

Question 2

Rita and Fred wanted to form a corporation to be named "Rita's Kitchen, Inc." (RKI) for the purpose of opening a restaurant. They contacted 75 friends who agreed individually to become investors in RKI. Five of these investors also agreed to serve on the RKI Board of Directors with Rita and Fred.

Rita and Fred entered into a five-year lease with Landlord for restaurant space, naming "Rita's Kitchen, Inc., a corporation in formation" as the tenant. They signed the lease as "President" and "Secretary," respectively.

Rita and Fred retained Art as their attorney to form the corporation. They told Art that 75 of their friends had committed to invest and become shareholders of RKI. Irv was a duly appointed representative of the 75 investors. Rita, Fred and Irv met with Art, and they agreed that Art would represent Rita, Fred, and all the investors. After extensive discussions with Rita, Fred, and Irv about the operation of the proposed business, Art agreed to prepare the necessary documentation to incorporate RKI.

Later, outside of Irv's presence, Rita and Fred asked Art to draft a shareholder agreement that would specifically designate Rita and Fred as permanent directors and officers of RKI and set Rita and Fred's annual salaries at 12.5% of the corporate earnings. Without further discussion, Art properly formed the corporation. He then prepared the shareholder agreement, including the terms that Rita and Fred had requested.

The 75 investors each purchased their shares of stock and signed the shareholder agreement. RKI operated for one year but failed to make a profit. RKI ceased operations and currently owes three months of back rent under the lease.

1. Can Landlord recover the unpaid rent from Rita and Fred individually? Discuss.
2. Is the shareholder agreement valid? Discuss.
3. What ethical violations, if any, has Art committed? Discuss, including distinctions, if any, between the ABA Model Rules and California authorities.

Do not discuss federal and state securities laws.

Answer A to Question 2

2)

1. Can the Landlord recover unpaid rent from Rita and Fred individually?

Liability of Promoters on Pre-Incorporation Contracts

Until such time as a corporation complies with all formalities of incorporation and files its articles of incorporation, it does not have a separate legal existence, and cannot enter into contractual obligations such as a lease. Prior to incorporation, it is typical for the corporation's promoters and/or founders to enter into contracts on its behalf. Here, Rita and Fred entered into the lease with the Landlord on behalf of Rita's Kitchen, Inc. ("RKI"), which had not yet been formed. Under the law, a promoter remains personally liable on a pre-incorporation contract unless there has been a subsequent novation (ie., all parties agree to substitute the corporation for the promoters as the party liable on the contract whereby the promoters are thereafter relieved of further personal liability) or unless the contract is explicit in providing that the promoter has no personal liability on the contract.

Here, there has not been a novation to relief [sic] Fred and Rita of liability. However, they would argue that they entered into the contract on behalf of RKI, a corporation in formation, and signed as officers, and therefore made it clear that it was only the corporation and not them personally who would be liable on the lease. Their arguments would not likely succeed because the lease was not explicit in stating that they would not be personally liable thereunder. In the absence of such explicit language, the most likely result is that the court would hold that Rita and Fred as promoters are and remain personally liable on the lease. Therefore, the landlord should be able to recover the unpaid rent from either or both of them.

Indemnification from Corporation

Note also that it is not clear where RKI has ever ratified the lease. If no corporate action was taken to ratify the lease, then the corporation would not be liable thereunder, unless it silently took the benefits of the lease. Here, if RKI did not ratify the lease, it could still be held liable because it took the benefit of the lease without objection.

Note that although Fred and Rita would be held liable for the unpaid rent on the lease, they would have a claim for indemnification against RKI for any amounts that they had to pay personally to the landlord. They will not be able to recover, however, if the corporation does not have sufficient funds to pay.

2. Is the shareholders agreement valid?

As a general matter, shareholders of a privately held corporation such as RKI can and often do enter into shareholders agreements dealing with their rights and obligations as shareholders. These types of agreements commonly provide for matters such as transfer restrictions, rights of first refusal, put and call rights, "tags and drags", preemption rights and registration rights in the event that the corporation becomes public in the future.

Shareholders agreements can also provide shareholders with certain veto rights regarding the overall management of the company. In the context of a closely held private corporation, shareholders can also enter into a shareholders agreement whereby they become the directors of the corporation by agreement, thus doing away with the need to have a separate board of directors. In such situations, the shareholders step into the shoes of the directors and owe each other and the corporation duties as fiduciaries.

It appears that the shareholders agreement in question is problematic for two main reasons. First, it prohibits shareholders from exercising their rights as shareholders to be able to elect and fire directors. Secondly, it prohibits the directors from being able to exercise their responsibility for setting their compensation and the compensation of officers in accordance with principles of prudence and good faith.

Rights of Shareholders to Elect and Remove Directors

Shareholders have the right to elect and fire directors, both with and without cause. An agreement that prohibits shareholders from being able to exercise these powers would be contrary to public policy and likely unenforceable. At the very best, shareholders must have the authority to fire directors for cause (ie, breach of duty of care, duty of loyalty, etc.). To the extent that the shareholders agreement prohibits shareholders for exercising their powers as shareholders by giving Fred and Rita permanent directorships, it is invalid. While shareholders can agree as to the election of directors, directors cannot make themselves permanent and unremovable by way of a shareholders agreement.

Rights and Duties of Directors

A director is a fiduciary, and obligated at all times to act in the best interests of the corporation. A director has certain powers and obligations granted under the corporation's code and at law.

Right to Appoint and Fire Officers

The Board of Directors has the power to appoint and fire officers. The shareholders agreement is problematic because it usurps the authority of the Board to make this determination by making Rita and Fred permanent officers. Officers owe a corporation duties of care and loyalty, and cannot by agreement be made unremovable. At the very least, they must be removable for cause. Therefore, the provision in the shareholders agreement which makes Rita and Fred unremovable as officers is invalid.

Duty of Care and Business Judgment Rule

A director owes the corporation the duty to act as a reasonably prudent person in the management of his or her own affairs, in good faith and in the best interests of the corporation. In exercising his or her duty of care, a director can rely on the business judgment rule if he or she acted in a reasonable, informed manner, with due care and diligence, in exercising his or her judgment.

Duty of Loyalty

A director owes the corporation a duty of loyalty as a fiduciary to act in the best interests of the corporation and to avoid self-dealing to his or her own benefit and/or to the detriment of the corporation.

Breach of Duty of Care and Loyalty

Under the law, directors cannot, as a general matter, agree in advance as to how they will exercise their powers as directors. Here, the shareholders agreement in essence does just that – it provides that the directors (recall that the Board of Directors is made up of five of the investors, plus Rita and Fred) agree in advance not to fire Rita and Fred as officers. This the directors cannot do and, for this reason also, this provision is invalid.

This provision is also likely in violation of the directors' duty of care, because it is improper to agree to never remove officers, as there may be good reason and justification to remove Rita and Fred at some point in the future. Likewise, directors have the duty and obligation to set their own compensation and officers' compensation in accordance with reasonable, good faith parameters, taking into account the needs of the corporation and ensuring that they do not commit a waste of corporate assets in setting compensation. Agreeing in advance to what Fred and Rita's compensation is going to be - at 12.5% of corporate earnings - may constitute a violation of this duty, because it is unclear whether this figure will or won't be a reasonable and proper amount as the corporation moves forward.

Likewise, making themselves unremovable and giving themselves a fixed salary as a percentage of earnings, regardless of whether it is appropriate in light of the corporation's then financial circumstances, constitutes a breach of Fred and Rita's duty of loyalty to the corporation, as they are clearly putting their personal interests ahead of those of the corporation.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the provisions in the shareholders agreement are invalid.

3. What Ethical Violations has Art Committed?

An attorney owes his clients various duties under the applicable rules of professional responsibility. Chief among these is the duty of care, the duty of loyalty and the duty of confidentiality. One of the chief difficulties Art faces is that he has not separately addressed or differentiated between the different clients he represents. He has acted to incorporate RKI, and is arguably counsel to the corporation, whereby he would owe the corporation itself duties of care and loyalty. He is also apparently counsel for Fred and Rita in their personal capacities as incorporators and as officers of the corporation. Finally, he has acted as counsel for the investors in drafting the shareholders agreement. Art's main ethical violation stems from failing to differentiate between the potential and actual conflicting interests of his various clients and failing to advise them to obtain separate counsel as appropriate.

Duty of Care/Competent Representation

Art clearly acted as counsel for the investors by meeting with Irv and representing the investors' interest in drafting the shareholders agreement. In so doing, he breached his duty of competence to exercise the skill, knowledge and diligence that would be expected of an attorney practicing in his community. As discussed above, the shareholders agreements contain provisions that are not in compliance with applicable corporate law and corporate governance principles. Art should not have drafted an agreement containing provisions that are invalid and, in so doing, likely committed malpractice. Likewise, in his role as counsel for Rita and Fred, he should have advised them that the provisions that they sought would not be enforceable, and breached his duty to them in this regard also.

Duty of Loyalty

An attorney is obligated to act in the best interests of his client and cannot take on representation that will result in him not being able to properly represent a client on account of conflicting duties and obligations owed to other clients (for example, where one client's interests are adverse to another's). If an attorney is of the view that he can competently represent all of his clients, he is required to disclose to all that he is representing everyone's interests and to seek the written consent of each client to such joint representation.

Here, Art failed to obtain the written, informed consent all parties to his joint representation of each of them and, in so doing, breached his ethical obligations. Moreover, he failed to seek further consent when it became apparent that Fred and Rita's personal interests as officers (ie, to be permanently appointed and to obtain a guaranteed percentage of corporate earnings) came into conflict with the investors' interests as shareholders in maximizing the return on their investment and fully exercising their rights as shareholders. When it became apparent to Art that Fred and Rita's interests were different than those of the investors (ie, when Rita and Fred spoke to him outside of Irv's presence), he should have alerted them to the fact that he was representing the investors and the corporation and that he could not separately seek to represent their interests. He should have advised Fred and Rita to seek separate, independent counsel to negotiate their compensation and tenure packages with the corporation. Art also failed to alert Irv, as he was arguably required to do, of the validity and desirability (or lack thereof) that Rita and Art had requested. Art therefore failed to fulfill his ethical responsibilities to all clients involved.

Answer B to Question 2

1. Can Landlord recover unpaid rent from Rita (R) and Fred (F)?

Promoter Liability

A promoter is a person who works prior to the incorporation of an entity to secure contracts and services for the to-be-formed entity. A promoter has a fiduciary duty to the other promoters and to the entity to be formed. A promoter can enter agreements on behalf of the to-be-formed entity but can be subject to liability on those agreements.

Adoption and Novation

A corporation does not become liable on a contract entered by a promoter until it adopts the contract. A contract can be adopted expressly by the corporation agreeing to be bound or impliedly by the corp. choosing to accept the benefit of the promoter's contract. Here, there is nothing to indicate that RKI expressly adopted the terms of the lease entered into by their promoters - R and F. However, RKI did accept the benefit of the lease by using the space for its restaurant. Thus, RKI will be bound on the lease.

R & F are also bound

The corporation's act of adopting a contract does not absolve the promoters from liability unless there is an express provision in the contract or a novation in which the corp. and the other party agree that the promoter will not be liable. Here, there is nothing on the lease to indicate R and F would not be liable. It only says they signed as Pres. and Sec. of RKI, "a corporation in formation". Further, there is no evidence of an agreement or novation after RKI was formed absolving them of their liability. Thus, there is no novation and R and F will still be individually liable on the lease with Landlord for the unpaid rent because they were promoters who were not relieved of liability.

2. Is the Shareholder Agreement Valid?

To have a valid shareholder agreement, there needs to be approval from the shareholders. Here, we are told that each of the 75 investors signed the shareholder agreement. Thus, the shareholder agreement is presumptively valid but the terms of the agreement must be examined.

Election of Directors

Directors of a corporation are elected by shareholders at the corporation's annual meeting. Here, the shareholder agreement specifically designated R and F as permanent directors and officers of RKI. By having this provision in the shareholder agreement, the agreement purports to strip the shareholders of their ability to elect directors annually. In this regard, it is invalid.

Removal of Directors

Along with the ability to elect directors, shareholders also have the ability to remove directors with or without cause. The provision of this shareholder agreement indicates that

R and F would be permanent directors. Because shareholders have the ability to remove a director, no director can be permanent. Thus, to the extent the shareholder agreement purports to make R & F permanent directors, it violates the right of shareholders to remove a director and is invalid.

Shareholders Can't Have a Predetermined Agreement of How They Will Vote if Elected Officers [sic]

Shareholders may have agreements for how they will vote on shareholder elections but can't agree to how they will vote as directors. To the extent this shareholder agreement commits R and F along with the 5 other investors who agreed to serve on the RKI board to elect R and F as officers and to set R and F's annual salaries at 12.5% of corporate earnings, it takes away their ability to act in their fiduciary capacity as duly elected directors and is invalid.

Board Decides Its Own Salaries

A board of directors is charged with the management of the company and makes decisions for the company on things such as their salaries. Here, the SH agreements purports to set R and F's salaries. Because the board, and not the shareholders, have the power to manage the company, the shareholders cannot set director and officer compensation. To the extent the SH agreement tries to do this, it is beyond the shareholder's powers and invalid.

Board Elects Officers

Another power inherent in the board of directors is the power to elect officers. Shareholders may have the power to elect directors but they can't elect officers. Thus, to the extent that shareholder agreement elects R and F as permanent officers of RKI, it is invalid because the directors, not the shareholders, are responsible for electing officers.

Thus, while the shareholder agreement as signed by all shareholders is presumptively valid, it is invalid to the extent it improperly elects directors and officers, it does not provide for removal of directors, it binds shareholders to how they will vote as directors, and it improperly sets director and officer compensation.

3. Art's Ethical Violations

Who Does Art Represent?

The first issue in deciding whether Art (A) committed any ethical violations is to determine who Art represents. Here, Art was originally approached by R and F to form the corporation. Also, A met with R and F as well as Irv (I) who was the duly appointed representative of the 75 investors. After meeting with R, F, and I, A agreed to prepare the necessary documentation to incorporate RKI. As a result, A potentially represents R & F, Irv and two other investors, and RKI, the corporation he helped form.

Duty of Loyalty

An attorney owes his client the duty to exercise his professional judgment solely for

the client's interests. If the interest of the attorney, another client or a third person may materially limit the attorney's representation or becomes adverse to the client's interests there is an actual or potential conflict of interest. When an attorney is presented with a conflict, he can only accept or continue the representation if he reasonably believes he can effectively represent all parties, he informs each party about the potential conflict, and the client consents to the representation in writing.

Without consent, an attorney should refuse to take the representation or withdraw from the representation.

A representing R & F and Irv and the Investors

Here, A has a potential conflict by representing both R & F as well as Irv and the investors. While A can say that R, F, and I all had the same interests and wanted to incorporate RKL, because he was representing multiple interests, he needed to be aware of potential or emerging conflicts.

When R & F approached A to draft the shareholder agreement without Irv being involved, A should have been suspicious. When he learned that they wanted the agreement to designate them as officers and directors and set their salaries, their interests were potentially conflicting with I and the investors. At that point, A should have disclosed the proposal to Irv and obtained written consent from I to draft the agreement as requested by R and F. It is also unlikely that a reasonable attorney would believe he could adequately represent both R and F and the investors.

In any event, A should have sought written consent from Irv. Because he did not, he violated his duty of loyalty.

Duty of Confidentiality

A lawyer also has a duty not to reveal anything related to a client's representation without consent. Thus, A can argue that he couldn't tell Irv about his conversation with R & F outside of his presence without violating his duty of confidentiality to R & F. If this is the case, A should have withdrawn from his representation of Irv and the investors and advised them to seek independent counsel re: the shareholder agreement.

Duty of Competence

A lawyer owes his client the duty to use the legal skill, thoroughness, preparation, and knowledge necessary and reasonable for the representation. Here, A had a duty to competently draft the shareholder agreement. For all the problems pointed out above about the shareholder agreement, A violated this duty.

Duty to Communicate

An attorney owes his client a duty to communicate about the matters of the case. Here, A had a duty to tell Irv about the provisions he was drafting in the agreement. Again, A would claim he could not communicate this to I without breaking his duty of confidentiality to R & F. As mentioned above, this again meant A should have withdrawn from the

representation of at least Irv and possibly R & F and urged the parties to seek independent counsel.

Art's Defense

Art will argue that any potential problems were avoided because the investors signed the agreement with the term R & F requested. However, the ends do not justify the means. A had ethical obligations to his client during the representation that he breached. Their later approval of the agreement does not equal informed consent to his breaches throughout.

Question 3

Dan has been in and out of mental institutions most of his life. While working in a grocery store stocking shelves, he got into an argument with Vic, a customer who complained that Dan was blocking the aisle. When Dan swore at Vic and threatened to kick him out of the store, Vic told Dan that he was crazy and should be locked up. Dan exploded in anger, shouted he would kill Vic, and struck Vic with his fist, knocking Vic down. As Vic fell, he hit his head on the tile floor, suffered a skull fracture, and died.

Dan was charged with murder. He pleaded not guilty and not guilty by reason of insanity. At the ensuing jury trial, Dan took the stand and testified that he had been provoked to violence by Vic's crude remarks and could not stop himself from striking Vic. Several witnesses, including a psychiatrist, testified about Dan's history of mental illness and his continued erratic behavior despite treatment.

1. Can the jury properly find Dan guilty of first degree murder? Discuss.
2. Can the jury properly find Dan guilty of second degree murder? Discuss.
3. Can the jury properly find Dan guilty of voluntary manslaughter? Discuss.
4. Can the jury properly find Dan not guilty by reason of insanity? Discuss.