WHEREFORE the undersigned being fully advised, adopt and agree to this Stipulation to Discipline as set forth above.

William Robert Brendgard, Bar No. 21254 Respondent

Natalea Skvir, Bar No. 34 Disciplinary Counsel

Stipulation to Discipline

Page 11

Dated: 11 20 2014

Dated: 11/20/14

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

1 2 APPENDIX TO STIPULATION TO SUSPENSION 3 American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions (1991 ed. & Feb. 1992 Supp.) (excerpts) 4 4.1 Failure to Preserve the Client's Property 5 Absent aggravating or mitigating circumstances, upon application of the factors set out in 3.0, the following sanctions are generally appropriate in cases involving the failure to preserve client 6 property: Disbarment is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly converts client property 4.11 7 and causes injury or potential injury to a client. 4.12 Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knows or should know that he is dealing improperly with client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client. 8 4.13 Reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent in dealing with client property and causes injury or potential injury to a client. 9 4.14 Admonition is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent in dealing with client property and causes little or no actual or potential injury to a client. 10 4.4 Lack of Diligence 11 Absent aggravating or mitigating circumstances, upon application of the factors set out in Standard 3.0, the following sanctions are generally appropriate in cases involving a failure to act with 12 reasonable diligence and promptness in representing a client: 4.41 Disbarment is generally appropriate when: a lawyer abandons the practice and causes serious or potentially serious injury to 13 (a) a client: or a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes serious or (b) 14 potentially serious injury to a client; or a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect with respect to client matters and causes (c) 15 serious or potentially serious injury to a client. 4.42 Suspension is generally appropriate when: 16 a lawyer knowingly fails to perform services for a client and causes injury or (a) potential injury to a client, or 17 (b) a lawyer engages in a pattern of neglect and causes injury or potential injury to a client. 18 4.43 Reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent and does not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes injury or potential injury to a client. 19 4.44 Admonition is generally appropriate when a lawyer is negligent and does not act with reasonable diligence in representing a client, and causes little or no actual or potential 20 injury to a client. 21 6.2 Abuse of the Legal Process Absent aggravating or mitigating circumstances, upon application of the factors set out in 22 Standard 3.0, the following sanctions are generally appropriate in cases involving failure to expedite litigation or bring a meritorious claim, or failure to obey any obligation under the rules of a tribunal 23 except for an open refusal based on an assertion that no valid obligation exists: Disbarment is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly violates a court order or 6.21 24 Stipulation to Discipline OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL Page 12

rule with the intent to obtain a benefit for the lawyer or another, and causes serious injury or potentially serious injury to a party or causes serious or potentially serious interference with a legal proceeding.

6.22 Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knows that he or she is violating a court order or rule, and causes injury or potential injury to a client or a party, or causes interference or potential interference with a legal proceeding.

6.23 Reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer negligently fails to comply with a court order or rule, and causes injury or potential injury to a client or other party, or causes interference or potential interference with a legal proceeding.

6.24 Admonition is generally appropriate when a lawyer engages in an isolated instance of negligence in complying with a court order or rule, and causes little or no actual or potential injury to a party, or causes little or no actual or potential interference with a legal proceeding.

7.0 Violations of Duties Owed as a Professional

Absent aggravating or mitigating circumstances, upon application of the factors set out in Standard 3.0, the following sanctions are generally appropriate in cases involving false or misleading communication about the lawyer or the lawyer's services, improper communication of fields of practice, improper solicitation of professional employment from a prospective client, unreasonable or improper fees, unauthorized practice of law, improper withdrawal from representation, or failure to report professional misconduct.

- 7.1 Disbarment is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional with the intent to obtain a benefit for the lawyer or another, and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.
 - 7.2 Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.
- 7.3 Reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer negligently engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.
- 7.4 Admonition is generally appropriate when a lawyer engages in an isolated instance of negligence that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional, and causes little or no actual or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.

17 || 8.0 *Prior Discipline Orders*

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

Absent aggravating or mitigating circumstances, upon application of the factors set out in Standard 3.0, the following sanctions are generally appropriate in cases involving prior discipline.

- 8.1 Disbarment is generally appropriate when a lawyer:
 - (a) intentionally or knowingly violates the terms of a prior disciplinary order and such violation causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, the legal system, or the profession; or
 - (b) has been suspended for the same or similar misconduct, and intentionally or knowingly engages in further similar acts of misconduct that cause injury or potential injury to a client, the public, the legal system, or the profession.
- 8.2 Suspension is generally appropriate when a lawyer has been reprimanded for the same or similar misconduct and engages in further similar acts of misconduct that cause injury or potential injury to a client, the public, the legal system, or the profession.
- 8.3 Reprimand is generally appropriate when a lawyer:

(a) negligently violates the terms of a prior disciplinary order and such violation

24 || Stipulation to Discipline Page 13

causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, the legal system, or the profession; or

(b) has received an admonition for the same or similar misconduct and engages in further similar acts of misconduct that cause injury or potential injury to a client, the public, the legal system, or the profession.

An admonition is generally not an appropriate sanction when a lawyer violates the terms of a prior disciplinary order or when a lawyer has engaged in the same or similar misconduct in the past.

24 || Stipulation to Discipline Page 14

8.4