

**People v. Eloise Henderson Bouzari. 16PDJ055. July 13, 2016.**

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' conditional admission of misconduct and suspended Eloise Henderson Bouzari (attorney registration number 26776) for six months, all stayed upon the successful completion of a three-year period of probation, with conditions. Bouzari's probation took effect July 13, 2016.

In June 2012, Bouzari agreed to represent a client in a civil case against the University of Denver ("DU") under an hourly fee arrangement. Gradually, Bouzari and the client developed a close personal relationship, and Bouzari offered to allow the client, who did not have sufficient financial resources to live on his own, to move into her own house. She allowed the client to use her credit card to get groceries for the house and put gas in his car. Bouzari often told the client that she loved him, and Bouzari talked with the client about adopting him. Bouzari and the client also traveled together to see Respondent's daughter. Both Bouzari and the client deny any sexual, romantic, or intimate relationship.

In January 2013, the client's case was converted into a contingency fee arrangement, but Bouzari did not provide the client with a written contingent fee agreement. In February 2013, Bouzari filed suit against DU on the client's behalf. In April 2013, Bouzari also filed on the client's behalf a suit against another attorney for legal malpractice. Bouzari asked other lawyers to work on these cases with her as co-counsel; those lawyers entered appearances in both cases in July 2013.

By January 2014, Bouzari's relationship with the client began to sour, with the client telling Bouzari several times that he wanted her to withdraw from representing him. He also asked Bouzari not to talk to him like family, but rather as a client. Though Bouzari remained counsel of record during the settlement of the legal malpractice case and pending the ongoing litigation with DU, the client moved out of Bouzari's home and into a luxury apartment complex, for which Bouzari executed a guarantor agreement.

In October 2014, after the DU litigation had been dismissed on summary judgment, the client grieved Bouzari. She received a request for response in January 2015. The next month, she requested a protection order against the client in which she repeated some allegations he had made in his grievance and disclosed other confidential information about her client, though she believes she disclosed only what was necessary to protect her personal safety.

Bouzari's conduct violated Colo. RPC 1.5(c) (a lawyer shall enter into contingent fee agreements that conform to the requirements of Chapter 23.3 of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure); Colo. RPC 1.6 (a lawyer shall not reveal information relating to the representation of a client); Colo. RPC 1.7 (restricting the circumstances in which a lawyer may represent a client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest); Colo. RPC 1.8(a) (a lawyer shall not enter into a business transaction with a client unless the client is advised to seek independent legal counsel and the client gives written informed consent to the transaction); and Colo. RPC 1.8(e) (a lawyer shall not provide financial assistance to a client in connection with a pending or contemplated litigation).