

Motions

4:05-cv-00329-GKF-SAJ Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma et al v. Tyson Foods, Inc. et al
DISCREP, LC-1

U.S. District Court

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered by Chilton, Gary on 6/1/2007 at 3:26 PM CDT and filed on 6/1/2007

Case Name: Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma et al v. Tyson Foods, Inc. et al

Case Number: 4:05-cv-329

Filer: Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America
American Tort Reform Association

Document Number: 1158

Docket Text:

MOTION for Leave to File Amicus Curiae *Brief* (Re: [1064] MOTION for Judgment as a Matter of Law) by Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, American Tort Reform Association (With attachments) (Chilton, Gary)

4:05-cv-329 Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Jo Nan Allen jonanallen@yahoo.com, bacaviola@yahoo.com

Frederick C Baker fbaker@motleyrice.com, fhmorgan@motleyrice.com, mcarr@motleyrice.com

Tim Keith Baker tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net

Sherry P Bartley sbartley@mws gw.com, jdavis@mws gw.com

Michael R. Bond michael.bond@kutakrock.com, amy.smith@kutakrock.com

Douglas L Boyd dboyd31244@aol.com

Vicki Bronson vbronson@cwlaw.com, lphillips@cwlaw.com

Paula M Buchwald pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com, dmaple@ryanwhaley.com

Louis Werner Bullock LBULLOCK@MKBLAW.NET, BDEJONG@MKBLAW.NET,
NHODGE@MKBLAW.NET

A Michelle Campney campneym@wwhwlaw.com, steelmana@wwhwlaw.com

Michael Lee Carr hm@holdenoklahoma.com, MikeCarr@HoldenOklahoma.com

Gary S Chilton gchilton@hcdattorneys.com

Bobby Jay Coffman bcoffman@loganlowry.com

Lloyd E Cole , Jr colelaw@alltel.net, amy_colelaw@alltel.net, gloriaeubanks@alltel.net

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-GKF-SAJ
)	
TYSON FOOD, INC., <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**MOTION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA AND THE AMERICAN TORT REFORM ASSOCIATION
FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW IN LIGHT OF PLAINTIFF'S
CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS**

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America (“the Chamber”) and American Tort Reform Association (“ATRA”) hereby move for leave to file a brief as amici curiae in support of the Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law in Light of Plaintiff’s Constitutional Violations filed by defendants Tyson Food Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Cobb Vantress, Inc., Simmons Foods, Inc., Willow Brook Foods, Inc., Cal-Maine Farms, Inc., George’s, Inc., George’s Farms, Inc., and Peterson Farms, Inc. (Doc. No. 1064). The proposed amicus brief is filed concurrently as an appendix to this motion.

THE CHAMBER

The Chamber is the world’s largest business federation, representing an underlying membership of more than three million companies and professional organizations of all sizes and in all industries. In addition to the nearly three thousand Chamber members which are located in Oklahoma, countless others do business within the state and are directly affected by its litigation climate. The Chamber advocates the interests of its members in matters before the courts,

Congress, and the Executive Branch. To that end, the Chamber regularly files *amicus* briefs in cases that raise issues of vital concern to the nation's business community.

AMERICAN TORT REFORM ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1986, ATRA is a broad-based coalition of more than 300 businesses, corporations, municipalities, associations, and professional firms that have pooled their resources to promote reform of the civil justice system with the goal of ensuring fairness, balance, and predictability in civil litigation. For more than a decade, ATRA has filed *amicus curiae* briefs in cases before federal and state courts that have addressed important liability issues.

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

This case is of significant interest to Amici because permitting the state to "contract out" its enforcement power to private attorneys can lead to prosecution of government lawsuits on the basis of profitability, not public interest. Agreements that provide private attorneys with the right to a percentage of the recovery in an action brought on behalf of the state can warp the development of law, are prone to political patronage and exorbitant fees, and create, at minimum, the appearance of impropriety.

The Chamber and ATRA have closely examined this issue, sponsoring studies of the relationship between contingency fee lawyers and state attorneys general in 2000 and 2004. See John Fund, *Cash In, Contracts Out: The Relationship Between State Attorneys General and the Plaintiffs' Bar* (U.S. Chamber Inst. for Legal Reform, 2004), available at <http://www.instituteforlegalreform.com/pdfs/Fund%20AG%20report.pdf>; John Fund & Martin Morse Wooster, *The Dangers of Regulation Through Litigation: The Alliance of Plaintiffs' Lawyers and State Governments* (American Tort Reform Found. 2000), available at <http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=8162>. Amici have also filed a brief in a Rhode

Island case presenting similar issues. See Brief of Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the American Tort Reform Association as Amici Curiae in Support of Petitioners, *Rhode Island v. Lead Indus. Ass'n, Inc.*, Case No. 2004-63-M.P. (R.I. filed May 13, 2005).

Amici have a strong interest in ensuring that this practice not be permitted to continue, lest other members find themselves targeted by private attorneys who are clothed in the mantle of state authority, but who are unrestrained by the constitutional checks and ethical obligations on the exercise of that authority. As the Amici bring a specialized perspective to the possibly far-reaching impact of this Court's decision, they have an important, independent contribution to make to the analysis of the issues presented to this Court.

For the foregoing reasons, the Chamber and ATRA respectfully request that the Court grant its motion to file a brief as amici curiae.

Dated: June 1, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Gary S. Chilton

Gary S. Chilton, OBA No. 1662
HOLLADAY CHILTON & DEGIUSTI, PLLC
204 North Robinson, Suite 1550
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone:(405) 236-2343
Facsimile: (405) 236-2349

Victor E. Schwartz, D.C. Bar No. 406172
(*pro hac vice motion pending*)
Cary Silverman, D.C. Bar No. 473658
(*pro hac vice motion pending*)
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P
600 14th Street N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005-2004
Telephone:(202) 783-8400
Facsimile: (202) 783-4211

ATTORNEYS FOR AMICI CURIAE

Robin S. Conrad, D.C. Bar No. 342774
(pro hac vice motion pending)

NATIONAL CHAMBER
LITIGATION CENTER, INC.
1615 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20062
Telephone: (202) 463-5337
Facsimile: (202) 463-5346

OF COUNSEL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 1st day of June, 2007, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

Jo Nan Allen	Frederick C. Baker	Tim K. Baker
Douglas L. Boyd	Vicki Bronson	Paula M. Buchwald
Louis W. Bullock	Lloyd E. Cole, Jr.	Angela D. Cotner
John Breian DesBarres	W. A. Drew Edmondson	Delmare R. Ehrich
John Elrod	William B. Federman	Bruce W. Freeman
Ronnie Jack Freeman	Richard T. Garren	D. Sharon Gentry
Tony M. Graham	James M. Graves	Michael D. Graves
Thomas J. Grever	Jennifer S. Griffin	Carrie Griffith
John T. Hammons	Jean Burnett	Michael T. Hembree
Theresa Noble Hill	Philip D. Hixon	Mark D. Hopson
Kelly S. Hunter Burch	Stephen L. Jantzen	Mackenzie Hamilton Jessie
Bruce Jones	Jay T. Jorgensen	Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee
Raymond T. Lay	Nicole M. Longwell	Dara D. Mann
Linda C. Martin	A. Scott McDaniel	Robert Park Medearis, Jr.
James Randall Miller	Robert A. Nance	John Stephen Neas
George W. Owens	David Phillip Page	K. Clark Phipps
Marcus N. Ratcliff	Robert P. Redemann	M. David Riggs
Randall E. Rose	Patrick Michael Ryan	Robert E. Sanders
David Charles Senger	William F. Smith	Jennifer F. Sherrill
Colin H. Tucker	John H. Tucker	R. Pope Van Cleef, Jr.
Kenneth E. Wagner	David A. Walls	Elizabeth C. Ward
Sharon K. Weaver	Timothy K. Webster	Gary V. Weeks
Adam Scott Weintraub	Terry W. West	Dale Kenyon Williams, Jr.
E. Stephen Williams	Douglas Allen Wilson	J. Ron Wright
Lawrence W. Zeringue	Bobby Jay Coffman	Laura Samuelson
Reuben Davis		

I further certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing will be mailed via first class U.S. Mail, postage properly paid, on the following who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

<p>C. Miles Tolbert Secretary of the Environment State of Oklahoma 3800 N. Classen Oklahoma City, OK 73118</p> <p>PLAINTIFF</p>	<p>William H. Narwold MOTLEY RICE LLC 20 Church Street 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103</p> <p>ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF</p>
<p>Monte W. Strout 209 W. Keetoowah Tahlequah, OK 74464</p> <p>ATTORNEY FOR CLAIRE WELLS, LOUISE SQUYRES, THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>	<p>Robin Wofford Rt. 2, Box 370 Watts, OK 74964</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>
<p>James R. Lamb D. Jean Lamb STRAYHORN LANDING Rt. 1, Box 253 Gore, OK 74435</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>	<p>Gordon and Susann Clinton 23605 S. Goodnight Lane Welling, OK 74471</p> <p>THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>
<p>Kenneth and Jane Spencer James C. Geiger Individually and dba Spencer Ridge Resort Route 1, Box 222 Kansas, OK 74347</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>	<p>Ancil Maggard c/o Leila Kelly 2615 Stagecoach Dr. Fayetteville, AR 72703</p> <p>THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>
<p>C. Craig Heffington 20144 W. Sixshooter Rd. Cookson, OK 74427</p> <p>PRO SE, SIX SHOOTER RESORT AND MARINA, INC., THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT</p>	<p>Richard E. Parker Donna S. Parker BURNT CABIN MARINA & RESORT, LLC 34996 S. 502 Road Park Hill, OK 74451</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>

James D. Morrison Rural Route #1, Box 278 Colcord, OK 74338 PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT	Jim R. Bagby Route 2, Box 1711 Westville, OK 74965 PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT
Marjorie A. Garman 5116 Hwy. 10 Tahlequah, OK 74464 THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT	Doris Mares Dbas Cookson Country Store and Cabins P.O. Box 46 Cookson, OK 74424 PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT
Eugene Dill P.O. Box 46 Cookson, OK 74424 PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT	Linda C. Martin N. Lance Bryan Doerner, Saunders 320 S. Boston Ave., Ste. 500 Tulsa, OK 74103 THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS
John and Virginia Adair Adair Family Trust Route 2, Box 1160 Stilwell, OK 74960 THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS	Charles L. Moulton Arkansas Natural Resources Commission 323 Center St., Ste. 200 Little Rock, AR 72206

s/Gary S. Chilton
Gary S. Chilton

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, *et al.*,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
 v.) Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-GKF-SAJ
)
 TYSON FOOD, INC., *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

**BRIEF OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA AND THE AMERICAN TORT REFORM ASSOCIATION AS
AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER
OF LAW IN LIGHT OF PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS**

Gary S. Chilton, OBA No. 1662*
HOLLADAY CHILTON & DEGIUSTI, PLLC
204 North Robinson, Suite 1550
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 236-2343
Facsimile: (405) 236-2349

Victor E. Schwartz, D.C. Bar No. 406172
(pro hac vice motion pending)
Cary Silverman, D.C. Bar No. 473658
(pro hac vice motion pending)
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P
600 14th Street N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005-2004
Telephone: (202) 783-8400
Facsimile: (202) 783-4211

ATTORNEYS FOR AMICI CURIAE

Robin S. Conrad, D.C. Bar No. 342774
(pro hac vice motion pending)
NATIONAL CHAMBER
LITIGATION CENTER, INC.
1615 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20062
Telephone: (202) 463-5337
Facsimile: (202) 463-5346

OF COUNSEL
*Counsel of record

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
II. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. The Purpose of Contingency Fees is to Provide Access to Justice to Individuals Who Cannot Otherwise Afford to Bring a Lawsuit; Government Use is Suspect.....	3
B. State Use of Contingency Fee Lawyers Often Leads to Conflicts of Interest, Exorbitant Fees, and a "Revolving Door," and Reduces the Public's Faith In Government	5
1. Political Patronage and the Hiring of Friends and Colleagues	6
2. A Well-Documented History of Exorbitant Fees at the Public's Expense	10
3. Contingency Fee Awards Take Away Public Dollars	13
4. The Revolving Door Between Government Agencies and Private Law Firms ..	14
C. State Hiring of Contingency Fee Lawyers is Unethical and Unconstitutional	15
D. Better Choices for State Attorneys General Exist Than Using Contingency Fee Lawyers	17
1. Actions Involving the State's Police Power Should be Pursued by State Attorneys	17
2. Outside Counsel Should be Available Only in a Supportive Role, On an <i>Hourly</i> Basis With Well-Defined Responsibilities and Close State Supervision	19
3. Attorneys General Have Better Options Than Hiring Contingency Fee Lawyers	20
E. The Growing Use of Contingency Fee Lawyers by State Attorneys General is Contrary to Public Policy	21
IV. CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> , 373 U.S. 83 (1963)	17-18
<i>Berger v. United States</i> , 295 U.S. 78 (1935)	2, 18
<i>Butler v. Legro</i> , 62 N.H. 350 (1882)	3
<i>Camden County Bd. of Chosen Freeholders v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 273 F.3d 536 (3rd Cir. 2001)	23
<i>City of Chicago v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 821 N.E.2d 1099 (Ill. 2004)	23
<i>City and County of San Francisco v. Philip Morris</i> , 957 F. Supp. 1130 (N.D. Cal. 1997) ..	5
<i>City of Philadelphia v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 277 F.3d 415 (3rd Cir. 2002)	23
<i>County of Santa Clara v. Atlantic Richfield Co.</i> , Case No. 1-00-CV-788657 (Cal. Super. Ct., Santa Monica Cty., Apr. 4, 2007)	16
<i>Freeport-McMoran Oil & Gas Co. v. Federal Energy Regulatory Comm'n</i> , 962 F.2d 45 (D.C. Cir. 1992).....	18
<i>Ganim v. Smith & Wesson Corp.</i> , 780 A.2d 98 (Conn. 2001).....	23
<i>Lewis v. Casey</i> , 518 U.S. 343 (1996).....	4
<i>Meredith v. Ieyoub</i> , 700 So. 2d 478 (La. 1997)	10, 16-17
<i>Penelas v. Arms Tech., Inc.</i> , 778 So. 2d 1042 (Fla. App. Ct. 2001).....	23
<i>People ex rel. Clancy v. Superior Ct.</i> , 705 P.2d 347 (Cal. 1985).....	15-16
<i>Rhode Island v. Lead Indus. Ass'n, Inc.</i> , 898 A.2d 1234 (R.I. 2006).....	23
 <u>CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES & REGULATIONS</u>	
Executive Order 13433, "Protecting American Taxpayers From Payment of Contingency Fees," 72 Fed. Reg. 28,441 (daily ed., May 18, 2007).....	21
La. Const., art. II, §§ 1-2.....	17
La. Const., art. III, § 16.....	17

Okla. Const., art. XV, §1	18
Okla. Const., art. IV, § 1	17
Okla. Const., art. V, § 55	17
Okla. Stat. tit. 74, § 18a	18
Okla. Stat. tit. 74, § 21b	18
Okla. Stat. tit. 74, § 250.4	18
Okla. Stat. tit. 74, Ch. 62 App., Standard 257:20-1-4.....	18-19
Okla. Stat. tit. 74, Ch. 62 App., Standard 257:20-1-10.....	18-19
Okla. Stat. tit. 74, Ch. 62 App., Standard 257:20-1-9.....	19
Okla. Stat. tit. 74, Ch. 62 App., Standard 257:20-1-1.....	19
Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-75	2

PUBLICATIONS

Assoc. Press, <i>Lawyer Fees Weren't S.C.'s, Official Says</i> , Charlotte Observer, May 2, 2000, at 1Y	8
Alex Beam, <i>Greed on Trial</i> , Atlantic Monthly, June 1, 2004, at 96	13
Susan Beck, <i>The Lobbying Blitz Over Tobacco Fees: Lawyers Went All Out in Pursuit of Their Cut of a Historic Settlement and the Arbitrators Went Along</i> , Legal Times, Jan. 6, 2003, at 1	22
Lester Brickman, <i>Contingency Fees Without Contingencies: Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark</i> , 37 UCLA L. Rev. 29 (1989)	3, 4
Sheila R. Cherry, <i>Litigation Lotto</i> , Insight on the News, Apr. 3, 2000, available at http://www.insightmag.com/news/2000/04/03/CoverStory/Litigation.Lotto-208397.shtml	11
Connecticut Gen. Assem., Office of Legal Research, Research Report, <i>Attorney General Hiring Practices and the Tobacco Settlement</i> , No. 2000-R-0879, Sept. 15, 2000, available at http://www.cga.ct.gov/2000/rpt/olr/htm/2000-r-0879.htm	7
Guillermo Contreras, <i>Ex-State AG Enters Halfway House</i> , Houston Chronicle, Dec. 23, 2006, at B1.....	11-12

Pamela Coyle, <i>Tobacco Lawyers Reveal How They'll Divvy Up Fee</i> , New Orleans Times Picayune, May 12, 2000, at A1	12
Editorial, <i>Ieyoub's Expedition</i> , New Orleans Times Picayune, Nov. 28, 1994, at B6	10
Editorial, <i>All Aboard the Gravy Train</i> , St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 17, 2000, at B2	9
Editorial, <i>Angel of the O's?</i> , Richmond Times Dispatch, June 20, 2001, at A8	21
<i>For the Record</i> , Wash. Post., Feb. 14, 2000, at F35	15
Sara Fritz, <i>Another N.Y. Official Making National Name for Himself</i> , St. Petersburg Times, Nov. 29, 2002, at A1	20
John Fund, <i>Cash In, Contracts Out: The Relationship Between State Attorneys General and the Plaintiffs' Bar</i> (U.S. Chamber Inst. for Legal Reform, 2004), available at http://www.instituteforlegalreform.com/pdfs/Fund%20AG%20report.pdf	9
John Fund & Martin Morse Wooster, <i>The Dangers of Regulation Through Litigation: The Alliance of Plaintiffs' Lawyers and State Governments</i> (American Tort Reform Found. 2000), available at http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=8162	21-22
William Hathaway, <i>State Sues Drug Companies, Claiming Price Gouging</i> , Hartford Courant, Mar. 14, 2003, at B7	23
Bruce Hight, <i>Lawyers Give up Tobacco Fight</i> , Austin American-Statesman, Nov. 20, 1999, at A1	11, 13
<i>Judge Stops Louisiana's Environmental Bounty Hunt</i> , Gas Daily, Dec. 19, 1994 ..	10
Glen Justice, <i>In Tobacco Suit, Grumblings Over Lawyer Fees</i> , Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 4, 1999	9, 12
Robert A. Levy, <i>The Great Tobacco Robbery: Hired Guns Corral Contingent Fee Bonanza</i> , Legal Times, Feb. 1, 1999, at 27	7, 13
John P. McDermott, <i>Ness Motley Tobacco Suit Fee \$82.5M</i> , Charleston Post & Courier, June 30, 2000	8
Jim McLean, <i>A.G.'s Firm to Share \$54 Million Fee Award</i> , Topeka Cap. J., Feb. 1, 2000, at 1	11
Manhattan Inst., Center for Legal Pol'y, <i>Trial Lawyers, Inc.: A Report on the Lawsuit Industry in America 2003</i> (2003)	22
John Monk, <i>Lawyers May Get \$1.48 Million from State; Controversial Fees is for Work S.C. Hired Them to Do in Wake of Reedy River Oil Spill in 1996</i> , The State (Columbia, S.C.), Nov. 17, 2000, at A1	8, 13-14

John Moritz, <i>Morales Gets 4 Years in Prison</i> , Ft. Worth Star Telegram, Nov. 1, 2003, at 1A	11
David Nitkin & Scott Shane, <i>Angelos to Get \$150 Million for Tobacco Lawsuit</i> , Baltimore Sun, Mar. 23, 2002, at 1A	12
Office of the State Auditor, Mississippi, <i>Informational Review: MCI Tax Settlement With the State of Mississippi (2006)</i> , available at www.osa.state.ms.us/documents/performance/mci-tax-review06.pdf	14
Michael Y. Park, <i>Lawyers See Fat Payoffs in Junk Food Lawsuits</i> , Fox News Channel, Jan. 23, 2002	23-24
John L. Peterson, <i>Attorneys for Kansas Collect \$55 Million In Tobacco Case, Stovall's Ex-Firm Expects \$27 Million</i> , Kansas City Star, Feb. 1, 2000, at B1	10-11
John L. Peterson, <i>Payment for Law Firm Draws Fire; Hearing Continues In Case Involving Tobacco Litigation</i> , Kansas City Star, Feb. 17, 2000, at B3	7
Emily Wagster Pettus, <i>Auditor, Attorney General Feud Over \$14M Fee to Private Attorneys</i> , Assoc. Press, Oct. 23, 2006	14
Robert B. Reich, <i>Don't Democrats Believe in Democracy?</i> , Wall St. J., Jan. 12, 2000, at A22	24
Robert B. Reich, <i>Regulation is out, Litigation is in</i> , USA Today, Feb. 11, 1999, at A15	21
Manuel Roig-Franzia, <i>Attorneys Hired for Suit Gave to Ieyoub Campaigns</i> , New Orleans Times Picayune, Nov. 21, 1998, at A8	10
Miriam Rozen & Brenda Sapino Jeffreys, <i>Why Did Dan Morales Exchange Good Judgment for the Good Life?</i> , Tex. Law., Oct. 27, 2003, at 1	7
Thomas Scheffey, <i>Winning the \$65 Million Gamble</i> , Conn. L. Trib., Dec. 6, 1999, at 1	8, 12-13
Victor E. Schwartz et al., <i>Tort Reform Past, Present and Future: Solving Old Problems and Dealing With "New Style" Litigation</i> , 27 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 237 (2000)	22
Victor E. Schwartz, <i>Trial Lawyers Unleashed</i> , Wash. Post, May 10, 2000, at A29	24
Scott Shane, <i>Angelos Says Panel Can't be Impartial</i> , Baltimore Sun, Nov. 30, 2001, at 1B	12
Scott Shane, <i>Judge to Rule on Dispute Over Legal Fees</i> , Baltimore Sun, Dec. 10, 1999, at 2B	13
Jeff Shields, <i>Taking Law into Their Own Hands</i> , Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 4, 2004	24

Jim Sullinger, <i>Kansas Paid \$2 Million for Legal Aid; Unusual Report Fulfills a Promise by Attorney General</i> , Kansas City Star, Dec. 29, 2004, at B1	19
Stuart Taylor, <i>How a Few Rich Lawyers Tax the Rest of Us</i> , Nat'l J., June 26, 1999.....	10
Alfred D. Youngwood, <i>The Contingency Fee – A Reasonable Alternative?</i> , 28 Mod. L. Rev. 330 (1965)	4
John J. Zefutie, Jr., Comment, <i>From Butts to Big Macs--Can the Big Tobacco Litigation And Nation-Wide Settlement With States' Attorneys General Serve as a Model for Attacking the Fast Food Industry?</i> , 34 Seton Hall L. Rev. 1383 (2004)	24

MISCELLANEOUS

33 A.B.A. Rep. 80 (Canon 13 of the Canons of Ethics)	3
Model Code of Prof'l Responsibility EC 2-20 (1979).....	4
Model Code of Prof'l Responsibility EC 7-14 (1981).....	18
Hearing on H.B. 2893, Before the Kansas House Taxation Comm., Feb. 14, 2000 (testimony of Carla Stovall, Attorney General of Kansas), at http://www.kslegislature.org/committeeminutes/2000/house/HsTax2-14-00b.pdf	6-7
Hearing on H.B. 2893, Before the Kansas House Taxation Comm., Feb. 17, 2000 (testimony of Andrew W. Hutton & Mark B. Hutton, Hutton & Hutton), at http://www.kslegislature.org/committeeminutes/2000/house/HsTax2-17-00b.pdf	7
Hearing on H.B. 2893, Before the Kansas House Taxation Comm., Feb. 17, 2000 (testimony of Jerry Levy, of Jerry K. Levy Law Offices), at http://www.kslegislature.org/committeeminutes/2000/house/HsTax2-17-00b.pdf	11
Manhattan Inst., Center for Legal Pol'y, <i>Regulation Through Litigation: The New Wave of Government-Sponsored Litigation</i> , Conference Proceedings (Wash., D.C., June 22, 1999)	19-20, 21
William H. Pryor, Jr., <i>Curbing the Abuses of Government Lawsuits Against Industries</i> , Speech Before the American Legislative Exchange Council, Aug. 11, 1999	4-5
State of Connecticut, Attorney General's Office, Request for Proposals: Litigation Services Involving Compensatory and Punitive Damages and Injunctive Relief Against Manufacturers, Designers, Refiners, Distributors, and Sellers of Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether ("MTBE") for Pollution and Contamination of the Waters of the State of Connecticut, RFP No. 04-01 (MTBE), Feb. 25, 2004	23
State of Connecticut, Attorney General's Office, Request for Proposals: Litigation Services Involving Claims for Restitution and Other Relief Authorized by Law With Respect to	

Unfair and Deceptive Sales and Marketing Practices by Pharmaceutical Companies With
Respect to the Sale, Marketing and Reporting of the Average Wholesale Price of Their
Drugs and Which Conduct Has Caused harm to the State of Connecticut and to
Consumers, RFP No. 04-02, Dec. 20, 2004 23

I. INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America (“the Chamber”) is the world’s largest business federation, representing an underlying membership of more than three million companies and professional organizations of all sizes and in all industries. In addition to the nearly three thousand Chamber members which are located in Oklahoma, countless others do business within the state and are directly affected by its litigation climate. The Chamber advocates the interests of its members in matters before the courts, Congress, and the Executive Branch. To that end, the Chamber regularly files amicus briefs in cases that raise issues of vital concern to the nation’s business community.

Founded in 1986, the American Tort Reform Association (“ATRA”) is a broad-based coalition of more than 300 businesses, corporations, municipalities, associations, and professional firms that have pooled their resources to promote reform of the civil justice system with the goal of ensuring fairness, balance, and predictability in civil litigation. For more than a decade, ATRA has filed *amicus curiae* briefs in cases before federal and state courts that have addressed important liability issues.

This case is of significant interest to Amici because permitting the state to “contract out” its enforcement power to private attorneys can lead to prosecution of government lawsuits on the basis of profitability, not public interest. Agreements that provide private attorneys with the right to a percentage of the recovery in an action brought on behalf of the state can warp the development of law, are prone to political patronage and exorbitant fees, and create, at minimum, the appearance of impropriety. Amici have a strong interest in ensuring that this practice not be permitted to continue, lest other members find themselves targeted by private attorneys who are clothed in the mantle of state authority, but who are unrestrained by the constitutional checks and

ethics obligations on the exercise of that authority.

II. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This case involves a claim by the State of Oklahoma against several poultry-related businesses seeking damages and injunctive under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-75 (“CERCLA”), and various state claims stemming from alleged pollution from poultry waste in the Illinois River Watershed. Rather than use his own staff and legislatively appropriated resources to prosecute this environmental litigation, Attorney General W.A. Drew Edmondson entered into a contingency fee agreement delegating the state’s enforcement power to three private law firms. The private firms stand to profit through receiving at least one third and as much as half of the monetary damages recovered on behalf of the State.

The interests of government and private contingency fee attorneys are widely divergent. Attorneys for the state are “the representatives not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all.” *Berger v. United States*, 295 U.S. 78, 88 (1935). Conversely, contingency fee attorneys are legitimately motivated by financial incentives to maximize recovery for their private clients. The two functions – impartial governance and for-profit lawsuits– are irreconcilably conflicted. They should not and cannot mix.

Contingency fee agreements were meant to increase access to courts for individuals without the resources to pay an hourly attorney fee; they were not meant for state governments. The Attorney General does not need to hire lawyers on a contingency-fee basis and has other alternatives available – options that safeguard the government’s power. Delegation of the state’s enforcement power to private attorneys on a contingency fee basis circumvents core principles

embodied in the Oklahoma Constitution, statutes governing the conduct of public officials, and ethics rules.

The experience of other states that have engaged in the practice of entering contingency-fee contracts demonstrates that government-hired private attorneys are often political donors, friends, or colleagues of the hiring government official – creating the appearance of impropriety, and sometimes worse. Such practices damage the public’s confidence in government. Moreover, these government-endorsed lawsuits have led to financially-motivated litigation and ill-conceived attempts to expand tort law under the cloak of state authority. This experience repeatedly and persuasively demonstrates that Oklahoma should not set down this path.

III. ARGUMENT

A. **The Purpose of Contingency Fees is to Provide Access to Justice to Individuals Who Cannot Otherwise Afford to Bring a Lawsuit; Government Use is Suspect**

Contingency fees, once viewed as illegal in the United States,¹ gained grudging acceptance in the late nineteenth century. *See, e.g.*, 33 A.B.A. Rep. 80, at 579 (Canon 13 of the Canons of Ethics) (approving of contingency fees, but carefully noting that they “should be under the supervision of the court, in order that clients may be protected from unjust charges”). Contingency fees do have a worthy purpose: providing access to the legal system, regardless of means. *See* Lester Brickman, *Contingency Fees Without Contingencies: Hamlet Without the Prince of Denmark*, 37 UCLA L. Rev. 29, 43-44 (1989). Contingency fees can allow an individual to assert a claim that he or she might not otherwise afford to bring. As one

¹ *See, e.g., Butler v. Legro*, 62 N.H. 350, 352 (1882) (“Agreements of this kind are contrary to public justice and professional duty, tend to extortion and fraud, and are champertous and void”).

commentator observed of the American system, “contingent fees are generally allowed in the United States because of their practical value in enabling the poor man with a meritorious cause of action to obtain competent counsel.” See Alfred D. Youngwood, *The Contingent Fee-A Reasonable Alternative?*, 28 Mod. L. Rev. 330, 334 (1965). Contingency fees can benefit society because they can “provide the only practical means by which one having a claim against another can economically afford, finance, and obtain the services of a competent lawyer to prosecute his claim. . . .” Model Code of Prof’l Responsibility EC 2-20 (1979). Lawyers who work on the basis of a contingency fee are legitimately motivated by financial incentives to maximize recovery for their private clients. See, e.g., *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 374 n. 4 (1996) (“the promise of a contingency fee should also provide sufficient incentive for counsel to take meritorious cases”).

When contingency fees do not further access to the courts for those with limited means or create incentives that violate public policy, they should be viewed with skepticism and scrutiny.² The traditional justifications for contingency fees do not apply to the State of Oklahoma as the “client” in this case. United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit Judge William H. Pryor, Jr., when he was Attorney General of Alabama, observed:

For a long time, contingent fee contracts were considered unethical, but that view gave way to the need for poor persons with valid claims to have access to the legal system. Governments do not have this problem. Governments are wealthy,

² Despite the widespread acceptance of contingency fee agreements today, there remain lingering prohibitions based on sound public policy. For example, contingency fees remain prohibited in criminal defense cases. See Brickman, *supra*, at 40-41. The bar in criminal cases is due to the creation of mis-incentives that threaten to corrupt justice. For instance, if a lawyer’s recovery is based on his or her client’s acquittal, the incentive is to win at any cost, possibly by suborning perjury. See *id.* Likewise, contingency fee agreements create improper incentives when they encourage use of the state’s enforcement power to obtain the highest monetary award at any broader cost to society.

because they have the power to tax and condemn. Governments also control access to the legal system. The use of contingent fee contracts allows governments to avoid the appropriation process and create the illusion that these lawsuits are being pursued at no cost to the taxpayers. These contracts also create the potential for outrageous windfalls or even outright corruption for political supporters of the officials who negotiated the contracts.

William H. Pryor, Jr., *Curbing the Abuses of Government Lawsuits Against Industries*, Speech Before the American Legislative Exchange Council, Aug. 11, 1999, at 8.

Of course, the state of Oklahoma could pay for such a suit without engaging private attorneys on a contingent fee basis: the state takes in several billion dollars of revenue each year, and has the power to raise even more money were this to prove insufficient. But the Attorney General did not use the resources of his office or request an additional appropriation from the people of the state of Oklahoma, through their duly-elected legislators. Instead, by entering into a contingent-fee arrangement that required no immediate out-of-pocket expenditure, the Attorney General circumvented the legislative appropriations process. *See, e.g., City and County of San Francisco v. Philip Morris*, 957 F. Supp. 1130, 1136 n.3 (N.D. Cal. 1997) (finding unconvincing “plaintiff’s argument that, as a matter of public policy, a contingent fee arrangement is necessary . . . to make it feasible for the financially strapped government entities to match resources with the wealthy [corporate] defendants”). This is not the type of “access to justice” that contingency fees were meant to promote.

B. State Use of Contingency Fee Lawyers Often Leads to Conflicts of Interest, Exorbitant Fees, and a "Revolving Door," and Reduces the Public's Faith in Government

In determining the constitutionality of the state’s contracting out of its powers to private attorneys on a contingency fee basis, this Court should closely consider the practical implications of such an approach. In case after case, experience in other states in entering such behind-closed-door contracts, and the resulting exorbitant legal fees, has more than just raised eyebrows.

It has created the appearance of impropriety, and, in one case, led to a criminal conviction. State hiring of contingency fee lawyers provides equal opportunity for political patronage – both Democratic and Republican Attorney Generals awarded lucrative contracts to their friends, colleagues, and supporters. The practice has damaged the public's faith in government. Oklahoma should avoid this unholy alliance between contingency fee lawyers and the State.

1. Political Patronage and the Hiring of Friends and Colleagues

When state attorneys general or other government agencies hire contingency fee counsel, they often do so without the open and competitive process used with other contracts to assure the state receives the best value as when awarding other state contracts. Even where state attorneys general have issued some type of request for proposals, as Attorney General W. A. Edmondson did in this case, there are often lax selection standards. Thus, state attorneys general have routinely hired and awarded potentially lucrative contracts to friends and political supporters. This creates a system whereby the state may not receive the most qualified counsel, taxpayers may not have received the best value, and private attorneys benefit at the expense of the public. There are many such examples, many of which come from the multi-state tobacco litigation.

For instance, in 1996, then-Attorney General Carla Stovall of Kansas hired her former law partners at Entz & Chanay to serve as local counsel in the State's tobacco lawsuit. See Hearing on H.B. 2893, Before the Kansas House Taxation Comm., Feb. 14, 2000, at 16 (testimony of Carla Stovall, Attorney General of Kansas), at <http://www.kslegislature.org/committeeminutes/2000/house/HsTax2-14-00b.pdf>. Attorney General Stovall testified that she asked her former law firm to take the case "as a favor" in part due to their "personal loyalty." *Id.* at 17. In addition to accepting the case that resulted in a "jackpot" fee award, Entz & Chanay performed other "favors" for Attorney General Stovall

during her campaign. First, Entz & Chanay's basement housed Ms. Stovall's Attorney General campaign. *Id.* at 16. In addition, Entz & Chanay also contributed money to her campaign effort. *See* John L. Peterson, *Payment for Law Firm Draws Fire; Hearing Continues In Case Involving Tobacco Litigation*, Kansas City Star, Feb. 17, 2000, at B3. Attorney General Stovall selected her former firm at the expense of another Kansas firm, Hutton & Hutton, which specializes in large product liability cases, and had experience in tobacco litigation. *See* Hearing on H.B. 2893, Before the Kansas House Taxation Comm., Feb. 17, 2000, at 27-88 (testimony of Andrew W. Hutton & Mark B. Hutton, Hutton & Hutton), at <http://www.kslegislature.org/committeeminutes/2000/house/HsTax2-17-00b.pdf>.

Then-Texas Attorney General Dan Morales also hired contingency fee lawyers to file his state's tobacco litigation in 1996. Four of the five hired firms together had contributed nearly \$150,000 in campaign contributions to Morales from 1990 to 1995. *See* Robert A. Levy, *The Great Tobacco Robbery: Hired Guns Corral Contingent Fee Bonanza*, Legal Times, Feb. 1, 1999, at 27. After hiring the firms, Morales reportedly asked them to make an additional political contribution of \$250,000. *See* Miriam Rozen & Brenda Sapino Jeffreys, *Why Did Dan Morales Exchange Good Judgment for the Good Life?*, Tex. Law., Oct. 27, 2003, at 1.

Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal requested letters from individual firms or consortia of firms to represent the state in the tobacco litigation.³ The Attorney General selected four of sixteen firms that expressed interest. As reported in the local media, the three Connecticut-based firms included:

³ *See* Connecticut Gen. Assem., Office of Legal Research, Research Report, *Attorney General Hiring Practices and the Tobacco Settlement*, No. 2000-R-0879, Sept. 15, 2000, available at <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2000/rpt/olr/htm/2000-r-0879.htm>.

- (1) General Blumenthal's own former law firm, Silver, Golub & Teitell in Stamford, where he served for six years prior to becoming Attorney General. Partner David S. Golub is a long-time friend and law school classmate of the Attorney General;
- (2) Emmet & Glander in Stamford, whose name partner, Kathryn Emmet, is married to partner David Golub of Silver, Golub & Teitell; and
- (3) Carmody & Torrance of Waterbury, whose managing partner, James K. Robertson, served as personal counsel and counselor to Governor John Rowland.

See Thomas Scheffey, *Winning the \$65 Million Gamble*, Conn. L. Trib., Dec. 6, 1999, at 1.

Other firms that wanted to be considered for the litigation publicly stated they did not have a fair chance at the contract. For example, Robert Reardon of New London, a former president of the Connecticut Trial Lawyers Association, reportedly could not even get in the door for a meeting.

See id.

South Carolina Attorney General Charles Condon came under fire for cronyism after he handpicked seven law firms to represent the state in the tobacco litigation, six of which included the attorney general's friends or political supporters. See Assoc. Press, *Lawyer Fees Weren't S.C.'s, Official Says*, Charlotte Observer, May 2, 2000, at 1Y.⁴ Attorney General Condon's practice of hiring contingency fee attorneys was not limited to the tobacco suit. He faced heavy criticism after two attorneys with close ties to his party received lucrative fees based on a contingency fee contract by which the lawyers pursued an environmental case on behalf of the state. See John Monk, *Lawyers May Get \$1.48 Million from State; Controversial Fees is for Work S.C. Hired Them to Do in Wake of Reedy River Oil Spill in 1996*, The State (Columbia, S.C.), Nov. 17, 2000, at A1.

⁴ Condon, accused of cronyism in his hiring of the firms, later proposed legislative oversight and competitive bidding for the government's hiring of private attorneys. See John P. McDermott, *Ness Motley Tobacco Suit Fee \$82.5M*, Charleston Post & Courier, June 30, 2000.

Missouri Attorney General Jay Nixon selected five law firms that had made over \$500,000 in political contributions over the preceding eight years, most to him and his party, to handle the state's participation in the tobacco litigation. Editorial, *All Aboard the Gravy Train*, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 17, 2000, at B2. Those firms eventually received \$111 million in fees, an amount decried as "out of proportion to the work performed and the risk involved," given that Missouri was the 27th state to join the litigation, coming in only after the hard work had been done by other states and settlement was inevitable. *Id.* Nixon refused to provide state officials with the criteria used to select the firms and claimed it was "privileged information." See John Fund, *Cash In, Contracts Out: The Relationship Between State Attorneys General and the Plaintiffs' Bar* 8 (U.S. Chamber Inst. for Legal Reform, 2004), available at <http://www.instituteforlegalreform.com/pdfs/Fund%20AG%20report.pdf>. And when Nixon ran unsuccessfully for the United States Senate in 1998, numerous attorneys in those firms made \$1,000 contributions to his campaign, the maximum individual donation permitted by law. See *id.* at 7.

Likewise, the two firms selected by then Pennsylvania Attorney General Mike Fisher to handle the tobacco lawsuits also happened to be among his largest campaign donors, placing in the top ten on a list of more than two hundred contributors. See Glen Justice, *In Tobacco Suit, Grumblings Over Lawyer Fees*, Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 4, 1999, at A1. Both firms also gave to General Fisher's inaugural committee. See *id.* When asked how he selected the two firms, General Fisher said "there was a familiarity factor" and "that was how the decision was made." *Id.* (quoting Attorney General Fisher).

While the tobacco litigation provides some of the most blatant examples of political favoritism, contingency fee contracts between states and private lawyers have raised controversy

and concern in other areas as well. For instance, in 1994, Louisiana Attorney General Richard Ieyoub proposed to hire fourteen law firms – including many past contributors to his campaigns – to pursue environmental claims on behalf of his office. Editorial, *Ieyoub's Expedition*, New Orleans Times Picayune, Nov. 28, 1994 at B6. The private firms, which did not specialize in environmental law, were to receive 25% of the amounts recovered. *Id.*; *Judge Stops Louisiana's Environmental Bounty Hunt*, Gas Daily, Dec. 19, 1994. When the propriety of these contracts was challenged in court, the Louisiana Supreme Court invalidated the contingency fee agreements. See *Meredith v. Ieyoub*, 700 So. 2d 478 (La. 1997) (discussed *infra* pp. 15-16). Nevertheless, Ieyoub received more than \$84,500 for his successful 1991 and 1995 attorney general races and his failed 1996 bid for the U.S. Senate from twelve of the seventeen law firms he hired to pursue the state's tobacco case. See Manuel Roig-Franzia, *Attorneys Hired for Suit Gave to Ieyoub Campaigns*, New Orleans Times Picayune, Nov. 21, 1998, at A8.

2. *A Well-Documented History of Exorbitant Fees at the Public's Expense*

Delegation of state authority to profit-motivated attorneys has predictably resulted in exorbitant fee awards at the public's expense. Contingency fee agreements have siphoned recovery that would otherwise go to the state treasury that could be used to support public programs or reduce taxes. Instead, such agreements have transferred millions of dollars to private lawyers with little relation to the number of hours actually spent working on the state's behalf. History has shown that lawyers chosen to represent the state by attorneys general are “often from the ranks of their own campaign contributors and cronies.” Stuart Taylor, *How a Few Rich Lawyers Tax the Rest of Us*, Nat'l J., June 26, 1999.

For example, Kansas Attorney General Stovall's former firm, Entz & Chanay, reportedly received \$27 million in legal fees for its “favor” of serving as local counsel in the State's tobacco

lawsuit. See John L. Peterson, *Attorneys for Kansas Collect \$55 Million In Tobacco Case, Stovall's Ex-Firm Expects \$27 Million*, Kansas City Star, Feb. 1, 2000, at B1. Because Entz & Chanay was not required to keep detailed billing records, the arbitration panel that set the firm's fees estimated that 10,000 hours of work was performed. See Jim McLean, *A.G.'s Firm to Share \$54 Million Fee Award*, Topeka Cap. J., Feb. 1, 2000, at 1. Others have argued that the firm did much less work on the case. See, e.g., Hearing on H.B. 2893, Before the Kansas House Taxation Comm., Feb. 17, 2000, at 10-12 (testimony of Jerry Levy, of Jerry K. Levy Law Offices); *id.* at 44-45 (Testimony of Andrew W. Hutton), at <http://www.kslegislature.org/committeeminutes/2000/house/HsTax2-17-00b.pdf>. Regardless, accepting the arbitration panel's estimate, Entz & Chanay was paid the equivalent of \$2,700 per hour for simply acting as local counsel in the State's case.

The tobacco settlement awarded the lawyers hired by then-Texas Attorney General Dan Morales fifteen percent of the State's \$15.3 billion recovery – about \$2.3 billion, which ultimately was increased by an arbitration panel adjudicating the fee dispute to \$3.3 billion. See Bruce Hight, *Lawyers Give up Tobacco Fight*, Austin American-Statesman, Nov. 20, 1999, at A1. That amounted to \$105,022 per hour, assuming the lawyers worked eight hours per day, seven days per week, for eighteen months. See Sheila R. Cherry, *Litigation Lotto*, Insight on the News, Apr. 3, 2000, available at <http://www.insightmag.com/news/2000/04/03/CoverStory/Litigation.Lotto-208397.shtml>. The eight-year Attorney General and former state representative and prosecutor was ultimately sentenced to four years in federal prison for attempting to funnel millions of dollars worth of legal fees to a long-time friend who did little work on the case. See John Moritz, *Morales Gets 4 Years in Prison*, Ft. Worth Star Telegram, Nov. 1, 2003, at 1A. He was recently released to a halfway house. See Guillermo Contreras, *Ex-State AG Enters Halfway*

House, Houston Chronicle, Dec. 23, 2006, at B1.

In Maryland, Attorney General J. Joseph Curran, Jr. entered into a contingency fee agreement with personal injury attorney (and Baltimore Orioles owner) Peter Angelos. Angelos demanded the full 25 percent share of the state's \$4.4 billion of the national settlement, as provided in his 1996 contract, and refused to submit his claim to arbitration. See David Nitkin & Scott Shane, *Angelos to Get \$150 Million for Tobacco Lawsuit*, Baltimore Sun, Mar. 23, 2002, at 1A. This would have entitled Angelos to more than \$1 billion, the equivalent of \$30,000 per hour. See Scott Shane, *Angelos Says Panel Can't be Impartial*, Baltimore Sun, Nov. 30, 2001, at 1B. After a three-year legal battle, Angelos settled with the state for \$150 million. See Nitkin & Shane, *supra*.

In Pennsylvania, the twenty-fourth state to join the tobacco litigation, the two private firms handpicked by Pennsylvania Attorney General Mike Fisher in that case split \$50 million in fees, the equivalent of about \$1,323 per hour. See Justice, *supra*. "It's hard to see \$50 million worth of value there," said Yale Law School Professor Peter Schuck. "I don't know what they did to advance the ball. Most of the work was done." *Id.*

The list goes on. The seventeen firms hired by Louisiana Attorney General Ieyoub divvied up \$575,000, the equivalent of about \$6,700 per hour, for their services. See Pamela Coyle, *Tobacco Lawyers Reveal How They'll Divvy Up Fee*, New Orleans Times Picayune, May 12, 2000, at A1. The three firms hired in Connecticut, each having a close personal, political, familial, or financial relationship to Attorney General Blumenthal or the Governor, divided \$65 million in legal fees. "I know how it [looks]," conceded the lead attorney, David Golob. See Thomas Scheffey, *Winning the \$65 Million Gamble*, Conn. L. Trib., Dec. 6, 1999, at 1.

The deals between state attorneys general and private personal injury lawyers have spawned bitter fee disputes. These disputes have occurred in Florida, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maryland, Texas, and other states. *See, e.g.,* Alex Beam, *Greed on Trial*, Atlantic Monthly, June 1, 2004, at 96, Scott Shane, *Judge to Rule on Dispute Over Legal Fees*, Baltimore Sun, Dec. 10, 1999, at 2B; Levy, *Tobacco Robbery*, *supra*; Hight, *supra*. In Massachusetts, for example, the firms representing the state challenged the \$7,700 an hour awarded by the arbitration panel in fees, arguing they were entitled to the full 25 percent provided in the contingency fee contract – \$1.3 billion more. *See* Beam, *supra*. These controversies force government officials to waste taxpayer dollars, divert their attention from other matters, and engage in unnecessary litigation.

3. *Contingency Fee Awards Take Away Public Dollars*

Contingency fee awards are often misrepresented as coming at no cost to the public, with no need for state resources – allowing prosecution of litigation for free. These contracts are, of course, not free. The cost, the fees paid to private lawyers as a result of the litigation, is money that would otherwise fund government services or offset the public's tax burden. When state governments make the unwise decision to enter into a contingency fee arrangement that can yield multi-million dollar payouts to private firms when they could either use their own lawyers or supplement their resources with private attorneys at a competitive hourly rate, the public loses.

For example, South Carolina Attorney General Charlie Condon was criticized by environmental groups after a contingency fee contract he entered resulted in a \$1.48 million fee to two private lawyers. *See* Monk, *supra*. The suit, a result of a 1996 oil spill, was initially handled by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, which usually handles suits against polluters, but then handed over to the private lawyers. *See id.* The contingency fee

lawyers did not file the lawsuit, make any motions or engage in pretrial discovery. *See id.* The company quickly settled for \$6.5 million, with the amount of the settlement placed in a trust fund while the private attorneys haggled with the state about their cut of the recovery. *See id.* Even accepting the attorneys' unsubstantiated claim that they worked 1,500 hours on the suit, the \$1.48 million fee would result in the equivalent of nearly \$1,000 per hour in a case in which there appeared to be little contingency. Dell Isham, the Executive Director of the South Carolina Sierra Club, said that the state should have used government lawyers. *See id.* "This fee is offensive because it goes outside the system to benefit individuals, and it harms the environment by taking money away from it." *Id.* (quoting Mr. Isham). Common Cause blamed the Attorney General for "giving away the house." *Id.* (quoting John Crangle, Director of Common Cause in South Carolina).

In Mississippi, Attorney General Jim Hood recently came under fire by the state's auditor after he hired the law firm of his top campaign contributor to pursue back taxes owed by MCI related to the collapse of its predecessor, WorldCom, then entered a settlement directing MCI to pay the private attorneys \$14 million. *See* Office of the State Auditor, Mississippi, Informational Review: MCI Tax Settlement With the State of Mississippi (2006), available at www.osa.state.ms.us/documents/performance/mci-tax-review06.pdf. The Auditor found that the Attorney General acted beyond the scope of his constitutional and statutory authority by paying the private lawyers out of funds not in his legislatively-approved budget. *See id.* at 2-4. That money, the Auditor stated, should have been placed in the general treasury for the benefit of the public. *See id.* at 13; *see also* Emily Wagster Pettus, *Auditor, Attorney General Feud Over \$14M Fee to Private Attorneys*, Assoc. Press, Oct. 23, 2006.

4. *The Revolving Door Between Government Agencies and Private Law Firms*

When states award lucrative contingency fees to outside lawyers, talented government attorneys can be left feeling they received the raw end of the deal. For example, in Washington State, the State's antitrust chief, Jon Ferguson, announced that he was leaving his post to join the private Seattle law firm of Chandler, Franklin & O'Bryan to work on a class action lawsuit against the tobacco industry. The announcement came after Ferguson and the Chandler firm's Steve Berman led Washington State's lucrative lawsuit against the tobacco companies. When asked why he was leaving his post to go work for the firm that handled the State's case, Mr. Ferguson succinctly explained: "Steve Berman got \$50 million and I got a plaque." *For the Record*, Wash. Post., Feb. 14, 2000, at F35.

C. State Hiring of Contingency Fee Lawyers is Unethical and Unconstitutional

The Defendants' motion for judgment as a matter of law provides in detail the reasons that the State's entrance into a contingency fee arrangement is an improper conflict of interest and violates the Oklahoma Constitution. Other courts have reached similar conclusions.

For instance, when faced with a parallel situation, the California Supreme Court found it inappropriate for the City to hire a private attorney on a contingency fee basis to bring a public nuisance claim. *See People ex rel. Clancy v. Superior Ct.*, 705 P.2d 347 (Cal. 1985). Citing principles of American Bar Association Code of Prof. Responsibility, the court recognized, "the contingent fee arrangement between the City and [the private attorney] is antithetical to the standard of neutrality that an attorney representing the government must meet when prosecuting a public nuisance claim." *Id.* at 746-47, 750. Unlike cases brought for private plaintiffs, the court recognized that enforcement actions "involve a balancing of interests" and a "delicate weighing of values" that "demands the representative of the government to be absolutely

neutral.” *Id.* at 749. The court concluded that “[a]ny financial arrangement that would tempt the government attorney to tip the scale cannot be tolerated,” which “precludes the use in such cases of a contingent fee arrangement.” *Id.* at 748-49. The fundamental principles of legal ethics are equally relevant in Oklahoma.

Recently, a California trial court applied *Clancy* to invalidate a contingency fee arrangement between the County of Santa Clara to disqualify private law firms from representing the state in a lawsuit against the lead paint industry. *See Order Regarding Defendants’ Motion to Bar Payment of Contingent Fees to Private Attorneys, County of Santa Clara v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, Case No. 1-00-CV-788657 (Cal. Super. Ct., Santa Monica Cty., Apr. 4, 2007) (attached as Exh. 1). The court found unpersuasive the government’s claim that it maintains control over the litigation, as Attorney General Edmondson argues here, recognizing the practical difficulty of monitoring the reality of such an arrangement:

[A]s a practical matter, it would be difficult to determine (a) how much control the government attorneys must exercise in order for the contingent fee arrangement with outside counsel be permissible, (b) what types of decisions the government attorneys must retain control over, e.g., settlement or major strategy decisions, or also day-to-day decisions involving discovery and so forth, and (c) whether the government attorneys have been exercising such control throughout the litigation or whether they have passively or blindly accepted recommendations, decisions, or actions by outside counsel. . . . Given the inherent difficulties of determining whether or to what extent the prosecution of this nuisance action might or will be influenced by the presence of outside counsel operating under a contingent fee arrangement, outside counsel must be precluded from operating under a contingent fee agreement, regardless of the government attorneys’ and outside attorneys’ well-meaning intentions to have all decisions in this litigation made by the government attorneys.

Id. at 3-4.

The Supreme Court of Louisiana has struck down a contingency fee agreement entered into by the state on constitutional grounds. Rather than consider the conflicting obligations, loyalties, and motivations of government and private lawyers, the Louisiana court found that

such an agreement violated the separation of powers established by the state constitution. *See Meredith v. Ieyoub*, 700 So. 2d 478 (La. 1997). The case, much like the one at bar, involved the state's hiring of private lawyers to prosecute and enforce environmental laws. *See id.* at 479-80. "[U]nder the separation of powers doctrine, unless the Attorney General has been expressly granted the power in the constitution to pay outside counsel contingency fees from state funds or the Legislature has enacted such a statute, then he has no such power," the court held. *Id.* at 481. The separation of powers provisions of the Louisiana and Oklahoma Constitutions are nearly identical. *Compare* La. Const., art. II, §§ 1-2 *with* Okla. Const., art. IV, § 1. Likewise, both state constitutions invest the legislature with exclusive control over the state treasury. *Compare* La. Const., art. III, § 16 *with* Okla. Const., art. V, § 55. The Louisiana court rejected the bases similar to those offered by the State of Oklahoma in this case as sources of its power, such as its "inherent authority" to hire outside attorneys or a statute generally permitting attorneys to use of contingency fee contracts. *See Meredith*, 700 So. 2d at 482-43. Nor is there any authority in the Oklahoma Constitution providing the attorney general with such power absent legislative approval.

D. Better Choices for State Attorneys General Exist Than Using Contingency Fee Lawyers

Restricting the ability of the Attorney General to hire private counsel on a contingency fee basis will not impede his or her ability to represent the state and protect the public interest. The Attorney General can make better choices when pursuing litigation on behalf of the State.

I. *Actions Involving the State's Enforcement Power Should be Pursued by State Attorneys*

When an action involves use of the state's enforcement power, the Attorney General must use the resources of his or her own office to pursue the litigation. The government attorney's

duty is not necessarily to prevail, or to achieve the maximum recovery, in a particular case; rather, "the Government wins its point when justice is done in its courts." *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 88 n.2 (1963). A government attorney "is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all," and therefore the government attorney is required to use the power of the sovereign to promote justice for all citizens. *Berger v. United States*, 295 U.S. 78, 88 (1935).⁵

Assistant Attorneys General, under the direction of the Attorney General, are best suited to carry out the State's responsibility, particularly when an action involves assertion of the state's police powers. The Attorney General and Assistant Attorneys General, like other attorneys in Oklahoma, take an oath to "support, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma." Okla. Const. art. XV, §1; Okla. Stat. tit. 74, § 18a. Unlike other attorneys, however, they are paid in full through the annual appropriation adopted by the general assembly to ensure that their loyalty is to the people of the State. *See* Okla. Stat. tit. 74, § 250.4 (stating compensation for the Attorney General); Okla. Stat. tit. 74, § 21b (setting forth Assistant Attorneys General duties and compensation). Furthermore, ethics rules prohibit the Attorney General and his or her staff from using their official positions to secure compensation for themselves, receiving any compensation that would impair their independence

⁵ It is beyond dispute that this solemn duty applies "with equal force to the government's civil lawyers." *Freeport-McMoran Oil & Gas Co. v. Federal Energy Regulatory Comm'n*, 962 F.2d 45, 47 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (Mikva, C.J.). Thus, it has long been recognized that a government lawyer in a civil proceeding should be held to a higher standard than a private lawyer, and that in civil proceeding "government lawyers have 'the responsibility to seek justice, and 'should refrain from instituting or continuing litigation that is obviously unfair.'" *Id.* (citing Model Code of Professional Responsibility EC 7-14 (1981)).

of judgment as state officials, or from entering into contracts on behalf of the state in which they have a "substantial financial interest." See Okla. Stat. tit. 74, Ch. 62 App., Standards 257:20-1-4(a), (c), 257:20-1-10(a)(1). Moreover, no state officer or employee may directly or indirectly receive or agree to receive anything of value in return for being influenced in the performance of an official act. See Okla. Stat. tit. 74, Ch. 62 App., Standards 257:20-1-9. These ethics rules exist to ensure that state officers and employees are independent and impartial, to avoid action that creates the appearance of impropriety, to protect public confidence in the integrity of its government, and to protect against conflicts of interest. See Okla. Stat. tit. 74, Ch. 62 App., Standard 257:20-1-1. Private attorneys are not bound by these principles of ethics in government, and the very nature of a contingency fee is directly contrary to the letter and spirit of prohibitions applicable to Attorney General actions under Oklahoma law.

2. *Outside Counsel Should be Available Only in a Supportive Role, On an Hourly Basis With Well-Defined Responsibilities and Close State Supervision*

There may be some tasks that are either routine or require special expertise for which the use of outside counsel on an *hourly* basis by the Attorney General may be appropriate. For example, under former Kansas Attorney General Phill Kline most legal work was undertaken by attorneys on his staff, but his office hired outside counsel to assist state attorneys when expertise in certain areas was needed, such as in water rights disputes between states and to defend the state in a school finance suit. See Jim Sullinger, *Kansas Paid \$2 Million for Legal Aid; Unusual Report Fulfills a Promise by Attorney General*, Kansas City Star, Dec. 29, 2004, at B1.

When undertaking litigation requiring extensive resources, the Attorney General may feel the need to hire private attorneys to supplement the resources of his or her office. In such cases, the fee should be *hourly*, the contracting process open and competitive, the lines of authority

clear, and the responsibilities of the private attorneys well-defined in the contract. The private attorneys should work under the close supervision of the Attorney General. Such a procedure maintains the power of the government within the Office of the Attorney General, removes the incentive to make policy based on profitability, and reduces the potential for political patronage. Former Delaware Attorney General Jane Brady followed these principles. After taking office, she eliminated the “cozy relationships” with outside lawyers and implemented a bidding process. Manhattan Inst., Center for Legal Pol’y, *Regulation Through Litigation: The New Wave of Government-Sponsored Litigation*, Conference Proceedings, at 38 (Wash., D.C., June 22, 1999) (transcript of remarks). “The contracts are definite, for either a durational or transactional term, and we negotiate hourly rates, number of hours, and other terms of the relationship. Our new approach is inconsistent with contingency fee arrangements.” *Id.*

3. *Attorney Generals Have Better Options Than Hiring Contingency Fee Lawyers*

Experience has proven that state attorneys general do, indeed, have a choice as to whether to contract with lawyers on a contingency fee basis, even when taking on the largest of adversaries. For example, former New York Attorney General Eliot Spitzer was considered one of the most aggressive and activist state attorney generals. *See, e.g.,* Sara Fritz, *Another N.Y. Official Making National Name for Himself*, St. Petersburg Times, Nov. 29, 2002, at A1 (reporting on Spitzer’s aggressive approach). Yet, General Spitzer did not enter into contingency fee agreements with private lawyers as a matter of principle and practice. *See, e.g., Regulation Through Litigation, supra*, at 7 (“I would never enter into an agreement with the plaintiffs’ bar on a contingency fee basis to give away billions of dollars.”), 23 (“I never would have entered into [the tobacco contingency fee] agreements and I criticized my predecessor for the terms, bidding process, and determination method his office used for choosing attorneys.”).

In the multi-state tobacco suits, it is notable that the attorneys general of some states, such as Virginia, opted *not* to hire contingency fee attorneys and instead pursued the litigation with available resources. See Editorial, *Angel of the O's?*, Richmond Times Dispatch, June 20, 2001, at A8 (comparing the additional benefits gained by Virginia citizens whose Attorney General did not hire outside counsel with the money lost by its neighbor, Maryland, to legal fees). Other attorneys general who were not motivated by contingency fee attorneys, such as Delaware Attorney General Jane Brady, decided that joining the tobacco suits did not have the support of her constituents, despite the potential for a financial windfall. See *Regulation Through Litigation, supra*, at 38.

In fact, the federal government pursues litigation without hiring lawyers on a contingency fee basis. In May 2007, President George W. Bush formalized this policy by promulgating Executive Order 13433, "Protecting American Taxpayers From Payment of Contingency Fees," 72 Fed. Reg. 28,441 (daily ed., May 18, 2007). The President's order states "the policy of the United States that organizations or individuals that provide such services to or on behalf of the United States shall be compensated in amounts that are reasonable, not contingent upon the outcome of litigation or other proceedings, and established according to criteria set in advance of performance of the services, except when otherwise required by law." *Id.* Hiring attorneys on a hourly or fixed fee basis, and not through a contingency fees arrangement, "help[s] ensure the integrity and effective supervision of the legal and expert witness services provided to or on behalf of the United States." *Id.*

E. The Growing Use of Contingency Fee Lawyers by State Attorneys General is Contrary to Public Policy

In addition to the constitutional and ethical questions raised by such arrangements, contracting out of the state's enforcement power to private contingency fee attorneys facilitates

what has been called “regulation through litigation.” See Robert B. Reich, *Regulation is out, Litigation is in*, USA Today, Feb. 11, 1999, at A15; see also John Fund & Martin Morse Wooster, *The Dangers of Regulation Through Litigation: The Alliance of Plaintiffs’ Lawyers and State Governments* (American Tort Reform Found. 2000), available at <http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=8162>. The strategy of the private contingency fee attorneys to select an industry and go after it through tort litigation – as opposed to through legislation – may result in an end-run around representative government. Victor E. Schwartz, et al., *Tort Reform Past, Present and Future: Solving Old Problems and Dealing With “New Style” Litigation*, 27 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 237, 258-59 (2000). For example, the private attorney/state attorney general alliance in the tobacco litigation “legislated” by achieving enormous settlements – and did so with private personal injury lawyers working hand in hand with state attorneys general.

The examples of political patronage and outrageous fees in these cases showed that these problematic public-private partnerships are quite lucrative. See Susan Beck, *The Lobbying Blitz Over Tobacco Fees: Lawyers Went All Out in Pursuit of Their Cut of a Historic Settlement and the Arbitrators Went Along*, Legal Times, Jan. 6, 2003, at 1 (reporting that at least \$13.6 billion in fees were awarded to private attorneys); Manhattan Inst., Center for Legal Pol’y, *Trial Lawyers, Inc.: A Report on the Lawsuit Industry in America 2003* 6 (2003) (estimating that approximately 300 lawyers from 86 firms are projected to earn up to \$30 billion total over the next 25 years from the 1998 tobacco settlement).

Despite the claims of most attorneys general during the tobacco litigation that tobacco was a “unique” situation, states and localities have hired contingency fee lawyers to attack a wide range of manufacturers and service providers. Soon after the tobacco settlement, local

governments hired private attorneys to sue handgun manufacturers in a large number of cities.⁶ In Connecticut, Attorney General Blumenthal has solicited private attorneys for their services in pursuing litigation against any company connected with the manufacture, distribution, or sale of gasoline with Methyl tertiary butyl ether (“MTBE”)⁷ and hired private attorneys to sue pharmaceutical companies over prescription drug pricing practices.⁸ Former Rhode Island Attorney Sheldon Whitehouse’s hiring of contingency fee lawyers to attack the lead paint industry has raised serious constitutional questions. *See Rhode Island v. Lead Indus. Ass’n, Inc.*, 898 A.2d 1234, 1238-40 (R.I. 2006) (quashing the writ of certiorari for lack of necessity of deciding matter on an interlocutory basis, but finding the practice “necessarily implicates sensitive questions regarding the proper role of the constitutional office of the Attorney General in relation to the exclusively legislative powers of the General Assembly” and “will not evade review”). Reports suggest that other targets include HMOs, automobiles, chemicals, alcoholic

⁶ Most of these early cases were unsuccessful. *See, e.g., City of Chicago v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.*, 821 N.E.2d 1099 (Ill. 2004); *City of Philadelphia v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.*, 277 F.3d 415 (3rd Cir. 2002); *Camden County Bd. of Chosen Freeholders v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.*, 273 F.3d 536 (3rd Cir. 2001) (applying New Jersey law); *Ganim v. Smith & Wesson Corp.*, 780 A.2d 98 (Conn. 2001); *Penelas v. Arms Tech., Inc.*, 778 So. 2d 1042 (Fla. App. Ct. 2001).

⁷ *See* State of Connecticut, Attorney General’s Office, Request for Proposals: Litigation Services Involving Compensatory and Punitive Damages and Injunctive Relief Against Manufacturers, Designers, Refiners, Distributors, and Sellers of Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (“MTBE”) for Pollution and Contamination of the Waters of the State of Connecticut, RFP No. 04-01 (MTBE), Feb. 25, 2004.

⁸ *See* State of Connecticut, Attorney General’s Office, Request for Proposals: Litigation Services Involving Claims for Restitution and Other Relief Authorized by Law With Respect to Unfair and Deceptive Sales and Marketing Practices by Pharmaceutical Companies With Respect to the Sale, Marketing and Reporting of the Average Wholesale Price of Their Drugs and Which Conduct Has Caused harm to the State of Connecticut and to Consumers, RFP No. 04-02, Dec. 20, 2004; William Hathaway, *State Sues Drug Companies, Claiming Price Gouging*, Hartford Courant, Mar. 14, 2003, at B7.

beverages, pharmaceuticals, Internet providers, “Hollywood,” video game makers, and even the dairy and fast food industries. See Michael Y. Park, *Lawyers See Fat Payoffs in Junk Food Lawsuits*, Fox News Channel, Jan. 23, 2002; see also John J. Zefutie, Jr., Comment, *From Butts to Big Macs--Can the Big Tobacco Litigation and Nation-Wide Settlement With States' Attorneys General Serve as a Model for Attacking the Fast Food Industry?*, 34 Seton Hall L. Rev. 1383, 1411-13 (2004).

This alliance will no doubt continue, because these “new style” cases give the state executive branch a new revenue source without having to raise taxes. These lawsuits also give government officials the chance to achieve a regulatory objective that the majority of the electorate, as represented by their legislators, may not support. See *id.* As Robert B. Reich, Secretary of Labor in the Clinton Administration, has sagely observed, “The strategy may work, but at the cost of making our frail democracy even weaker. . . . This is faux legislation, which sacrifices democracy to the discretion of administration officials operating in secrecy.” Robert B. Reich, *Don't Democrats Believe in Democracy?*, Wall St. J., Jan. 12, 2000, at A22; see also Victor E. Schwartz, *Trial Lawyers Unleashed*, Wash. Post, May 10, 2000, at A29.

In addition to offending the democratic process, contingency fee agreements by the state pose a danger to the business and legal environment in Oklahoma. They encourage lawsuits against “deep pocket” defendants that are often in industries viewed as unpopular by the public, making it difficult for them to receive a fair trial. This is particularly true when what is essentially private litigation is backed by the state’s moral authority and seal of approval. As Michael Greve of the American Enterprise Institute has asked, “Do you want your state attorney general to be an ambulance chaser?” Jeff Shields, *Taking Law into Their Own Hands*, Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 4, 2004. Should this Court accept use of contingency fee agreements

by the State, the political patronage and unwarranted payouts seen in other states can be expected in Oklahoma, and exercise of the State's power based on profit, not public interest, will result.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein and in the Motion of the Defendants, Amici respectfully request that the contingent-fee agreement between the Attorney General and the private lawyers should be declared unlawful and void.

Dated: June 1, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Gary S. Chilton

Gary S. Chilton. OBA No. 1662
HOLLADAY CHILTON & DEGIUSTI, PLLC
204 North Robinson, Suite 1550
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 236-2343
Facsimile: (405) 236-2349

Victor E. Schwartz, D.C. Bar No.406172
(pro hac vice motion pending)
Cary Silverman, D.C. Bar No. 473658
(pro hac vice motion pending)
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P
600 14th Street N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005-2004
Telephone: (202) 783-8400
Facsimile: (202) 783-4211
ATTORNEYS FOR AMICI CURIAE

Robin S. Conrad, D.C. Bar No. 342774
(pro hac vice motion pending)
NATIONAL CHAMBER
LITIGATION CENTER, INC.
1615 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20062
Telephone: (202) 463-5337
Facsimile: (202) 463-5346
OF COUNSEL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 1st day of June, 2007, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

Jo Nan Allen	Frederick C. Baker	Tim K. Baker
Douglas L. Boyd	Vicki Bronson	Paula M. Buchwald
Louis W. Bullock	Lloyd E. Cole, Jr.	Angela D. Cotner
John Breian DesBarres	W. A. Drew Edmondson	Delmare R. Ehrich
John Elrod	William B. Federman	Bruce W. Freeman
Ronnie Jack Freeman	Richard T. Garren	D. Sharon Gentry
Tony M. Graham	James M. Graves	Michael D. Graves
Thomas J. Grever	Jennifer S. Griffin	Carrie Griffith
John T. Hammons	Jean Burnett	Michael T. Hembree
Theresa Noble Hill	Philip D. Hixon	Mark D. Hopson
Kelly S. Hunter Burch	Stephen L. Jantzen	Mackenzie Hamilton Jessie
Bruce Jones	Jay T. Jorgensen	Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee
Raymond T. Lay	Nicole M. Longwell	Dara D. Mann
Linda C. Martin	A. Scott McDaniel	Robert Park Medearis, Jr.
James Randall Miller	Robert A. Nance	John Stephen Neas
George W. Owens	David Phillip Page	K. Clark Phipps
Marcus N. Ratcliff	Robert P. Redemann	M. David Riggs
Randall E. Rose	Patrick Michael Ryan	Robert E. Sanders
David Charles Senger	William F. Smith	Jennifer F. Sherrill
Colin H. Tucker	John H. Tucker	R. Pope Van Cleef, Jr.
Kenneth E. Wagner	David A. Walls	Elizabeth C. Ward
Sharon K. Weaver	Timothy K. Webster	Gary V. Weeks
Adam Scott Weintraub	Terry W. West	Dale Kenyon Williams, Jr.
E. Stephen Williams	Douglas Allen Wilson	J. Ron Wright
Lawrence W. Zeringue	Bobby Jay Coffman	Laura Samuelson
Reuben Davis		

I further certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing will be mailed via first class U.S. Mail, postage properly paid, on the following who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

<p>C. Miles Tolbert Secretary of the Environment State of Oklahoma 3800 N. Classen Oklahoma City, OK 73118</p> <p>PLAINTIFF</p>	<p>William H. Narwold MOTLEY RICE LLC 20 Church Street 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103</p> <p>ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF</p>
<p>Monte W. Strout 209 W. Keetoowah Tahlequah, OK 74464</p> <p>ATTORNEY FOR CLAIRE WELLS, LOUISE SQUYRES, THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>	<p>Robin Wofford Rt. 2, Box 370 Watts, OK 74964</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>
<p>James R. Lamb D. Jean Lamb STRAYHORN LANDING Rt. 1, Box 253 Gore, OK 74435</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>	<p>Gordon and Susann Clinton 23605 S. Goodnight Lane Welling, OK 74471</p> <p>THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>
<p>Kenneth and Jane Spencer James C. Geiger Individually and dba Spencer Ridge Resort Route 1, Box 222 Kansas, OK 74347</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>	<p>Ancil Maggard c/o Leila Kelly 2615 Stagecoach Dr. Fayetteville, AR 72703</p> <p>THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>
<p>C. Craig Heffington 20144 W. Sixshooter Rd. Cookson, OK 74427</p> <p>PRO SE, SIX SHOOTER RESORT AND MARINA, INC., THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT</p>	<p>Richard E. Parker Donna S. Parker BURNT CABIN MARINA & RESORT, LLC 34996 S. 502 Road Park Hill, OK 74451</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>

<p>James D. Morrison Rural Route #1, Box 278 Colcord, OK 74338</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>	<p>Jim R. Bagby Route 2, Box 1711 Westville, OK 74965</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>
<p>Marjorie A. Garman 5116 Hwy. 10 Tahlequah, OK 74464</p> <p>THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>	<p>Doris Mares Dba Cookson Country Store and Cabins P.O. Box 46 Cookson, OK 74424</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>
<p>Eugene Dill P.O. Box 46 Cookson, OK 74424</p> <p>PRO SE, THIRD PARTY DEFENDANT</p>	<p>Linda C. Martin N. Lance Bryan Doerner, Saunders 320 S. Boston Ave., Ste. 500 Tulsa, OK 74103</p> <p>THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>
<p>John and Virginia Adair Adair Family Trust Route 2, Box 1160 Stilwell, OK 74960</p> <p>THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS</p>	<p>Charles L. Moulton Arkansas Natural Resources Commission 323 Center St., Ste. 200 Little Rock, AR 72206</p>

s/Gary S. Chilton

Gary S. Chilton

E-FILED

Apr 4, 2007 12:42 PM

KIRI TORRE

Chief Executive Officer

Superior Court of CA, County of Santa Clara

Case #1-00-CV-788657 Filing #G-2399

By R. Walker, Deputy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1-00-CV-788657

**ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO BAR PAYMENT OF
CONTINGENT FEES TO PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS**

The motion by Defendants Atlantic Richfield Company; American Cyanamid Company; ConAgra Grocery Products Company; E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company; Millennium Inorganic Chemicals Inc.; NL Industries, Inc.; and The Sherwin-Williams Company for an order to bar payment of contingent fees to private attorneys came on for hearing before the Honorable Jack Komar on April 3, 2007, at 9:00 a.m. in Department 17C. The matter having been submitted, the Court orders as follows:

I. Defendants' Requests for Judicial Notice

A. Defendants' request for judicial notice of Plaintiffs' agreements with outside counsel (Exs. A - I) is DENIED. While judicial notice of the agreements is not proper, the Court



1 has considered the agreements as evidence in connection with Defendants' motion. Plaintiffs do
2 not contest the authenticity of the agreements and have provided identical copies of some of the
3 agreements in opposition.

4 B. Defendants' request for judicial notice of a minute order from *People v. Atlantic*
5 *Richfield Co., et al.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 804030 (Ex. J), is GRANTED as
6 to the existence of the order.

7 C. Defendants' request for judicial notice of the size of the budgets of the plaintiff
8 entities (Reply Exs. A – I) is DENIED. The amount of a specific entity's budget is not a proper
9 subject of judicial notice. An entity's projections and expectations regarding its budget may
10 change during the course of the fiscal year at issue. Further, the sizes of the budgets are not
11 relevant to the issues in Defendants' motion.

12 II. Defendants' Motion

13 Defendants seek an order precluding Plaintiffs from retaining outside counsel under any
14 agreement in which the payment of fees and costs is contingent on the outcome of the litigation.
15 Defendants contend the government may not retain a private attorney on a contingent fee basis to
16 litigate a public nuisance claim.

17 Plaintiffs contend there is no absolute bar to retaining outside counsel on a contingent fee
18 basis to litigate a public nuisance claim and, given the circumstances under which outside
19 counsel was retained in this case, disqualification of outside counsel is not warranted.

20 In *People ex rel. Clancy v. Superior Court* (1985) 39 Cal.3d 740 ("*Clancy*"), the
21 California Supreme Court "evaluate[d] the propriety of a contingent fee arrangement between a
22 city government and a private attorney whom it hired to bring abatement actions under the city's
23 nuisance ordinance." (*Clancy*, 39 Cal.3d at 743.) The California Supreme Court explained that
24 "the contingent fee arrangement between the City and Clancy is antithetical to the standard of
25 neutrality that an attorney representing the government must meet when prosecuting a public
26 nuisance abatement action. In the interests of justice, therefore, we must order Clancy
27 disqualified from representing the City in the pending abatement action." (*Id.*, at 750.)
28

1 *Clancy* is applicable to the instant case. Plaintiffs fail to persuasively distinguish *Clancy*,
2 or otherwise persuasively articulate why their fee arrangements with outside counsel are proper.
3 Plaintiffs' main argument is that the government attorneys continue to retain and/or exercise
4 decision-making authority and control over the litigation in this case.¹ The fact remains,
5 however, that outside counsel (*i.e.*, Thornton & Naumes, Motley Rice LLC, and Mary Alexander
6 and Associates for the City and County of San Francisco, and Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy for
7 most of the other public entities) are co-counsel in this case. They are performing work as
8 attorneys for the plaintiff government entities, and consequently they are subject to the standard
9 of neutrality articulated in *Clancy*. Oversight by the government attorneys does not eliminate the
10 need for or requirement that outside counsel adhere to the standard of neutrality.

11 Moreover, as a practical matter, it would be difficult to determine (a) how much control
12 the government attorneys must exercise in order for a contingent fee arrangement with outside
13 counsel be permissible, (b) what types of decisions the government attorneys must retain control
14 over, *e.g.*, settlement or major strategy decisions, or also day-to-day decisions involving
15 discovery and so forth, and (c) whether the government attorneys have been exercising such
16 control throughout the litigation or whether they have passively or blindly accepted
17 recommendations, decisions, or actions by outside counsel. Plaintiffs in their opposition
18 characterize outside counsel as "collaborators." (*See* Pls.' Mem. Opp. Motion, at 8:21-22.)
19 Given the inherent difficulties of determining whether or to what extent the prosecution of this
20 nuisance action might or will be influenced by the presence of outside counsel operating under a
21

22 _____
23 ¹ Some of the agreements between Plaintiffs and Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy (formerly Cotchett,
24 Pitre & Simon) clearly state outside counsel "is given absolute discretion in the decision of who
25 to sue and who not to sue, if anyone, and what theories to plead and what evidence to present."
26 However, many of the Plaintiffs revised or are in the process of revising this language in their
27 agreements with the Cotchett firm. Further, the declarations submitted in opposition to
28 Defendants' motion uniformly state that the government attorneys have retained decision-making
authority and responsibility in the case, notwithstanding the hiring of outside counsel.

1 contingent fee arrangement, outside counsel must be precluded from operating under a
2 contingent fee agreement, regardless of the government attorneys' and outside attorneys' well-
3 meaning intentions to have all decisions in this litigation made by the government attorneys.

4 Plaintiffs make two additional arguments in their opposition. Plaintiffs contend public
5 policy should preclude disqualification in this case, because the government entities and lawyers
6 lack the resources and specific expertise necessary to prosecute this action. The standard of
7 neutrality should apply, however, regardless of the wealth of either the government lawyer or the
8 defendant. (*See City & County of San Francisco v. Philip Morris, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. 1997) 957 F.
9 Supp. 1130, 1136 fn. 3 ["The Court wishes to make clear that it does not base this ruling on
10 plaintiffs' argument that, as a matter of public policy, a contingent fee arrangement is necessary
11 in this case to make it feasible for the financially strapped government entities to match
12 resources with the wealthy tobacco defendants. The Court does not find this argument
13 convincing in light of the concerns expressed in *Clancy*."].)

14 Plaintiffs also contend Defendants' motion is premature, unless and until Defendants are
15 found liable, the Court determines the appropriate form and scope of the abatement remedy, and
16 the Court determines the appropriate amount of fees in this case. This action may be resolved
17 prior to such determinations, however, *e.g.*, by way of settlement or by way of other dispositive
18 motion. If Defendants are entitled to neutral prosecution by government attorneys who are not
19 operating under a contingent fee arrangement, then they are so entitled throughout the
20 prosecution of this case.

21 Accordingly, Defendants' motion for an order precluding Plaintiffs from retaining
22 outside counsel under any agreement in which the payment of fees and costs is contingent on the
23 outcome of the litigation is GRANTED. Plaintiffs shall have 30 days to file with the court new
24 fee agreements in accordance with this order. In lieu of filing the actual agreements, Plaintiffs
25 may provide declarations detailing the fee arrangements with outside counsel.

27 Dated: April 4, 2007

/s/ Jack Komar
Hon. Jack Komar
Judge of the Superior Court