

Legal Malpractice Claims In Pennsylvania

Updated April 1, 2017

by Clifford A. Rieders, Esquire

Rieders, Travis, Humphrey,

Waters & Dohrmann

161 West Third St.

Williamsport, PA. 17701

P: 570-323-8711

F: 570-567-1025

crieders@riederstravis.com

www.riederstravis.com

Copyright 2009, 2014 Clifford A. Rieders

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	5
1.1 Statute of Limitations	5
1.2 Venue	7
1.3 All Claims Related to the Attorney Malpractice Must Be Joined.....	7
1.4 Certificate of Merit.....	7
2. <i>Prima facie</i> case.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1 Attorney - Client Relationship.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2 Negligence – the Failure to Exercise a Reasonable Degree... Error! Bookmark not defined.	
of Knowledge, Skill & Care	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.1 Negligent Settlement Negotiations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.2 Transactional Negligence Drafting Agreements.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.3 Negligent Representation in Criminal Cases	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.4 Violations of the Rules of Professional Responsibility	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.5 Negligently Entering Into Stipulations of Law	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3 Causation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.4 Damages.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.4.1 General Damages.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.4.2 Punitive Damages Against Attorneys.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. Evidentiary Matters	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.1 Expert Testimony	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2 Contributory Negligence	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Other Claims Against Attorneys	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1 Breach of Contract Claims Against Attorneys ...	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2 Breach of Fiduciary Duty.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3 Claims Against Attorneys for Misusing the Legal System Error! Bookmark not defined.	
4.3.1 Abuse of Process Claims Against Attorneys.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.2 Malicious Prosecution.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.3 Wrongful Use of Civil Proceedings	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5. Other Rights Regarding Attorneys	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.1 Non-compete Agreements for Attorneys.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.2 Attorney Client Contractual Terms	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Table of Authorities, Statutes, etc.

Cases

<i>Aiken Indus. v. Estate of Wilson</i> , 383 A.2d 808 (1978)	11
<i>Atkinson v. Haug</i> , 622 A.2d 983, 986 (Pa.Super. 1993).....	4
<i>Bailey v. Tucker</i> , 621 A.2d 108, 115 (Pa. 1993).....	2, 4, 13
<i>Banks v. Jerome Taylor & Assoc's</i> , 700 A.2d 1329, 1332 (Pa. Super. 1997).....	6
<i>Bannar v. Miller</i> , 701 A.2d 242, 247 (Pa.Super. 1997)	15
<i>Barcola v. Hourigan, Kluger & Quinn P.C.</i> , 82 Pa. D. & C.4th 394, 406 (Lackawanna Co. 2006)	10
<i>Beyers v. Richmond</i> , 937 A.2d 1082 (Pa. 2007)	17
<i>Brubacher Excavating Inc. v. W.C.A.B. (Bridges)</i> , 575 Pa. 168, 174 n.2, 835 A.2d 1273, 1277 n.2 (2003)	10
<i>Capozzi v. Latsha & Capozzi</i> , 797 A.2d 314 (Pa. Super. 2002)	18
<i>Chambers v. Montgomery</i> , 192 A.2d 355 (1963)	11
<i>Coleman v. Duane Morris, LLP</i> , 58 A.3d 833 (Pa. Super 2012).....	9, 13
<i>Collas v. Garnick</i> , 624 A.2d 117, 120, <i>appeal denied</i> , 636 A.2d 631 (1993)	4, 5, 7
<i>Commonwealth v. Cole</i> , 709 A.2d 994, 997 (Pa.Commw.1998), <i>appeal denied</i> , 736 A.2d 606 (1999).....	17
<i>Composition Roofers Local 30/30B v. Katz</i> , 581 A.2d 607, 609-10 (1990)	4
<i>Cost v. Cost</i> , 677 A.2d 1250, 1254-1255 (Pa. Super. 1996)	4
<i>D'Allessandro v. Wassel</i> , 587 A.2d 724, 276 (1991)	3
<i>Daniels v. Baritz</i> , 2003 WL 21027238 (E.D.Pa.2003)	17
<i>ei bon ee baya ghananee v. Black</i> , 504 A.2d 281, 284 (1986).....	4
<i>Feld v. Merriam</i> , 506 Pa. 383, 485 A.2d 742 (1984)	11, 12
<i>Fiorentino v. Rapoport</i> , 693 A.2d 208, 219(Pa. Super. 1997)	passim
<i>Francis J. Bernhardt, III, P.C. v. Needleman</i> 705 A.2d 875, 879 (Pa. Super.1997).....	8, 9
<i>Frank v. Terwinkle</i> , 45 A.3d 434 (Pa. Super 2012)	13
<i>Gans v. Mundy</i> , 762 F.2d 338, 340 (3d Cir. 1985)	12
<i>Garcia v. Community Legal Servs. Corp.</i> , 524 A.2d 980, 982 (1987).....	1
<i>Glenbrook Leasing Co. v. Beausang</i> , 839 A.2d 437, 442 (Pa. Super. 2003)	2
<i>Gorski v. Smith</i> , 812 A.2d 683 (Pa. Super. 2002)	1, 12, 13
<i>Gregg v. Lindsay</i> , 649 A.2d 935, 937 n. 1 (Pa.Super.1994).....	4
<i>Guy v. Liederbach</i> , 459 A.2d 744, 748 (1983).....	1, 4, 5, 17
<i>Herman v. Russo</i> , PICS Case No. 13-0822 (C.P. Lehigh Mar. 13, 2013)	10
<i>Hess v. Fox Rothschild, LLP</i> , 925 A.2d 798, 806 (Pa.Super. 2007).....	4, 5, 16, 17
<i>Hilferty v. Shipman</i> , 91 F.3d 573, 579 (3d Cir.1996)	15
<i>Huber v. Taylor</i> , 469 F.3d 67, 82 (3 rd Cir. 2006).....	13, 14
<i>Jones v. Wilt</i> , 871 A.2d 210 (Pa. Super. 2005)	5, 11
<i>Kenis v. Perini Corp.</i> , 682 A.2d 845 at 849 (Pa. Super. 1996)	18
<i>Kirschner v. K&L Gates, LLP</i> , 46 A.3d 737 (Pa. Super.2012)	4, 11, 14
<i>Kituskie</i> , 552 Pa. at 281, 714 A.2d at 1030	9, 10, 11
<i>Kohl v. PNC Bank Nat. Ass'n</i> , 912 A.2d 237 (Pa. 2006)	16
<i>Koval v. Melnick</i> , 83 Pa. D. & C.4th 390, 395 (Phila. Co. 2007)	9
<i>Mariscotti v. Tinari</i> , 485 A.2d 56 (1984).....	11
<i>Maritrans v. Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz</i> , 602 A.2d 1277 (1992) at 1283	13, 14

<i>McGee v. Feege</i> , 535 A.2d 1020 (1987)	14
<i>McMahon v. Shea</i> , 547 Pa. 124, 688 A.2d 1179 (1997).....	4, 5, 6
<i>McPeake v. William T. Cannon, Esquire, P.C.</i> , 381 Pa.Super. 227, 232, 553 A.2d 439, 441 (1989)	4
<i>Merkle v. Upper Dublin School Dist.</i> , 211 F.3d 782, 791 (3d Cir. 2000).....	15
<i>Minnich v. Yost</i> , 817 A.2d 538, 543 (Pa. Super. 2003)	17
<i>Muhammad v. Strassburger, et. al.</i> , 587 A.2d 1346 (Pa. 1991), <i>cert. denied</i> , 502 U.S. 867 (1991)	5, 6
<i>Mumma v. Boswell, Tintner, Piccola & Wickersham</i> , 937 A.2d 459, 465(Pa. Super. 2007)	3
<i>Myers v. Robert Lewis Seigle, P.C.</i> , 751 A.2d 1182 (Pa. Super. 2000).....	10
<i>Nienstedt v. Wetzel</i> , 651 P.2d 876, 33 A.L.R.4th 635 (App.1982).....	9
<i>O’Kelly v. Dawson</i> , 62 A.3d 414 (Pa. Super 2013).....	6
<i>Parkinson v. Kitteridge, Donley, Elson, Fullem & Embick, LLP</i> 2006 WL 2008922, at 2 (Phila. Co. 2006).....	4, 5, 12
<i>Pashak v. Barish</i> , 450 A.2d 67, 69 (1982) (quoting R. Mallen and V. Levitt, <i>supra</i> , § 302, at 353-54 (2d ed. 1981))	11
<i>Pompei v. Williams</i> , 731 A.2d 133 (Pa. Super. 1999).....	8
<i>Poole v. W.C.A.B. (Warehouse Club Inc.)</i> , 570 Pa. 495, 499-500, 810 A.2d 1182, 1184 (2002)	10
<i>Post v. St. Paul Travelers Ins.</i> , 691 F.3d 500 (3d Cir. 2012)	1
<i>Raker v. G.C. Murphy Co.</i> , 58 A.2d 18 (1948)	16
<i>Rizzo v. Haines</i> , 555 A.2d 58, 68 (Pa. 1989)	passim
<i>Robbins & Seventko v. Geisenberger</i> , 674 A.2d 244, 246 (1996).....	1
<i>Rosen v. American Bank of Rolla</i> , 627 A.2d 190, 192 (1993)	14
<i>Rubin Quinn Moss Heaney & Patterson, P.C. v. Kennel</i> , 832 F.Supp. 922, 931-32 (E.D.Pa.1993).....	9
<i>Salamoni v. Karoly</i> , 74 Pa. D. & C.4th 378, 386(Lehigh Co. 2005)	3
<i>Shiner v. Moriarty</i> , 706 A.2d 1228, 1236 (Pa. Super. 1998).....	9, 14, 15, 16
<i>Slaughter v. Rushing</i> , 683 A.2d 1234 (Pa. Super. 1996).....	8
<i>Smith v. Morrison</i> , 47 A.3d 131 (Pa. Super 2012).....	8
<i>Stone Crushed Partnership v. Kassab Archbold Jackson & O’Brien</i> , 908 A.2d 875(Pa. 2006)	4, 16
<i>Storm v. Golden</i> , 538 A.2d 61 (1988).....	12
<i>Wachovia Bank, N.A. v. Ferretti</i> , 935 A.2d 565, 570 (Pa.Super. 2007)	1, 2, 3, 13
<i>Wassall v. DeCaro</i> , 91 F.3d 443 (3d Cir. 1996).....	6
<i>Werner v. Plater-Zyberk</i> , 799 A.2d 776 (Pa.Super. 2002).....	16
<i>Zampana-Barry v. Donaghue</i> , 921 A.2d 500 (Pa. Super. 2007).....	3

Statutes

§323 of the Restatement (Second) of Torts	10
42 Pa. R.C. P. 1020(d)	3
42 Pa. R.C.P. No. 1042.3(b)(1)	3
42 Pa.C.S. §§ 5524(3), 5525.....	1
42 Pa.C.S.A. § 8351.....	15
42 Pa.C.S.A. §§ 8351 - 8355	15
Code of Professional Responsibility EC 7-7 (1974)	5

Pa. Const. Art. 1, § 11	16
Pa. Rule of Professional Conduct 3.1.....	9
Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure No. 1020(d)	3
Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure No. 1042.3.....	3
Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 1.15.....	8
Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 302 (1979)	5, 16
RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 682).....	14
Restatement (Second) of Torts § 908(2) (1977).....	11
Rule 5.6 of the Professional Rules of Conduct.....	18
Section 908(2) of the Restatement (Second) of Torts	11
Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protections Law (UTCPL), 73 P.S. §§ 201-1, <i>et. seq.</i>	17
Other Authorities	
Hall, <i>Turnabout is Fair Play In Malpractice Litigation, Defendant Lawyers Need not Make ‘the Case Within the Case,’</i> 30 P.L.W. 193, 203 (2007).....	10

Legal Malpractice Claims in Pennsylvania

1. Introduction

Various claims can be brought against an attorney for harm to a client. The various claims include breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty to the client and negligence. “[A]n action for legal malpractice may be brought in either contract or tort.” *Wachovia Bank, N.A. v. Ferretti*, 935 A.2d 565, 570 (Pa.Super. 2007), *citing*, *Garcia v. Community Legal Servs. Corp.*, 524 A.2d 980, 982 (1987); See also, *Gorski v. Smith*, 812 A.2d 683 (Pa. Super. 2002) (discussing the different types of claims against attorneys.); *Guy v. Liederbach*, 459 A.2d 744, 748 (1983)(trespass or *assumpsit* theory require proof of different elements.)

The first aspect of representing a legal malpractice claim involves the initial contact with the potential client. At that point in time, an analysis must be done as to what potential claims exist and what deadlines, especially statute of limitations, apply. Next one must assess the merits of the case with the information available. Ideally one would have all of the pertinent court documents, if any, and a copy of the client's file as held by the attorney against whom the legal malpractice is alleged. Also, for many practitioners and their clients, it is also important to determine the ability to collect any damages awarded against the attorney. Thus, one must determine if the attorney has malpractice insurance and the status of the attorney's business liability, such as whether the law firm, business, association is liable and whether the attorney vulnerable personally. Many meritorious malpractice claims may be un-collectable and thus the advice to the client may simply be to report the malpractice to the disciplinary board. At the onset in a legal malpractice action, it is important to determine the scope of coverage of the applicable malpractice insurance. See, e.g., *Post v. St. Paul Travelers Ins.*, 691 F.3d 500 (3d Cir. 2012) (scope of insurer's duty to defend legal malpractice action did not encompass entirety of sanctions proceeding against attorney in medical malpractice action, but was limited to defense costs incurred by attorney subsequent to hospital filing its answer to plaintiff's motion for sanctions

1.1 Statute of Limitations

A critical preliminary matter is ascertaining the deadline for the legal malpractice claims under the correct and applicable statute of limitations. As a general matter, the two-year statute of limitations applies to legal malpractice claims based upon negligence and the four-year period that governs contract disputes applies to legal malpractice claims based upon breach of contract. *Wachovia Bank, N.A. v. Ferretti*, 935 A.2d 565, 571 (Pa. Super. 2007); *Fiorentino v. Rapoport*, 693 A.2d 208, 219(Pa. Super. 1997) 42 Pa.C.S. §§ 5524(3), 5525.

The next question is when the statute of limitations begins to run. “In Pennsylvania, the **occurrence rule** is used to determine when the statute of limitations begins to run.” (emphasis added) *Fiorentino v. Rapoport*, 693 A.2d 208, 219 (Pa. Super.1997), *citing*, *Robbins & Seventko v. Geisenberger*, 674 A.2d 244, 246 (1996).

There appears to be inconsistency in what triggers the running of the statute of limitations in legal malpractice claims. In *Fiorentino*, for example, the Superior Court states that: “[u]nder the Pennsylvania occurrence rule, the statutory period commences when the harm is suffered, or if appropriate, at the time an alleged malpractice is discovered.” *Fiorentino v. Rapoport*, 693 A.2d 208, at 219 (Pa.Super.1997), *citing*, *Bailey v. Tucker*, 621 A.2d 108, 115 (Pa. 1993). In *Fiorentino*, *supra*, the statute of limitations on the negligent drafting of an agreement that involved the payment of money did not begin to run until a party defaulted on the agreement, even after knowledge of the negligence, because the right to sue does not vest until harm is suffered. “[T]he mere breach of a professional duty that causes only the *threat* of *unrealized* future harm does not suffice to create a cause of action for negligence.” *Fiorentino*, *supra*, *citing*, *Rizzo v. Haines*, 555 A.2d 58, 68 (Pa. 1989). Obviously, this could have significant ramifications in the area of malpractice for transactional attorney negligence.

By contrast, in *Wachovia Bank*, the Superior Court states that the trigger for the accrual of a legal malpractice action, ... is not the realization of actual loss, but the occurrence of a breach of duty.” *Wachovia*, 935 A.2d at 572. The court states: “...the statute of limitations in a legal malpractice claim begins to run when the attorney breaches his or her duty, and is tolled only when the client, despite the exercise of due diligence, discovers the injury or its cause.” *Id.* at 573. The Superior Court does not discuss *Fiorentino*, *supra*, in its decision but rejects the “actual loss” argument that the *Fiorentino* court based its decision upon, and cites numerous cases supporting the rejection of this argument. Furthermore, in *Wachovia*, the Superior Court explains that *Rizzo*, *supra* (relied upon by *Fiorentino*) is based upon whether damages are remote or speculative and that speculative damages arise only when the question of the existence of damages as opposed to the amount of damages. Thus, the statute of limitations in the legal malpractice claim in *Wachovia* was not tolled for the pendency or potential pendency of an appeal in the underlying case. *Wachovia*, 935 A.2d at 574.

The Superior Court has rejected the “continuing representation” tolling argument in legal malpractice cases. *Glenbrook Leasing Co. v. Beausang*, 839 A.2d 437, 442 (Pa. Super. 2003). The Court refused to toll the statute of limitations until the date on which the client terminated his attorney. *Glenbrook* involved a real estate matter in which the client’s failed to file a writ of summons within two years of discovering that there was a problem with the deed.

The question of when the statute begins to run is decided by the court when there is no factual dispute and by a jury where there is a factual dispute. *Fiorentino*, *supra*, at 219. In *Fiorentino*, the court noted that the statute of limitations could not begin to run until after the client suffered the harm, and thus, as a matter of law, the statute did not begin to run at the time of the negligent drafting of the agreement. However, there was a factual issue as to when the client was made aware of the harm and that required a jury determination on that issue.

1.2 Venue

A quality - quantity analysis applies to determine whether a claim against a law firm or partnership is brought in an appropriate venue. *Zampana-Barry v. Donaghue*, 921 A.2d 500 (Pa. Super. 2007). Providing legal services to clients in a county satisfies the quality aspect of the test, whereas incidental acts like advertising, hiring, selling insurance, trainings, or referrals do not. *Id.* at 506. The practice of law in a county satisfies the quality test for a law firm or law partnership. *Id.* Furthermore, a trial court would not be reversed in deciding that the quantity test is met when a law firm or partnership has consistently generated approximately three to five percent of its gross business revenue from cases within the county. *Id.* The quantity analysis turns on whether the business is conducted ‘regularly’ as opposed to ‘principally’. *Id.* In *Zampana-Barry*, Judge Klein filed a concurring opinion emphasizing that the ‘quantity’ analysis is inconsistent and without specific guidelines, and for this reason a trial court is unlikely to be reversed on the quantity analysis. *Id.* at 507 (concurring opinion.). The concurring opinion points out: “[I]n reviewing the case law, there are some cases that say 1-2% of contacts in the particular county is enough to meet the ‘quantity’ test, while others say 3% is *not* enough.” *Id.* Thus, venue may be established under 42 Pa.R.C.P. 2130 (partnerships) or 2179(a)(2) (corporations) when a law firm or partnership regularly represents clients in a county, even though it generates only a small percentage of the annual revenue over a period of ten years. *Zampana-Barry*, 921 A.2d 500, 502, 506-509. It should be noted that *Zampana-Barry* case did not involve a motion to transfer based upon *forum non conveniens* under 42 Pa.R.C.P. 1006(d)(1).

1.3 All Claims Related to the Attorney Malpractice Must Be Joined

The Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure No. 1020(d) requires that all claims related to a legal malpractice claim must be joined in one action when they arise out of the same “transaction or occurrence” against the “same person” to avoid waivers of claims related to an attorney’s malpractice. *Wachovia Bank, N.A. v. Ferretti*, 935 A.2d 565, 571 (Pa. Super. 2007), *citing*, *D’Alessandro v. Wassel*, 587 A.2d 724, 276 (1991)(There was no waiver because Rule 1020 requires joinder of actions in the nature of trespass or assumpsit arising from same occurrence but does not apply to equity claims.); 42 Pa. R.C. P. 1020(d).

1.4 Certificate of Merit

The Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure No. 1042.3 requires that a certificate of merit be filed with the complaint or within sixty days after the filing of the complaint, unless one of the two limited exceptions applies. 42 Pa. R.C.P. No. 1042.3. The 60 day limit applies even when the entry of judgment was technically deficient under Civil Rule 236. *Mumma v. Boswell, Tintner, Piccola & Wickersham*, 937 A.2d 459, 465(Pa. Super. 2007) 42 Pa. R.C.P. No. 1042.3(b)(1) requires that “[a] separate certificate of merit shall be filed as to each licensed professional against whom a claim is asserted.” A Common pleas court has held that a single certificate of merit is sufficient against jointly liable defendants in an attorney malpractice case where the certificate of merit names them both. *Salamoni v. Karoly*, 74 Pa. D. & C.4th 378, 386(Lehigh Co. 2005)