

CLIENT PROTECTION FUND

Trustees' Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2025

LAWYERS' INDEMNITY FUND, EST. 1960 | CLIENT PROTECTION FUND, EST. 1994



WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600, Seattle, WA 98101-2539

206.727.8200 | www.wsba.org

PURPOSE OF THE CLIENT PROTECTION FUND

“The purpose of this rule is to create a Client Protection Fund, to be maintained and administered as a trust by the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA), in order to promote public confidence in the administration of justice and the integrity of the legal profession. [...] Funds accruing and appropriated to the Fund may be used for the purpose of relieving or mitigating a pecuniary loss sustained by any person by reason of the dishonesty of, or failure to account for money or property entrusted to, any member of the WSBA as a result of or directly related to the member’s practice of law (as defined in GR 24), or while acting as a fiduciary in a matter directly related to the member’s practice of law. Such funds may also, through the Fund, be used to relieve or mitigate like losses sustained by persons by reason of similar acts of an individual who was at one time a member of the WSBA but who was at the time of the act complained of under a court ordered suspension.”

Admission and Practice Rules 15(a) and (b).

FY 2025 TRUSTEES

WSBA Board
of Governors
(2024-2025)

Sunitha Anjilvel, <i>President</i>	Redmond
Daniel Clark, <i>Past President</i>	Yakima
Francis Adewale	Spokane
Tom Ahearne	Seattle
Todd Bloom	Port Orchard
Jordan Couch	University Place
Matthew Dresden	Seattle
Kevin Fay	Bellevue
Kristina Larry	Tukwila
Nam Nguyen	Olympia
Kari Petrasek	Mukilteo
Mary Rathbone	Ephrata
Alain Villeneuve	Seattle
Parvin Price	Bothell
Allison Widney	Oklahoma
Emily Arneson	

FY 2025 CLIENT PROTECTION BOARD

Carrie Umland, <i>Chair</i>	University Place
Joanne Abelson	Mercer Island
Luis Beltrán	Tacoma
Andrew Benjamin	Seattle
Mackenzie Bretz	Bothell
Carla Higginson	Friday Harbor
Efrem Krisher	Bellevue
Dana Laverty	Covington
Sarah Moen	Seattle
Mark Stiefel	Kirkland
Ruthanna Walker	Renton
Brandon West	Spokane
Kathy Yue	Newcastle

WSBA STAFF TO CLIENT PROTECTION BOARD

Nicole Gustine	Assistant General Counsel; CPF Liaison/Secretary
Brenda Jackson	CPF Specialist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I.	History and Establishment of the Client Protection Fund (CPF)	1
SECTION II.	CPF Procedures	2
SECTION III.	Finances	4
SECTION IV.	Board and Trustee Meetings	5
SECTION V.	Applications and Payments	6

APPENDIX

FY 2025 Final Audited Income and Expense Report and Sept. 30, 2025, Fund Balance Sheet (Audited)	20
---	-----------

History and Establishment of the Client Protection Fund

Washington is fortunate to have a history of maintaining a stable Client Protection Fund (CPF) that is strongly supported by the Washington Supreme Court and the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA). Washington was one of the first states to establish what was then called a Lawyers’ Indemnity Fund in 1960. Since that time, WSBA members have compensated victims of the few dishonest members who have misappropriated or failed to account for client funds or property.

The current CPF was established by the Washington Supreme Court in 1994 at the request of the WSBA by the adoption of [Rule 15](#) of the Admission to Practice Rules (APR), now called the Admission and Practice Rules. Prior to the adoption of that rule, the WSBA had voluntarily maintained a clients’ security or

indemnity fund out of the Bar’s general fund. Similar funds are maintained in every jurisdiction in the United States, as well as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other countries.

The CPF helps accomplish important goals shared by the Court and the WSBA — client protection, public confidence in the administration of justice, and maintaining the integrity of the legal profession. Under APR 15, CPF payments are gifts, not entitlements. An annual assessment paid by certain Washington licensees finances all CPF gifts. Gifts are not financed by public funds.

On January 4, 2024, the Court approved the WSBA Board of Governor’s (BOG) recommendation to increase the CPF assessment for the 2025 calendar year from \$15 to \$20. On July 17, 2025, the Court approved the BOG’s recommendation to maintain the CPF assessment for the 2026 calendar year at \$20.

Currently, WSBA lawyers on active status, lawyers with pro hac vice admissions, in-house counsel, house counsel, foreign law consultants, and Limited Licensed Legal Technicians (LLLTs) pay an annual assessment to the Fund. The following chart shows key statistical trends from the past 10 years.

CLIENT PROTECTION FUND APPLICATIONS 2016-2025

FISCAL YEAR	NO. OF MEMBERS	NO. OF MEMBERS WITH APPROVED APPLICATIONS*	NO. OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED	NO. OF APPLICATIONS APPROVED	GIFTS APPROVED
2016	32,969	16	56	44	\$253,228
2017	33,357	19	72	47	\$439,273
2018	33,858	18	119	46	\$926,434
2019	34,388	18	61	48	\$419,488
2020	34,905	16	57	33	\$586,266
2021	34,839	18	107	29	\$491,737
2022	33,121	13	49	33	\$587,815
2023	33,383	14	41	42	\$342,424
2024	33,600	13	165	25	\$436,328
2025	33,920	7	94	37	\$412,963

* NOTE: Through Dec. 31, 2018, only lawyers on Active status, pro hac vice, in-house counsel, house counsel, and foreign law consultants paid the assessment. Effective Jan. 1, 2019, Limited Licensed Legal Technicians (LLLTs), also paid the assessment.

SECTION II

Fund Procedures

The CPF is governed by [Admission and Practice Rule \(APR\) 15](#) and [CPF \(APR 15\) Procedural Regulations](#) adopted by the Board of Governors and approved by the Supreme Court.

> Administration: The members of the Board of Governors of the WSBA serve as Trustees of the Fund. The Trustees appoint and oversee the Board, comprised of 11 lawyers and two community representatives. The Board is authorized to consider all CPF applications, make gift recommendations to the Trustees, submit an annual report on Board activities to the Trustees, and make such other reports and publicize Board activities as the Court or the Trustees may deem advisable. Two WSBA staff members help to ensure the smooth functioning of the Board's work. WSBA Client Protection Fund Specialist Brenda Jackson performs a wide variety of tasks to help members of the public and the Board in processing and analyzing CPF applications. WSBA Assistant General Counsel Nicole Gustine acts as staff liaison, provides legal advice, and serves as Secretary to the Board.

> Application: Clients of WSBA members that allege a dishonest taking of, or failure to account for, funds or property by a WSBA member, in connection with that member's practice of law, can apply for a gift from the CPF. To be eligible, clients must file a disciplinary grievance against the member, unless the member has resigned in lieu of discipline, been disbarred, or is deceased. Because most applications involve members who are the subject of disciplinary grievances and proceedings, action on Fund applications normally awaits resolution of the disciplinary process.¹ This

means that most applicants wait for the discipline process to be complete before the Board reviews their application. To increase efficiency, application review takes place in the order that an applicant filed their grievance (if applicable). Otherwise, an application is processed and reviewed in the order of receipt.

> Eligibility: To be eligible for payment, an applicant must show by a clear preponderance of the evidence that they suffered a loss of money or property through the dishonest acts of, or failure to account, by a WSBA member. Dishonesty includes, in addition to theft, embezzlement, and conversion, the refusal to return unearned fees as required by Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The Fund is not available to compensate for member malpractice or professional negligence. It also cannot compensate for loan, investment, or other business transactions unrelated to the member's practice of law.

When an application is received, it is initially reviewed to determine whether it appears eligible for recovery from the Fund. If the application is ineligible on its face, the applicant is advised of the reasons for its ineligibility. If the application passes the initial intake process and appears potentially eligible for payment, Fund staff investigates the application. When the application is ripe for consideration by the Board, staff prepare a report and recommendation.

> Board and Trustee Review: On applications for less than \$25,000, or where the recommendation for payment is less than \$25,000, the Board's decision is final. Board recommendations on applications where the applicant seeks more than \$25,000, or where the Board recommends payment of more than \$25,000 or involving payment of more than \$25,000 be

CONTINUED >

1. APR 15 Regulation 6(h). In addition, Rule 3.4(i) of the Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct provides that otherwise confidential information obtained during the course of a disciplinary investigation may be released to the Client Protection Fund concerning applications pending before it. Such information is to be treated as confidential by the Board and Trustees.

SECTION II

Fund Procedures

CONTINUED >

made to applicants regarding any one licensed legal professional, are reviewed by the Trustees.

The maximum gift amount is \$150,000.² There is no limit on the aggregate amount that may be paid on claims regarding a single member. Any payments from the Fund are gifts and are at the sole discretion of the Fund Board and Trustees.

> **Legal Fees:** Members may not charge a fee for assisting with an application to the Fund, except with the consent and approval of the Trustees.

> **Assignment of Rights and Restitution:** As part of accepting a gift from the Fund, applicants are required to sign a subrogation agreement for the gift. The Fund attempts to recover its payments from the members or former members on whose behalf gifts are made, when possible. Recovery is generally successful when it is a condition of a criminal sentencing, or when a member petitions for reinstatement to the Bar after disbarment.³ To date, the Fund (and its predecessors) has recovered approximately \$637,994.

> **Difficult Claims:** One of the more difficult claim areas for the Board and Trustees involves fees paid

to a member for which questionable service was performed. The Board is not in a position to evaluate the quality of services provided, nor to determine whether the fee charged was reasonable. Therefore, such applications may be denied as a fee dispute. (The denial may also include other bases, such as malpractice or negligence.) However, where it appears that there is a pattern of conduct which establishes that a member knew or should have known at the time the member accepted fees from a client that the member would be unable to perform the service for which he or she was employed, or the member simply performs no service of value to the client, and does not return unearned fees, the Board has concluded that such conduct may be either dishonesty or failure to account, within the context of the purposes of the Fund, and will consider such applications. Similarly, if a member withdraws from representing a client or abandons a client's case without refunding any unearned fee, the Board may conclude that the member has engaged in dishonest conduct or has failed to account for client funds.

Another difficult claim area concerns loans or investments made to or through members. In instances where there is an existing client/licensed legal practitioner relationship through which the member learns of his or her client's financial information, persuades the client to loan money or to invest with the member without complying with the disclosure and other requirements of RPC 1.8,⁴ and does not return the client's funds as agreed, the Board may consider that a dishonest act for purposes of the Fund.

2. In June 2026, the Supreme Court ordered that the maximum gift amount be increased to \$250,000, effective September 1, 2026.

3. Admission and Practice Rule 25.1(d) provides that no disbarred lawyer may petition for reinstatement until amounts paid by the CPF to indemnify against losses caused by the conduct of the disbarred lawyer have been repaid to the CPF, or a payment agreement has been reached.

4. In relevant part, RPC 1.8 provides:

(a) A lawyer shall not enter into a business transaction with a client or knowingly acquire an ownership, possessory, security or other pecuniary interest adverse to a client unless:

(1) the transaction and terms on which the member acquires the interest are fair and reasonable to the client and are fully disclosed and transmitted in writing in a manner that can be reasonably understood by the client;

(2) the client is advised in writing of the desirability of seeking and is given a reasonable opportunity to seek the advice of independent legal counsel on the transaction; and

(3) the client gives informed consent, in a writing signed by the client, to the essential terms of the transaction and the lawyer's role in the transaction, including whether the lawyer is representing the client in the transaction.

(b) A member shall not use information relating to representation of a client to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules.

SECTION III

Finances

The Fund is financed by an assessment as described in Section II: Fund Procedures. The Fund is maintained as a trust, separate from other funds of the WSBA. In addition, interest on the balance accrues to the Fund, and any restitution paid by members is added to the Fund balance. The Fund is self-sustaining; administrative costs of the Fund, such as Board expenses and WSBA staff support, are paid from the Fund.

FISCAL YEAR	PENDING APPLICATIONS AT START OF FY	CPF BEGINNING BALANCE ⁵	CPF REVENUES RECEIVED	BOARD EXPENSES AND OVERHEAD ⁶	RESTITUTION RECEIVED	GIFTS RECOGNIZED FOR PAYMENT
2016	\$13,203,653	\$2,144,289	\$1,001,198	\$129,553	\$2,970	\$371,452 ⁷
2017	\$1,463,914	\$2,646,222	\$1,024,954	\$113,672	\$3,709	\$318,584
2018	\$2,045,175	\$3,242,299	\$1,040,498	\$166,969	\$28,255	\$917,051 ⁸
2019	\$3,206,880	\$3,227,988	\$1,110,963	\$146,618	\$8,347	\$379,818
2020	\$3,342,227	\$3,816,143	\$1,099,237	\$141,514	\$15,351	\$591,449 ⁹
2021	\$4,690,958	\$4,193,130	\$368,170	\$151,055	\$137,971	\$499,637
2022	\$4,252,961	\$4,046,246	\$740,321	\$162,100	\$8,906	\$587,815
2023	\$1,583,390	\$4,063,501	\$961,358	\$173,059	\$9,177	\$342,424
2024	\$5,094,587	\$4,513,398	\$816,420	\$180,831	\$27,839	\$436,328
2025	\$5,883,120	\$4,759,353	\$952,453	\$180,007	\$20,766	\$412,963

5. It is important for the Fund to maintain a sufficient balance to meet anticipated future needs. It is impossible to predict from year to year how many meritorious claims injured applicants will make.
6. Board expenses and overhead include WSBA staff time to administer the Fund, including processing of applications, helping members of the public, investigating claims, and making recommendations to the Board.
7. The amount of gifts recognized in the FY 2016 financial statements overstates by \$115,000 due to a duplicate recording of approved gifts, correct in FY 2017. This explains the substantial difference between the amounts listed for FY 2016 and FY 2017 under this column as compared with the "Gifts Approved" column on page 1.
8. The amount of gifts recognized in the FY 2018 financial statements understates by \$9,383 due to unclaimed CPF gifts that expired in FY 2018.
9. The amount of gifts recognized in the FY 2020 financial statements overstates by \$5,183, due to interest owed to an applicant and a payment voided in FY 2021. This explains the difference between the amounts listed for FY 2020 under this column as compared with the "Gifts Approved" column on [page 1](#).

SECTION IV

Board and Trustee Meetings and Activities

Board: The Client Protection Board met four times this past fiscal year:

- > November 4, 2024;
- > February 3, 2025;
- > May 5, 2025, and
- > August 4, 2025.

The Board considered 43 applications to the CPF involving 12 members and approved 37 applications involving 7 members.

Fund Trustees: The Trustees reviewed the Board's recommendations on applications for more than \$25,000, or for payment of more than \$25,000, and approved the 2024 Annual Report for submission to the Supreme Court pursuant to APR 15(g).

PUBLIC INFORMATION ONLINE

The Client Protection Fund maintains a website at: <https://www.wsba.org/Legal-Community/Committees-Boards-and-Other-Groups/Client-Protection-Board> that provides information about the CPF, its procedures, and a downloadable application form.



< SCAN
QR CODE
TO LEARN
MORE

Applications and Payments

At the beginning of FY 2025, there were 231 pending applications to the Fund. During FY 2025, the Fund received 94 additional applications. The Board and Trustees acted on 43 applications concerning 12 licensed legal practitioners and approved 37 applications concerning 7 licensed legal practitioners. The total amount in approved payments is \$412,963.

Applications Denied in FY 2025

Application denials are for reasons such as fee disputes, no evidence of dishonesty, alleged malpractice, restitution already paid in full, no attorney client relationship, and other reasons.

6

Applications Approved for Payment in FY 2025

Applications approved for payment arose from the member’s dishonest acts such as theft or conversion, failure to return or account for unearned legal fees, and investments or loans with members.

37

APPLICATIONS IN DETAIL

Applications Pending as of October 1, 2025	231 ¹⁰
Applications Received During FY 2025	94
Applications Acted Upon by Board and Trustees	44
Applications Carried Over to FY 2026	281

APPROVED APPLICATIONS

ATTORNEY	NO. OF APPLICATIONS APPROVED	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF APPLICATIONS APPROVED*	PAGE NUMBER
Corey, Barbara, WSBA #11778	1	\$4,300	7
Jakeman, David, WSBA #39332	3	\$11,000	7
King, Christina, WSBA #39431	13	\$69,770	8-11
Moceri, Mike, WSBA #47787	2	\$6,500	12
Pimpleton, Kristi, WSBA #34419	11	\$178,054	13-17
Rivera, Aurora Lynn, WSBA #846LPO	1	\$2,800	17-18
Taylor-Manning, Robert, WSBA #21890	6	\$140,539	18-19
TOTALS	37	\$412,963	

**Rounded to the nearest dollar*

10. Applications received or pending are still in investigation, not yet ripe, or temporarily stayed. All approved applications receive initial payments of up to \$5,000, with the balance reserved for possible proration against 75% of the CPF balance at fiscal year-end.

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

**ATTORNEY
BARBARA
COREY**

**WSBA #11778 –
DECEASED**

APPLICANT: 22-032

DECISION: \$4,300

In November 2017, Applicant hired Corey to represent him in a criminal matter, paying \$4,790. Corey performed some work, however due to her illness, she was often unavailable. Prior to her death, Corey requested that the prosecutor file a petition pursuant to SB 6164, seeking a resentencing, prior to filing for a Personal Restraint Petition (PRP). Corey's request was denied. Since the PRP was never filed, Applicant sought relief for the balance of the fees paid to Corey.

The Board approved a gift of \$4,300.

**ATTORNEY
DAVID
JAKEMAN**

**WSBA #39332 –
RESIGNED IN LIEU OF
DISCIPLINE**

APPLICANT: 21-099

DECISION: \$4,000

In July 2018, Applicant hired Jakeman to represent him in an immigration matter, paying a flat fee of \$7,000. Applicant agreed to make monthly payments. Jakeman's scope of work included attending Applicant's final merits hearing on his request for asylum in the United States. In October 2020, Applicant received a letter from Beacon Immigration informing him of the office closure and bankruptcy. Though Jakeman did prepare some work of value, he did not refund the remainder of unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$4,000.

APPLICANT: 21-102

DECISION: \$2,000

In October 2017, Applicant hired Jakeman for representation in an immigration matter, paying \$7,000. Applicant signed a fee agreement for Jakeman to prepare and apply for cancellation of removal and represent Applicant at all "master calendar" hearings and one "individual calendar" (merits) hearing. In October 2020, Beacon Immigration offices closed. At the time of closure, Jakeman had performed some work in Applicant's matter. However, the merit hearing had not been scheduled. Applicant never received a refund for the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$2,000.

APPLICANT: 22-027

DECISION: \$5,000

In October 2018, Applicant hired Jakeman to represent him in an immigration matter, paying a flat fee of \$7,000. The scope of Jakeman's work was to prepare and represent Applicant in his removal proceeding before the Seattle Immigration Court. Applicant's final hearing was scheduled for January 2022. In October 2020, Applicant was informed of Beacon Immigration office's closure. In December 2020, Applicant hired new counsel to complete his immigration case. Jakeman had prepared and filed Applicant's application for Cancellation of Removal, and an associate from Jakeman's office attended a preliminary hearing before the Seattle Immigration Court. The work that remained to be done in Applicant's case at the time of Beacon Immigration's closure was preparation of a brief, evidence, and witnesses for trial. Applicant never received a refund for the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
CHRISTINA
KING

WSBA #39431 -
DISABILITY INACTIVE

APPLICANT: 24-009

DECISION: \$4,700

In May 2023, Applicant hired King to represent her in a Committed Intimate Relationship (CIR) matter, paying a total of \$5,000. Applicant hired King to assist with evicting Applicant's ex-boyfriend from her home. After the initial meeting with King, Applicant drafted an eviction email to her ex-boyfriend for King's review. King reviewed and made edits to the email and sent it back to Applicant, along with additional eviction documents. Applicant sent the email and eviction notice to her ex-boyfriend, including the date by which he was to vacate Applicant's home. As the eviction date approached, Applicant sent King several emails, with no return response. Applicant's ex-boyfriend complied and moved out on the date set in the notice. Applicant sent King an email to terminate representation and to request a refund of unearned fees. King never sent the refund of the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$4,700.

APPLICANT: 24-010

DECISION: \$5,000

In July 2023, Applicant hired King to represent him in a family law matter, paying a total of \$5,000. King's scope of work was to represent Applicant in his divorce and to fight a protection order Applicant's wife had filed against him. Applicant states that though it became difficult to communicate with King, he trusted that things were going well and assumed that she was busy working on his case. Applicant states that the protection order hearings were continued four times, and the dissolution matter had yet to be heard. In October 2023, Applicant received a text message regarding King's office closure, the possibility of a refund, and the waiver of outstanding balances. Applicant had a court hearing scheduled in two days and had to hire new counsel. When Applicant and his new counsel tried to contact King, King blocked each of their phone numbers. Applicant never received a refund of the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.

APPLICANT: 24-016

DECISION: \$3,500

In June 2023, Applicants hired King to represent them in a family law matter, paying a total of \$3,500. Applicants signed a fee agreement with King to represent them in obtaining guardianship of their granddaughters. Thereafter, it became difficult for Applicants to communicate with King. In October 2023, when King's office closed, Applicants were informed by the Whatcom County Clerk's Office that nothing had ever been filed with the court on their behalf. The Whatcom County Guardianship Facilitator reviewed Applicant's paperwork and informed them that it was not complete. Applicants never received a refund of the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$3,500.

APPLICANT: 24-017

DECISION: \$3,750

In November 2021, Applicant hired King to represent her in a family law matter, paying

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
CHRISTINA
KING

WSBA #39431 -
DISABILITY INACTIVE

a total of \$3,750. The scope of King’s work was to finalize Applicant’s parenting plan. During the representation, King was unavailable for appointments and never returned phone calls. Applicant received notice of King’s office closure. Applicant states that King performed no work on her case and that she still does not have a finalized parenting plan. During the time she hired King to finalize her parenting plan, she also requested child support modification through the state. Because King was her attorney of record, the filings were automatically sent to King. Applicant provided copies of the documents filed by the prosecutor’s office on her behalf for the child support modification. King did not perform any work on the modification. Applicant never received a refund of the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$3,750.

APPLICANT: 24-023	DECISION: \$11,000
-------------------	--------------------

In August 2023, Applicant hired King to represent her in family law matter, paying a total of \$11,000. The scope of King’s representation was to assist Applicant with the final stages of her dissolution. Prior to King’s representation, Applicant already had a court date scheduled, as King was aware. King was supposed to meet with Applicant prior to the hearing to go over the case, but King kept cancelling the meetings. King arrived in court unprepared and argued for the wrong motion. King never provided a fee agreement and when Applicant requested an itemized billing statement, King gave excuses, blamed the bookkeeper, and assured Applicant that they were working on her case. Applicant continued to pay King when they requested additional payment for representation through arbitration. Thereafter, King was unreachable, did not show up or prepare for the arbitration, and refused to refund unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$11,000.

APPLICANT: 24-025	DECISION: \$5,250
-------------------	-------------------

In June 2023, Applicant hired King to represent her in a family law matter, paying a total of \$5,250. King agreed to represent Applicant at her custody trial. Thereafter, King became unreachable. King failed to appear for a “Motion for Revision” hearing, which King had filed. Since King failed to appear, alternate counsel helped Applicant at the hearing. King never refunded the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$5,250.

APPLICANT: 24-030	DECISION: \$5,000
-------------------	-------------------

In May 2023, Applicant hired King to represent him in a family law matter, paying a total of \$5,000. Applicant states that “it was difficult to communicate with King from the start.” At Applicant’s first court date, King had to request a continuance because they did not have the proper information in court documents. The court gave King 30 days to correct the paperwork. King did not make the corrections or file new paperwork, resulting in Applicant being ordered to pay more in child support. King stopped answering Applicant’s phone calls and emails. Applicant states that

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
CHRISTINA
KING

WSBA #39431 -
DISABILITY INACTIVE

he never received an accounting of the retainer he paid. In October 2023, Applicant was informed of King’s office closure. The custodian assigned to King’s files informed Applicant that there was no money in King’s trust account, no records of funds being received, and no insurance.

The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.

APPLICANT: 24-031	DECISION: \$6,000
-------------------	-------------------

In September 2023, Applicant hired King to represent her in a family law matter, paying a total of \$6,000. Applicant met with King and paid \$300 for an initial one-hour consultation. After agreeing to take her case for \$5,700, King continued the meeting for an additional hour to complete paperwork. Weeks later, Applicant learned that King never filed anything in her matter. Applicant was informed of King’s office closure and possible refund from an automated email reply. King provided no work of value and never refunded the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$6,000.

APPLICANT: 24-032	DECISION: \$5,000
-------------------	-------------------

In June 2023, Applicant hired King to represent her in a Committed Intimate Relationship (CIR) matter, paying a total of \$5,000. Applicant met with King prior to a District Court hearing, where they would file a notice of appearance. King and opposing counsel agreed to have the case moved to Superior Court to determine if a CIR existed. Applicant met with King at their office to discuss next steps. Applicant sent King a text to ask when the response to the Motion for Summary Judgement was due, as the hearing date approached. King responded with the response date. Applicant texted King again to check the status of the response. Applicant again sent King a text and received an automatic message stating: “the law office of Christina King is closing immediately due to a medical emergency. I will arrange refunds for private clients as soon as possible, if there is an outstanding balance it will be waived.” Applicant contacted the court clerk, the judicial assistant, and opposing counsel; and the hearing was stricken. Applicant received King’s Notice of Intent to Withdraw. Thereafter, applicant contacted WSBA, who put her in contact with the custodian assigned to disperse King’s client files. King provided no work of value and never refunded the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.

APPLICANT: 24-035	DECISION: \$5,000
-------------------	-------------------

In February 2023, Applicant hired King to represent him in a family law matter, paying a total of \$5,000. After Applicant paid the retainer in full, communications with King stopped. Applicant states that he never received an invoice, and that no progress was made in his case. King appeared late to court to file a notice of appearance, resulting in a finding of contempt and a \$1,470 fine for Applicant to pay the opposing party. King sent Applicant a text asking for more money.

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
CHRISTINA
KING

WSBA #39431 -
DISABILITY INACTIVE

Applicant refused, stating that there should still be funds left from the retainer fee. Thereafter, King went silent. Applicant found out about King’s office closure through an automated reply, just days before his settlement conference. Applicant settled his case on his own. King provided no work of value and never refunded the unearned fees.
The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.

APPLICANT: 24-041	DECISION: \$6,510.11
In March 2022, Applicant hired King to represent her in a family law matter, paying a total of \$6,510.11. The original matter began in 2011. However, King was hired to represent Applicant to finalize a contempt of court action, which led to the need for a modification to an existing parenting plan. In August 2023, King sent Applicant an email of proposed orders from opposing counsel. Applicant verified, signed and sent the documents back to King. In October 2023, when King closed her office, Applicant discovered that there was a trial date, and that King had not filed the agreed orders, nor had they been forwarded to opposing counsel. Applicant was left to find new counsel to finalize her case. King provided no work of value and never refunded the unearned fees. <i>The Board approved a gift of \$6,510.11.</i>	

APPLICANT: 24-046	DECISION: \$5,000
In July 2023, Applicant hired King to represent him in a family law matter, paying a total of \$5,000. Applicant initially met King for a free consultation. King had a plan on how to handle Applicant’s case and instructed Applicant on which programs to complete. Applicant completed the programs as suggested. King showed up for three hearings, each lasting 15-20 minutes, and each being continued. Applicant provided King with a completed parenting plan, which he had filed in Pierce County; where Applicant lives. However, because Applicant’s child lives in Whatcom County, King said that they would need to complete new forms to file in Whatcom County. There is no record of King completing and filing the new parenting plan in Whatcom County. During this time King’s law office closed without proper notice. King provided no work of value and never refunded the unearned fees. <i>The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.</i>	

APPLICANT: 24-088	DECISION: \$4,060
In October 2021 and in March 2022, Applicant hired King to represent her in family law matters paying a total of \$4,060 in flat fees on two fee agreements. Applicant and King began to work on Applicant’s divorce case. However, King suddenly stopped performing any work and there was little to no communication regarding the status of the case. Applicant made several attempts to contact King with no return response. After months of no communication from King or her office, Applicant discovered that nothing had been filed in her case and that King had closed her practice. Applicant hired new counsel who found that King performed no work of value in either of the matters. King never refunded the unearned fees. <i>The Board approved a gift of \$4,060.</i>	

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
MIKE
MOCERI
WSBA #47787 -
SUSPENDED

APPLICANT: 22-024

DECISION: \$5,000

In September 2021, Applicant hired Mocerì to represent her in a family law matter, paying \$5,000. Prior to hiring Mocerì, Applicant filed and served documents to terminate the parental rights of her child's biological father and to initiate adoption by the man who helped raise the child. During her consult with Mocerì, Applicant informed him that she had already filed and served the necessary documents. Applicant emailed the documents to Mocerì. Mocerì replied to the email stating that he would review them within a week and get back to her. Applicant sent Mocerì an email to check on the status of his review. Mocerì replied to the email stating that he was researching and would be drafting a memorandum and needed another week. Mocerì emailed Applicant stating that he had completed the work. Applicant and Mocerì met by phone, where Applicant had to repeat the same case information that was previously covered in emails, phone calls, and court documents. Mocerì had not taken the time he claimed he had taken with her case. Thereafter, Applicant reached out when Mocerì failed to follow up, as promised. Mocerì made excuses for his failure to follow through. Applicant requested a copy of her case file and an itemized billing statement, which Mocerì never provided. Applicant received no further communication from Mocerì and discovered that he had never filed anything with the court. Mocerì provided no work of value and never refunded the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.

APPLICANT: 25-001

DECISION: \$1,500

In January 2021, Applicant hired Mocerì to represent her in a family law matter paying \$1,500. After Applicant made an initial payment, she reached out to the firm's paralegal. The paralegal informed her that he left the Mocerì Law Group and asked her to contact the firm directly. A few days later, another firm representative contacted Applicant requesting information that Applicant had already provided. Applicant grew suspicious but was desperate for representation and did not feel comfortable going to trial unrepresented. Applicant felt that she was being misled and expressed her urgency and frustration with the firm. She requested a refund so that she could seek other representation. Thereafter, Mocerì's office contacted her enough to keep her on as a client. Applicant continued to grow more confused with inconsistent information from the firm, as her trial date was drawing near. In May 2021, Smith received a letter stating that Mocerì Law Group was permanently closing. Applicant was informed at the pre-trial conference that the opposing counsel was never contacted by Mocerì Law Group regarding mediation. Applicant requested a continuance, which was granted, and she represented herself at trial. Mocerì never refunded the unearned fee.

The Board approved a gift of \$1,500.

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
KRISTI
PIMPLETON

WSBA #34419 –
DISBARRED

APPLICANT: 24-004	DECISION: \$13,522.50
In December 2020, Applicant hired Pimpleton to represent her in an employment matter, paying a total of \$13,522.50. Applicant met with Pimpleton and paid a consultation fee of \$1,522.50. Thereafter, Applicant signed a fee agreement, paying Pimpleton another \$6,500. Pimpleton sent Applicant’s employer a letter of representation, with hopes that the employer would settle the matter. In response to Pimpleton’s representation letter, Applicant’s employer instructed Pimpleton to contact their corporate office. Thereafter, Pimpleton told Applicant that it would be an additional charge of \$5,500 to move forward with filing the matter with the court. After paying the additional fee, it became difficult for Applicant to contact Pimpleton. Pimpleton performed no work of value and did not return any unearned fees. <i>The Board approved a gift of \$13,522.50.</i>	
APPLICANT: 24-027	DECISION: \$7,500
In February 2023, Applicant hired Pimpleton for representation in an employment matter, paying \$7,500. Pimpleton told Applicant that she would complete a draft of a demand letter within the week. Thereafter, Pimpleton became unresponsive to Applicant’s emails requesting the status of the demand letter, and questions about billing. Finally, Applicant received a draft of the demand letter. However, Applicant learned that Pimpleton had been suspended from the practice of law. Pimpleton performed no work of value in Applicant’s case, as the work listed on the invoices misrepresented the work product. Even the draft demand letter was of no value to Applicant. Pimpleton never refunded the unearned fees. <i>The Board approved a gift of \$7,500.</i>	
APPLICANT: 24-033	DECISION: \$8,000
In September 2021, Applicant hired Pimpleton to represent him in an employment matter, paying a total of \$8,000. Pimpleton drafted a demand letter to Applicant’s employer, which Applicant discovered was never sent. After many unsuccessful attempts to contact Pimpleton by phone, texts, and registered mail, Applicant filed a WSBA grievance and application to the Fund. Pimpleton never refunded the unearned fees. <i>The Board approved a gift of \$8,000.</i>	
APPLICANT: 24-034	DECISION: \$2,500
In May 2023, Applicant hired Pimpleton to represent him in an employment matter paying a total of \$2,500. Pimpleton met with Applicant at an initial consultation, agreeing to the representation for a retainer fee of \$4,000; \$2,000 down payment, and \$2,000 due in 30 days. Applicant paid Pimpleton \$2,500 for the consultation fee and down payment. Thereafter, Applicant did not hear from Pimpleton. Applicant grew unhappy with the lack of communication. Applicant terminated Pimpleton’s	

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
KRISTI
PIMPLETON

WSBA #34419 –
DISBARRED

representation and requested a refund of the unearned fee. Pimpleton sent a response, stating that she had been in depositions and that she had begun to work on the demand letter, but that she would be closing his file and follow-up with him about a possible refund. Applicant never heard from Pimpleton again nor did he receive a refund.

The Board approved a gift of \$2,500.

APPLICANT: 24-037

DECISION: \$12,642

In October 2021, Applicant hired Pimpleton to represent him in a wrongful termination matter, paying a total of \$12,642. Applicant and Pimpleton entered into a fee agreement consisting of an hourly fee and retainer of \$6,000. The scope of service included investigation of the termination, settlement negotiations, and litigation. Applicant paid the retainer fee by credit card through QuickBooks. Pimpleton resubmitted the charge through Square. Applicant disputed the second charge, and Pimpleton opposed the dispute. By March 2022, the dispute was resolved, and Applicant recovered the \$6,000 charged through Square. Pimpleton continued to bill Applicant for additional fees throughout the course of the representation. Pimpleton sent Applicant a draft of the demand letter, which Applicant approved. Counsel for Applicant's former employer received the demand letter. Pimpleton sent billing invoices to Applicant reflecting that Pimpleton spoke with opposing counsel on three separate occasions. This was false. It became difficult for Applicant to contact Pimpleton. Finally, Pimpleton sent Applicant an email stating that she spoke with opposing counsel and was waiting to hear back. This was false. Pimpleton continually failed to communicate and made false statements about the case. Opposing counsel sent Pimpleton an email and received an automatic reply that Pimpleton was preparing for trial and would respond as soon as she was able. This was the last contact opposing counsel had with Pimpleton. Pimpleton sent Applicant a billing invoice for \$6,550; \$6,000 retainer fee, \$250 telephone call with opposing counsel, \$200 to respond to the payment dispute, and \$100 for emails to Applicant. In Applicant's response, she reiterated that QuickBooks never voided the first credit card charge and offered to show Pimpleton the statements. Applicant also questioned being charged for Pimpleton's opposition to the credit card dispute and pointed out that there had been no progress on her case for six months. In April 2022, Applicant terminated representation and filed a WSBA grievance and application to the Fund. Pimpleton performed no work of value and never returned the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$12,642.

APPLICANT: 24-038

DECISION: \$10,000

In December 2019, Applicant hired Pimpleton to represent her in an employment matter, paying a flat fee of \$10,000. The scope of representation included writing a demand letter, negotiating with the opposing party, and drafting and finalizing a settlement and release agreement. The fee agreement stated that if the representation terminated before Pimpleton provided all services, Applicant may be

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
KRISTI
PIMPLETON
WSBA #34419 -
DISBARRED

entitled to a refund of all or part of the flat fee. The agreement did not set forth how a refund would be calculated. In March 2020, Pimpleton emailed a demand letter but received no response. Pimpleton told Applicant that the demand letter would be served on the opposing party in June 2020. Pimpleton also informed Applicant that, if they were to file a lawsuit, Applicant would have to enter into a new fee agreement, which would give her a credit of \$5,000 (half of the \$10,000 flat fee), because the opposing party did not negotiate. Pimpleton did not make any attempts to negotiate, nor did she draft or finalize any settlement or release agreements. Applicant decided against filing a lawsuit and requested a partial refund of the \$10,000 flat fee. In August 2020, Pimpleton sent Applicant an email agreeing to the partial refund but stated that she needed to review the time spent on the case to determine the refund amount. Thereafter, Applicant was unsuccessful in obtaining the partial refund. Applicant filed a WSBA grievance and application to the Fund.

The Board approved a gift of \$10,000.

APPLICANT: 24-039	DECISION: \$41,389.50
-------------------	-----------------------

In August 2020, the Applicants hired Pimpleton to assist them with a litigation matter, paying a total of \$41,389.50. Initially, they paid \$1,000 for coaching and counseling, and \$7,500 for settlement negotiations. In February 2021, Pimpleton sent opposing party’s counsel a demand letter offering to settle Applicants’ legal claim for \$91,714.10. When the demand did not result in a settlement, Applicants hired Pimpleton to represent them in a lawsuit. In July 2021, Applicants and Pimpleton entered into a flat fee agreement that covered legal representation from the initiation of a lawsuit through trial, with fees assigned to specific phases of the litigation; \$7,500 for the initiation of the lawsuit, \$7,500 for written discovery, \$7,500 for depositions, \$5,000 for dispositive motions and summary judgment, \$3,000 for pre-trial, \$5,000 for mediation, and \$10,000 for trial. In August 2021, Pimpleton filed the lawsuit. In February 2022, opposing counsel served First Interrogatories and Requests for Production. Pimpleton received the Interrogatories and Requests for Production, but she did not respond by the due date. Opposing counsel emailed Pimpleton requesting a date and time for a CR 26(i) conference and stated that if he did not hear from Pimpleton, he would call at 9:00 a.m. on March 22, 2022. Pimpleton did not respond, nor did she answer when opposing counsel called. Thereafter, unbeknownst to Applicants, Pimpleton remained unresponsive to opposing counsel’s requests, failed to appear at scheduled hearings, and failed to obey court sanctions and fees. When Applicants discovered the court’s order, they made several attempts to contact Pimpleton with no return response. In February 2023, Pimpleton withdrew from the representation, stating that she would evaluate Applicants’ account to determine if a refund was warranted. Pimpleton did not file the notice of withdrawal with the court, nor did she ever refund any of the unearned fees. According to the fee agreement, Pimpleton did not perform any work of value nor in accordance with the specific phases of the litigation.

The Board approved a gift of \$41,389.50.

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
KRISTI
PIMPLETON
WSBA #34419 -
DISBARRED

APPLICANT: 24-049

DECISION: \$2,500

In September 2022, Applicant hired Pimpleton to represent her in an employment matter paying \$2,500. Applicant and Pimpleton entered into a fee agreement with a retainer fee provision stating that in addition to the contingency fee, Applicant would pay Pimpleton a non-refundable fee of \$2,500. The scope of Pimpleton’s representation was to recover Applicant’s commission payments from her former employer, with a demand letter and negotiations. If negotiations were to fail, Pimpleton would advise Applicant regarding filing a lawsuit. Pimpleton sent Applicant an invitation to upload documents to Dropbox. Applicant uploaded several files, and tried to contact Pimpleton by email, phone, and website to confirm that the documents were received. Pimpleton became unresponsive. Applicant went to Pimpleton’s business address in Mill Creek and discovered that the address was a virtual mailbox service, which had been closed for non-payment. Applicant filed a WSBA grievance. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel sent Pimpleton a copy of the grievance and requested a response. Finally, Pimpleton sent Applicant a draft demand letter and message via Dropbox, apologizing for the delay. Applicant responded, noting that Pimpleton’s contact information was no longer valid. She asked to speak with Pimpleton by phone, however, when she called, Pimpleton did not answer. Pimpleton sent Applicant a letter stating that, because Applicant did not edit the demand letter, Pimpleton was closing the file and that though the \$2,500 retainer was non-refundable, she was willing to refund \$600. Applicant ceased communications with Pimpleton and moved forward with her WSBA grievance, and application to the Fund. *The Board approved a gift of \$2,500.*

APPLICANT: 24-085

DECISION: \$9,000

In August 2021, Applicant hired Pimpleton for representation in an employment matter, paying a flat fee of \$9,000. Although Applicant is a former Illinois lawyer, Applicant did not specialize in employment matters. However, Applicant drafted a demand letter and prepared documentation of a sequence of events, regarding a wrongful termination case against their former employer. Subsequently, Applicant also had a workers’ compensation claim with Washington Labor and Industries (L&I). Another law firm represented Applicant in the L&I claim, as Pimpleton did not specialize in workers’ compensation. Since Pimpleton’s website promoted her expertise in employment law, Applicant hoped that Pimpleton could handle the case. Applicant paid a fee of \$1,500 for an initial file review, case assessment, and discussion of the course of action. The \$1,500 fee would be credited toward the fee arrangement package of Applicant’s choice. Applicant paid an additional \$7,500 for drafting and negotiating a settlement agreement with Applicant’s former employer. Pimpleton’s scope of work was to coincide with the L&I claim. Pimpleton sent Applicant’s drafted demand letter and documentation, neither of which she reviewed or edited prior to sending to opposing counsel. Thereafter, Pimpleton became unresponsive and difficult to reach. In February

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY KRISTI PIMPLETON

WSBA #34419 -
DISBARRED

2022, opposing counsel reached out to Pimpleton regarding Applicant's case. Pimpleton never responded. From February 2022 through the summer of 2022, Applicant made many unsuccessful attempts to contact Pimpleton. In response to her lack of communication, Pimpleton often sent blanket emails to all clients, with excuses as to why she had been unreachable. In August 2022, Pimpleton sent Applicant a letter terminating representation and did not refund any unearned fees. Pimpleton performed no work of value in Applicant's case and caused significant harm. Her lack of work resulted in Applicant missing the statute of limitations in the wrongful termination matter.

The Board approved a gift of \$9,000.

APPLICANT: 24-091

DECISION: \$6,000

In July 2019, Applicant hired Pimpleton for representation in a timber trespass matter, paying \$6,000 for the dispositive motion phase of litigation. After two years, the motion had not been filed and no work had been performed. Applicant requested a refund of \$6,000 and wanted to discuss settlement options. Pimpleton refused to refund Applicant the unearned fee and informed Applicant that she was withdrawing from his case regardless of whether he signed a liability waiver. In June 2021, Pimpleton withdrew, abandoning Applicant at a critical phase of his case. Applicant settled the case himself Pro Se.

The Board approved a gift of \$6,000.

APPLICANT: 25-010

DECISION: \$65,000

In August 2021, Applicant hired Pimpleton for representation in an employment matter, paying \$65,000. Soon after paying the retainer, it became difficult for Applicant to communicate with Pimpleton. When Pimpleton responded, she made excuses for her lack of communication and work. Pimpleton eventually became entirely unresponsive, abandoning Applicant's case and never refunding the unearned fees. Applicant hired new counsel, who states that when he took over Applicant's case, he found that Pimpleton's work consisted only of emails to opposing party that did not advance Applicant's case.

The Board approved a gift of \$65,000.

LIMITED PRACTICE OFFICER (LPO)

A. LYNN RIVERA

WSBA #846LPO
- VOLUNTARY
CANCELLATION

APPLICANT: 24-048

DECISION: \$2,800

Rivera was the owner of Escrow Services of Washington, LLC. Rivera's sole responsibility is to supervise escrow transactions and escrow accounts. In October 2021, Rivera's bank issued two Notice of Insufficient Funds for her trust account. In September and October of 2021, Rivera knowingly made multiple unauthorized disbursements of client and third person escrow funds via wire transfers to unknown parties unrelated to the clients and third parties. The total loss of clients' and third persons' escrow funds is estimated to be \$1,968,869.50. Among the unauthorized disbursements were the proceeds of a

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

LIMITED PRACTICE
OFFICER (LPO)
**A. LYNN
RIVERA**

WSBA #846LPO
- VOLUNTARY
CANCELLATION

real estate purchase and sale. Funds were wired to Escrow Services between October 1 and 12, 2021, for an estate. Applicant is the estate fund administrator. The funds were intended to pay costs associated with the purchase and sale totaling \$430,956.12. The estate was ready to be closed. However, due to Rivera’s failure to pay, and follow the escrow instructions, interest, penalties, and charges continued to accrue. The Board determined that while various creditors received some compensation from insurance claims, a balance of \$2,800 was due directly to the estate.

The Board approved a gift of \$2,800.

ATTORNEY
**ROBERT
TAYLOR-
MANNING**

WSBA #21890 -
DISBARRED

APPLICANT: 23-039	DECISION: \$111,038.60
-------------------	------------------------

In August 2021, Applicant hired Taylor-Manning to represent him in a dissolution, paying \$250 a month. In February 2023, Applicant’s automatic payments from his bank account to Taylor-Manning were being returned. Applicant had paid Taylor-Manning a total of \$4,250. Applicant contacted Taylor-Manning’s office to inquire, with no return response. After making several attempts to resolve the issue, Applicant had no choice but to cancel the auto payments. In July 2022, Applicant’s daughter moved him to her home in Niagara Falls, NY, after he suffered a stroke. Applicant’s daughter is his Power of Attorney. In October 2022, Taylor-Manning told Applicant’s daughter that Applicant’s divorce should be concluded by December 2022 or at the latest January 2023, since the paperwork was being finalized. In December 2022, Applicant’s family home sold and the proceeds of the sale were sent to each parties’ counsel to be deposited into their trust accounts (\$111,038.60 each). Taylor-Manning never informed Applicant of the sale. Applicant learned of the sale when his realtor congratulated him. Applicant contacted the title company and confirmed that his proceeds were sent to Taylor-Manning. Applicant’s wife received her portion of the proceeds of the sale from her counsel. Taylor-Manning continued to be unreachable and failed to appear at court dates in Applicant’s proceeding. Applicant was informed by the court that Taylor-Manning also failed to appear for other clients and was encouraged to contact opposing counsel. Opposing counsel and Applicant, along with his daughter, worked to finalize the divorce.

The Board approved a gift of \$111,038.60.

APPLICANT: 24-012	DECISION: \$3,000
-------------------	-------------------

In December 2021, Applicant hired Taylor-Manning to assist her family with an elder law matter. Applicant’s husband has Parkinson’s disease and resides in an assisted living facility. Applicant signed a fee agreement and paid an advance fee of \$3,000. The fee agreement also gave Taylor-Manning permission to communicate with her children on her behalf. Taylor-Manning told Applicant that to obtain power of attorney for her husband, she needed a letter from his doctor documenting his diminished capacity. Taylor-Manning emailed the executive director of the assisted living facility to request a letter from the doctor regarding Applicant’s husband’s

CONTINUED >

SECTION V

The following summarizes the gifts and recommendations made by the Board:

ATTORNEY
ROBERT
TAYLOR-
MANNING

WSBA #21890 –
DISBARRED

health condition, treatment and capacity to manage finances and personal care. In January 2022, Applicant took the requested documents to Taylor-Manning’s office. Her daughter also sent him an email with the documents attached. Taylor-Manning received both hand-delivered and emailed documents. Taylor-Manning did nothing with the documents. Thereafter, neither Applicant nor her children ever heard from Taylor-Manning again; all calls and email attempts to reach Taylor-Manning were unsuccessful. In March 2022, Applicant sent Taylor-Manning a letter terminating representation and requesting a refund of the unearned fees. Between December 2021 and August 2022, Taylor-Manning withdrew Fields’s money from his trust account, and never refunded the unearned fees.

The Board approved a gift of \$3,000.

APPLICANT: 24-019	DECISION: \$5,000
-------------------	-------------------

In January 2020, Applicant hired Taylor-Manning to prepare his estate plan, paying \$5,000. Taylor-Manning did not complete the estate planning work, nor did he perform any work of value. After terminating representation, and failed attempts seeking a refund, Applicant filed a small claims case against Taylor-Manning. The court granted Applicant a judgment of \$5,095. Taylor-Manning has failed to satisfy the judgment.

The Board approved a gift of \$5,000.

APPLICANT: 24-026	DECISION: \$18,000
-------------------	--------------------

In May 2023, Applicant hired Taylor-Manning to represent her in an estate matter, paying \$18,000 cash. Taylor-Manning filed a notice of appearance and an incomplete Trust and Estate Dispute Resolution Act (TEDRA) petition. Thereafter, Applicant never heard from Taylor-Manning again. Applicant realized that Taylor-Manning had taken her money without performing any work and filed a WSBA grievance and application to the Fund.

The Board approved a gift of \$18,000.

APPLICANT: 25-002	DECISION: \$1,000
-------------------	-------------------

In January 2024, Applicant hired Taylor-Manning to make a change to his will, paying \$1,000. Thereafter, it became difficult to communicate with Taylor-Manning. Applicant learned of Taylor-Manning’s disbarment, and never received a refund of the unearned fee.

The Board approved a gift of \$1,000.

APPLICANT: 25-003	DECISION: \$2,500
-------------------	-------------------

In January 2023, Applicants hired Taylor-Manning to draft wills and estate planning documents, paying \$2,500. Applicants never signed a fee agreement with Taylor-Manning. Soon after hiring Taylor-Manning, it became difficult to contact him. Applicants never received any formal documents, and no work of value was performed. Taylor-Manning never informed Applicants of his disbarment, and he did not refund the unearned fee.

The Board approved a gift of \$2,500.

APPENDIX

CPF Balance Sheet

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

ASSETS

Audited as of September 30, 2025

Checking Account	\$188,318
Accrued Interest Receivable	\$34,006
Money Market.....	\$3,423,559
Investments.....	\$2,224,540

TOTAL ASSETS	\$5,870,423
---------------------	--------------------

LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

Approved gifts to injured clients payable.....	\$392,335
Liability to WSBA general fund.....	\$170,996
Net Assets	\$5,307,092

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS	\$5,870,423
---	--------------------

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

REVENUE

Audited as of September 30, 2025

Donations.....	\$2,000
Restitution.....	\$20,766
Member Assessment.....	\$732,050
Interest.....	\$220,403

TOTAL REVENUE	\$975,219
----------------------	------------------

EXPENSES

Misc.	(\$3,317)
Gifts to Injured Clients.....	\$249,483
CPF Board.....	\$553
Staff Membership Dues.....	\$200
Indirect (overhead).....	\$180,560

TOTAL EXPENSE	\$427,479
----------------------	------------------

Net Income (Expense)	\$547,740
----------------------------	-----------

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS

Balance on September 30, 2024	\$4,759,353
Net Income as of September 30, 2025	\$547,740

BALANCE ON SEPTEMBER 30, 2025	\$5,307,092
--------------------------------------	--------------------



WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600, Seattle, WA 98101-2539

206.727.8200 | www.wsba.org