

PRESENTED AT

39th Annual Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy Conference

November 5-6, 2020

Live Webcast

VEXING ISSUES IN CONSUMER CASES

Judge Robert L. Jones

Judge Robert L. Jones
U.S. Bankruptcy Court
Northern District of Texas
Abilene, Amarillo, Lubbock,
and San Angelo Divisions
(806) 472-5020

Internet-Based Law Firms and Use of Appearance Counsel – Is this a Good Model?

- *In re Pearson*, No. 20-30077, ECF No. 69 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. Sept. 22, 2020).

Judge Jernigan issued the *Order Resolving Matters Set Forth in April 9, 2020 Show Cause Order by: (A) Requiring Disgorgement of Fees; and (B) Prescribing Certain Limitations on Use of “Appearance Attorneys” by Attorney Nicholas M. Wajda*. Debtor’s counsel was identified as operating an internet-based law firm, doing business as both Wajda & Associates, APC and Recovery Law Group.

Judge Jernigan set a show-cause hearing in this chapter 13 case because of her concerns “regarding the professional conduct of the Debtor’s attorney.” The conduct included:

- accepting a \$1,500 post-petition retainer without leave of court in violation of the court’s standing order for chapter 13 cases;
- failing to amend debtor’s petition, schedules, SOFA, and creditors matrix, which were “grossly incomplete and inaccurate”;
- filing a nonsensical plan;
- not appearing at debtor’s § 341 meeting or at a contentious hearing on a stay motion (for which he sent an ill-prepared “appearance counsel” who had never met the debtor).

After the show-cause hearing, Judge Jernigan made the following findings:

- though counsel had filed 52 cases in the Northern District, he never actually appeared in court in the Northern District of Texas or attended a § 341 creditors meeting;
- counsel has a registered office address in Dallas, but he is never there; instead, he offices in Culver City, California;

- counsel failed to check for any prior bankruptcy cases filed by the debtor (which there were);
- counsel failed to explain why debtor’s case deficiencies were never addressed; this included deficiencies with the debtor’s schedules, SOFA, petition, and creditors matrix;
- counsel used ill-informed appearance counsel at the § 341 creditors meeting.

The court concluded that counsel’s regular use of “appearance counsel” is “improper and signifies a conscious disregard of his clients.” The “routine, regular delegation of duties to a third-party counsel . . . does not reflect proper adherence to [counsel’s] fiduciary duties to his clients; does not satisfy the requirements imposed on counsel by Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct 1.01(b)(1), (2) and 1.04(f); and does not meet the spirit of paragraph 21(e) of the Standing Order Concerning All Chapter 13 Cases regarding standard fees in a Chapter 13 bankruptcy case.”

The court ordered counsel to disgorge the \$1,500 unauthorized post-petition retainer and that he be barred from using “appearance attorneys” as a routine matter in cases in the Northern District.

Judge Jernigan provided a definition of an “Internet-Based Law Firm” as a law firm that solicits clients through its internet presence or advertising (without regard to location), prepares bankruptcy paperwork for the client, and then largely refers a client to a local attorney for appearing at § 341 meetings and hearings. *Citing* Stephen W. Sather, *Ethics and the Internet Law Firm*, 35 Am. Bankr. Inst. J. 38 (December 2016).

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](https://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Vexing Issues in Consumer Cases

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2020 Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the 39th Annual Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy Conference session "Judges Panel on Vexing Issues in Consumer Cases"