

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Torts

QUESTION

Ann, an attorney, represented Harry in his dissolution of marriage proceedings, which involved an acrimonious dispute over custody of Harry and Wilma's minor children.

Ann advised Harry that a favorable custody ruling would be more likely if he could show that Wilma had engaged in improper behavior. Two days after receiving this advice Harry came to Ann's office with his wrist heavily bandaged. Harry told Ann that, when he went by the family home the prior evening to get some of his things, Wilma had tried to run over him with her car, actually hitting him. This was the first suggestion of any violence between Harry and Wilma. After listening to Harry's story, Ann urged Harry to sue Wilma for assault and battery. Ann said: "Filing this suit will improve our bargaining position on custody." Ann did nothing to investigate the truth of Harry's story.

Just before the hearing on custody, Ann filed a tort action on Harry's behalf alleging Wilma had committed an assault and battery on Harry. Ann referred to the tort action at the custody hearing, and Wilma denied that the incident ever occurred. The judge, however, believed Harry's version and awarded sole custody to Harry.

Three months later, Ann learned that Harry had fabricated the story about how he injured his wrist. Ann did not report Harry's lie to anyone and merely failed to prosecute the tort action, which, as a result, was dismissed with prejudice. Wilma then sued Ann for malicious prosecution, abuse of process, and defamation. Wilma also filed a complaint against Ann with the State's office of lawyer discipline.

- A: What is the likelihood that Wilma can succeed on each of the claims she has asserted in her civil suit against Ann? Discuss.
- B: Did Ann's conduct violate any rules of professional ethics? Discuss.

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Torts

ANSWER A

I. What is the likelihood that Wilma (W) can succeed on the following claims against Ann (A) ? -

A. Malicious Prosecution-

Malicious prosecution requires (1) filing of a claim against a party for a purpose other than seeking justice, (2) the claim being dismissed in the defendant's favor (3) that there was a not sufficient probable cause to bring the claim, and (4) damages.

On the first element, W will likely argue that A should have known that the claim was frivolous, or at least suspected that the claim might not be valid because H was suddenly injured two days after A advised H that he needed to obtain evidence of improper behavior by W. Further, W may assert that the fact A filed the claim right before the custody hearing suggests that A's intent was to use the claim against W in the custody hearing. Because A did use the information of the claim in the custody hearing, W will likely meet the requirements of this element (additionally, that A stated to H her intent to file to improve the likelihood of success is evidence of filing for an improper purpose. However, this is confidential communication and W would likely not ever be aware of it).

On the Second Element, the claim was dismissed with prejudice in favor of W because A failed to prosecute the claim prior to filing. Therefore, this element is satisfied.

On the Third Element, W will argue that because the event did not occur, that it was impossible for A to have sufficient probable cause that the event occurred. W will further argue that A failed to make a reasonable investigation to determine whether there was any substance to H's claims (such as inspecting the car, arranging to depose W to determine if W was the driver . . . etc). While A may assert that she had probable cause due to H's injuries, such a line of argument may be undermined by A's failure to investigate the extent of H's injuries by requesting H to seek a doctor. Because there was insufficient probable cause to bring the claim for either battery or assault, W will win on this element.

On the Fourth Element, W must establish some form of pecuniary loss. Because W was required to undergo the expense of preparing to defend the claim against her, W has suffered loss.

Because W has met her burden on all of the elements, she will likely win here.

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress-

Further, W may seek damages for emotional distress under IIED. Because A's conduct was beyond the scope of social tolerance, and A had demonstrated recklessness by not pursuing an investigation, if W has suffered severe emotional distress, W may recover here.

B. Abuse of Process-

JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS

Torts

To establish abuse of process, a party must show (1) that a claim was brought to further an improper purpose, (2) that there was a sufficient act or threat used to accomplish that purpose, and (3) damages.

With regard to the first element, W may argue that the claim was not brought to adjudicate H's injuries, but rather to create false evidence to use against W in the child custody hearing. W may demonstrate that there was no proper purpose by showing that the claim was brought immediately before the child custody hearing even though the claim was not ready to file due to an insufficient investigation. Further, W may assert that the claim was raised as evidence in the hearing, and that after its usefulness had been served, A left the claim to wither by failing to even try and prosecute it. (Additionally, A stated to H her intent to file to improve the likelihood of success is evidence of filing for an improper purpose. However, this is confidential communication and W would likely not ever be aware of it.) While A may assert that she had a justification to file the claim due to H's injuries, such an argument may be undermined by A's failure to investigate the extent of H's injuries by requesting H to seek a doctor. Because there is sufficient evidence that the claim was brought to further H's interests in the custody hearing and not to adjudicate the alleged battery or assault, W will win on this element.

On the second element, W may assert that the act of filing the claim was intended to place pressure on the judge to award H custody by discrediting W's character. Because A filed a frivolous tort claim against W to achieve those purposes, A has engaged in a sufficient act under this element.

Because W has undergone damages, both emotionally (from the claim itself, and its effect in causing W to lose custody of her children) and economically (expenses in fighting the claim), there is sufficient damage here. Therefore, because W has satisfied all of the elements of the claim, she will likely win here.

C. Defamation - To establish a claim for defamation, the plaintiff must prove the following elements:

1. Defamatory Statement -

A statement satisfies the defamatory element if the statement causes harm to a person's reputation. W will argue that a charge of assault and battery ruined her reputation (as evidenced by the judge's decision not to grant W custody of the children). Unless A can show evidence that W had a reputation for being violent, W will win this element.

2. Of or Concerning the Plaintiff -

A statement can be said to be "of or concerning the plaintiff" if a reasonable person would know that the statement was about the plaintiff. Here, the claim was filed in W's name. Therefore, a reasonable person would be able to determine that the statement was concerning W.

3. Publication -

JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS

Torts

The publication element requires that the statement be memorialized in some medium, or communicated to a 3rd party. Here, the statement that W had assaulted H was not only written in a claim that is public record, the claim, was raised in the presence of several persons in the courtroom. Therefore, this element is satisfied.

4. Damages -

As a general rule, a plaintiff does not need to establish damages if the statement was either libel or slander per se. Because the statement was recorded in writing and became public information, the statement is libel. However, W may assert that the statement was slander per se as well. A statement that reflects a crime of moral turpitude will fall under slander per se. W may argue that the battery against a spouse carries a high stigma in our society (and may use the judge's reaction as evidence). Because there is libel and slander per se, W will win on this element.

5. Are there any defenses? -

a. *Absolute Privilege* -

A may assert that absolute privilege applies here. Although A is not a state actor, she is an officer of the court and the statements made against W were in furtherance of her duty to her client as an officer of the court. However, A may assert that A's intention in bringing the claim was not to further H's interests with regard to the assault and battery and that A failed her duty to the court by bringing frivolous claim and should not be entitled to immunity. Because A did not know that H was fabricating his story at the time A filed the claim (even if filed for improper purposes), A should be entitled to privilege here and should not be held liable for defamation.

b. *Qualified Privilege* -

Does not apply.

II. Did Ann's conduct violate an rules of Professional ethics? -

A. Duties to the Court -

1. Filing Frivolous Claims (Rule 11 FRCP) -

Under Rule 11, an attorney, by signing the pleading, agrees that: (1) attorney has brought an action for a proper purpose, (2) the attorney has not brought a frivolous claim, (3) the claim is supported by admissible evidence, and (4) a reasonable investigation have [sic] been conducted to ensure the above.

Here, A should have known that the claim was frivolous, or at least suspected that the claim might not be valid because H was suddenly injured two days after A advised H that he needed to obtain evidence of improper behavior by W. Further, prior to filing the claim A was required to ensure that the claim was supported by admissible evidence. Because A failed to conduct a reasonable investigation to determine whether the evidence was valid, and the claim was meritorious prior to filing the claim, A has violated the rules of ethics.

JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS

Torts

2. Duty to not allow client to commit perjury -

Under the model rules, if a client admits that he/she has committed perjury, the attorney must advise the client to inform the court. If the client refuses, the attorney must attempt to withdraw from representation, and if withdrawal is not possible, the attorney must disclose the perjury to the court. However, under the CA rules, once an attorney has advised the client to disclose the perjury to the court, and the client refuses, the attorney cannot disclose the perjury.

Here, A discovered that H had lied about W trying to hit H with the car, and that H had feigned his injury. Under either of the above stated rules, A had a duty to advise her client to disclose the perjury to the court. However, A did not advise H to disclose the fabrication, but instead chose to allow the case to die without prosecution. Because A failed to take the critical step of advising H to disclose the lie, A has violated the rules of ethics under both the model rules and the CA rules.

3. Duty to Withdraw -

Under the model rules, an attorney cannot assist her client to commit fraud or a crime and must withdraw if the client insists that the attorney pursue these ends. In CA, an attorney's duty to withdraw is permissive, but not required. Here, although H did not ask A to commit fraud, A's failure to withdraw from representing H after learning that H had created his claim against W is questionable. That A failed to at least request H to drop the claim she knew was frivolous may rise to the level of participating in H's fraud.

B. Duties to Client -

1. Breach of Client's Authority -

While an attorney has the right to control the arguments and claims put forth, the client (in civil cases) has the right to determine the objectives of the case. Here, A has asked Harry (H) to file a claim against W for assault and battery. However, H did not consent to filing the claim prior to A's filing. However, because H did not challenge A's filing, H will likely be held to have implicitly ratified A's filing of the claim.

ANSWER B

1. Wilma v. Ann

a. Malicious Prosecution

Malicious prosecution in a civil setting is usually referred to as malicious institution of civil proceedings. It occurs when: 1) a plaintiff institutes - civil proceedings against a defendant; 2) the proceedings are instituted for an improper purpose; 3) the proceedings are resolved in favor of the defendant; 4) the proceedings were instituted without probable cause or a reasonable basis for believing their merit; 5) harm.

First, Ann instituted the tort action against Wilma for assault and battery of Harry.

JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS

Torts

Second, the facts suggest that the sole reason for instituting the proceedings was to gain an advantage in the acrimonious custody battle of the children of Wilma and Harry. The most damaging fact is that Ann “urged” Harry to sue Wilma and said: “Filing this suit will improve our bargaining position on custody.” The fact that Ann mentioned the tort action in the custody hearings suggests that her purpose in bringing the action was for the advantage in the custody battle. Additionally, Ann failed to investigate the facts involved in this situation before bringing the case. When a lawyer brings an action for any reason other than to vindicate the rights of the plaintiff, the purpose is improper. Therefore, Ann acted improperly when she instituted the proceedings against Wilma.

Third, the tort action was dismissed with prejudice when Ann failed to litigate it. Dismissal with prejudice means that Harry is precluded from bringing the action in the future. Therefore, this designation suggests that Wilma is “off the hook” for this tort action and the proceedings were, in fact, resolved in her favor.

Fourth, the facts suggest that Ann brought the action without a reasonable factual basis for believing in its merit. Ann suggested that Harry would have an advantage if he could show that Wilma had engaged in improper behavior. The fact that Harry came into Ann’s office just 2 days after hearing this, claiming that Wilma had attempted to run him over with the car, creates a suspicious causal connection between the advice and the claim. Additionally, the facts indicate that this was “the first suggestion of any violence between Harry and Wilma” and should have put Ann on notice that the claim needed more investigation before bringing suit.

Ann will argue that she is entitled to believe in Harry’s account, and the fact that he had a noticeably bandaged hand gave her a reasonable basis for bringing the suit. Since the judge in the custody hearing believed Harry, he must have been quite convincing. However, as discussed above, this probably is not enough basis to bring the suit, given the circumstances between Harry and Wilma’s acrimonious custody battle.

Fifth, Wilma will certainly be able to show harm because the judge awarded full custody to Harry and she has no custody of her children.

Therefore, because all of these requirements indicate that Ann acted improperly, Wilma will likely be successful on her claim of malicious institution of civil proceedings.

b. Abuse of Process

Abuse of process occurs when a legal process or proceeding is used to gain an improper advantage and such advantage results in harm to the plaintiff. Here, Ann used the legal process of a civil claim in tort against Wilma for allegedly assaulting and battering Ann’s client, Harry.

As discussed above, Ann used this process to gain an improper advantage in the custody hearing between Harry and Wilma. Her advantage was improper because the facts suggest that the sole reason for instituting the proceedings was to gain an advantage in the acrimonious custody battle of the children of Wilma and Harry. The most damaging fact is that Ann “urged”

JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS

Torts

Harry to sue Wilma and said: "Filing this suit will improve our bargaining position on custody." The fact that Ann mentioned the tort action in the custody hearings suggests that her purpose in bringing the action was for the advantage in the custody battle.

Wilma was also likely disadvantaged by Ann's use of the tort action against her. The facts indicate that the judge believed Harry's version of the story over Wilma's and awarded him sole custody of their children. Therefore, Wilma suffered harm and will be successful in showing that Ann abused process by bringing the tort action against her.

c. Defamation

Defamation is the: 1) publication 2) to a third party 3) of a statement about the plaintiff 4) that tends to adversely affect the reputation of the plaintiff. Here, Ann instituted a tort action for assault and battery against Wilma. By filing this complaint, she published in writing the accusations that Wilma acted violently with her husband. This publication is a form of libel. The publication was to a third party because it was filed with the court. Ann published the statements a second time by arguing about them before the judge in the custody hearing. This oral publication is a form of slander.

Because Wilma is not a public figure and the matter is not one of public concern, Wilma does not need to prove that the statement was false.

The statements were clearly about Wilma as the complaint had to name her as defendant and the statements in court must have expressly indicated Wilma as the tortious batterer. These accusations probably tend to adversely affect Wilma's reputation. The accusations suggest that Wilma has violent tendencies against her ex-husband. While some listeners might readily forgive such tendencies, a judge considering whether Wilma is a proper parent certainly would not. Therefore, the accusations not only tend to adversely affect Wilma's reputation but, in fact, hurt her reputation with the judge presiding over the custody hearing.

Defenses

No adequate defenses exist for the malicious prosecution or abuse of process actions.

Common Interest

Ann will try to argue that she had a defense to the defamation action because she made the statements to parties with a common interest. However, this privilege is only a qualified privilege that can be extinguished with abuse. Even though Ann's publication to the judge and the court were to interested parties, Ann did not make any efforts to investigate the truth of the accusation and therefore she abused her privilege of spreading the accusations about Wilma.

Absolute Litigation Privilege

Ann will argue that her comments to the court were privileged because comments in a courtroom have an absolute privilege. Because Ann's publications were to a judge and were in a

JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS

Torts

tort complaint, they do qualify as protected under the absolute privilege for statements made in a courtroom. Therefore, Wilma's defamation action against Ann will fail.

2. Professional Conduct

Duty of Candor to the Court

As an officer of the court, lawyers owe the court a duty of candor. This requires that lawyers do nothing to promote fraud on the court. Ann may have violated this duty by instituting a tort action against Ann without fully investigating the facts first and for the improper purpose of gaining an advantage in the custody battle. Furthermore, she planted the idea in Harry's mind to fabricate conduct about Wilma, thus aiding a client to defraud the court.

When a client seeks representation that would require the attorney to engage in conduct that violates a law or ethical standard, the attorney must withdraw from the representation. Ann should not have represented Harry in this action and should not have counseled her client to improperly gain an advantage by claiming a tort injury. Therefore, Ann will be subject to discipline for this conduct.

Additionally, Ann may have violated her duty of candor to the court when she learned that Harry's story about Wilma was fabricated and merely failed to prosecute the tort action against Wilma.

The ABA Model Rules require that lawyers may not assist their clients in lying to the court. The ABA and California rules say that lawyers may withdraw if they learn that a client has used the lawyer to assist them in a past crime or fraud. California rules of conduct say that lawyers must do nothing to further the deception.

Here, when Ann found out about Harry's lies, she merely failed to prosecute the action against Wilma rather than withdrawing the action. This may have violated her duty of candor to the court because she allowed the case to remain on the docket even after finding out about the lie. Therefore, Ann may be subject to discipline for this action.

Duty Not to Suborn Perjury

Lawyers must not aid clients in suborning perjury. Here, Harry lied to the judge during the custody hearing by claiming that Wilma had engaged in tortious conduct. The ABA would allow Ann to withdraw. California does not allow Ann to do so but she must do nothing to further the deception. In either case, Ann should have counseled Harry to retract his lies to the judge so that the judge would be able to properly rule on the custody matter with truthful facts.

Duty of Fairness to the Adversary

Lawyers owe a duty of fairness to their adversaries. This duty precludes lawyers from engaging in conduct that obstructs the truth-seeking process. By filing a suit to gain an advantage in the custody battle, Ann violated her duty of fairness to Wilma as the adversary. Therefore, Ann is subject to discipline for this violation as well.

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Torts

Duty of Competence

The rules of professional conduct require that lawyers competently serve their clients. The duty of competence requires lawyers to possess all of the knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation necessary for the representation.

Here, Ann may have violated her duty of competence by suggesting that Harry find some improper behavior in Wilma and by urging Harry to file a tort claim for assault and battery without first investigating all of the facts. When Harry came to Ann just two days after Ann's suggesting that Wilma's improper behavior would advantage [sic] Harry in the custody battle, Ann failed to prepare for tort litigation by investigating the facts of the incident. She merely accepted Harry's word.

Additionally, because this was the first suggestion of violence between Harry and Wilma, Ann should have been on notice that investigation was necessary. Therefore, Ann is also probably subject to discipline for violating her duty of competence in failing to adequately prepare for the tort claim against Wilma.