

C

Stetson Law Review  
Fall, 1998

Essay

**\*323 PROFESSIONALISM AND LITIGATION ETHICS**Hon. [Claudia Rickert Isom \[FN1\]](#)

Copyright (c) 1998 by Hon. Claudia Rickert Isom

My first assignment as a newly elected circuit judge was to the family law division. Although I considered myself to be an experienced trial attorney, I was somewhat naive about my role as a judge presiding over discovery issues. I assumed that the attorneys assigned to my division would know the rules of procedure and the local rules of courtesy. I also assumed that, being knowledgeable, they would comply in good faith with these provisions. I soon learned that attorneys who were entirely pleasant and sociable creatures when I was counted among their numbers, assumed a much different role when advocating for litigants.

For example, take Harvey M. (not his real name). Harvey and I had bantered for years, having many common interests. Perhaps this familiarity gave rise to, while not contempt, a certain lackadaisical attitude about complying with case management and pretrial orders. Harvey challenged me to establish my judicial prerogative and assist him in achieving goals not of his own making.

A common assumption regarding family law is that clients receive the quality of legal representation that they deserve. However, my time in the family law division has convinced me that this is not necessarily true. Often times, a case that has wallowed along, seemingly hung up in endless depositions and discovery problems, becomes instantly capable of resolution by bringing all parties together in the context of a pretrial conference. Apparently, some attorneys feel that "cutting up" is a large part of what their clients expect them to do. When this litigious attitude begins to restrict the trial court's ability to effectively bring cases to resolution, the judge must get involved to assist the process.

Recently, the Florida Conference of Circuit Court Judges conducted an educational seminar designed to guide circuit judges in appropriately responding to unprofessional and unethical behavior. [FN1] Various scenarios were presented on video, after which the \*324 judges voted on what they felt would be the appropriate court response. A surprising number of judges voted to impose sanctions or report unethical behavior to the Florida Bar Grievance Section. However, the most common response was to do nothing or to privately counsel the offending attorney.

A common theme at meetings of the Florida Bar Standing Committee on Professionalism is that, while attorneys can aspire to greater professionalism, the courts can be a bully pulpit to encourage professional behavior. Perhaps the perceived backlash of cracking down on unprofessional behavior is unrealistic for Florida's circuit judges who are elected officials. However, that perception shapes the judicial response, even when responding theoretically at a seminar.

The Joint Committee of the Trial Lawyers Section of the Florida Bar and the Conferences of Circuit and County Court Judges' 1998 Handbook on Discovery Practice admonishes trial judges to fully appreciate their broad powers to end discovery abuses and the 1998 Handbook reassuringly states that the appellate courts will sustain the trial court's authority if it is exercised in a procedurally correct manner. [FN2] Once again, this rallying cry ignores the reality of our situation.

As a new judge, the lessons urged by bar leadership have been a matter of trial and error (pun intended). Harvey quickly established his reputation, not as a fellow member of my legal community, but as a problematic litigator whose behavior had to be controlled and modified by court order for the legal process to smoothly progress. For example, hearing time was made available to address discovery issues, very specific orders were entered regarding who was to do what, when, and how, verbal commitments were elicited on the record about document production and interrogatory responses, in an attempt to avoid additional hearings. Cases involving Harvey were, by necessity, intensely case managed.

Resentment, of course, is a by-product of such intensive case management. Attorneys may perceive that the court is trying to prevent them from earning additional attorney fees by streamlining the process. However, clients rarely complain once they realize that the underlying purpose is to bring the case to timely resolution.

In Harvey's case, extreme tools--reporting Harvey to the Florida\*325 Bar, striking responses, striking witnesses, imposing financial sanctions, and conducting contempt hearings-- were never implicated. What did happen was that Harvey trained me to be a better judge by showing me how, in a nonconfrontational manner, I could effectively case manage Harvey and similar counsel without having to take off the gloves.

Fortunately, not every litigator requires the case management skills of a Harvey situation. Most attorneys are well-intentioned, have a legitimate interest in pursuing discovery efficiently, and do not seek to unnecessarily delay the resolution of a case. What a relief it is to have a case with opposing counsel who are both of this school of thought.

New attorneys, or attorneys who are appearing in front of a judge for the first time, must remember that their reputation is primarily built on the judge's personal experiences with them. No bench book exists with a list of which attorneys are trustworthy professionals and which are not. Instead, the individual judge keeps a mental catalog of experiences. For example, does this attorney routinely generate complaints from opposing counsel in other cases about not clearing depositions with their office? Is this attorney often the subject of motions to compel? Can this attorney be trusted when he tells you that the responses to interrogatories are "in the mail"? Once a negative reputation has been established with the court, an attorney's job will be much more challenging in establishing credibility with the court. And certainly, with so many issues up to the court's discretion, an attorney's reputation as trustworthy and ethical is of utmost importance.

And, what about Harvey? Do his clients suffer? Of course they do. But, with effective case management and an experienced judiciary, the damage and delay caused by the Harveys of this world can be minimized while still allowing clients the freedom to choose their own counsel.

[FN1]. Circuit Judge, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, Tampa, Florida, 1991-Present; B.S.Ed., University of Iowa, 1972; J.D., Florida State University, 1975; Vice-Chair and member, Florida Bar Standing Committee on Professionalism; Assistant State Attorney, Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, 1979-1982; District VI Legal Counsel, Florida

28 STETLR 323  
28 Stetson L. Rev. 323

Page 3

Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 1984-1986; Shareholder, Isom, Pingel and Isom-Rickert, P.A., 1986-1990.

[FN1]. See ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING OF FLORIDA CONFERENCE OF CIRCUIT JUDGES: PROFESSIONALISM PROBLEM SOLVING (1998).

[FN2]. See JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE TRIAL LAWYERS SECTION OF THE FLORIDA BAR AND CONFERENCE OF CIRCUIT AND COUNTY JUDGES 1998 HANDBOOK 8-9 (1998).  
28 Stetson L. Rev. 323

END OF DOCUMENT

© 2010 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.