	SIGNED.
1 2	Dated: May 19, 2011
3	1 1 1
4	Kandoph J. Haines
5	RANDOLPH J. HAINES U.S. Bankruptcy Judge
6	
7	IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
8	In re) Chapter 7
9	WAYNE S. GOSHKARIAN and) CASE NO. 2:03-bk-01600-RJH MELISSA A. GOSHKARIAN,)
10) ORDER FOR SUPPLEMENTAL Debtors.) BRIEFING AND/OR EXPERT OPINION
11)
12	Prior to the evidentiary hearing now scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on June 13, the Court
13	would appreciate supplemental legal memoranda and/or expert opinion addressing the questions
14	that arise from the following hypothetical. Although such supplemental memoranda and/or
15	expert opinions are not required, if they are provided they should be filed by 5:00 p.m., Monday,
16	June 6.
17	Assume Attorney A enters into a valid 40% contingent fee agreement with the
18	client. Assume Attorney A subsequently agrees to share 50% of that fee with Attorney B, but
19	the client does not agree to B's participation in violation of Arizona Ethical Rule 1.5(e)(2).
20	Assume, when the case is concluded, that a 40% contingent fee is reasonable.
21	1. To what fee is Attorney B entitled – <i>quantum meruit</i> based on the work he
22	performed, or nothing?
23	2. To what fee is Attorney A entitled – 40%, 20%, or <i>quantum meruit</i> based
24	on the work A performed?
25	DATED AND SIGNED ABOVE
26	
27	
28	