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This case involves copyright litigation, but doesn’t advance your knowledge of copyright law in the least. Rather it is a gripping cautionary tale about leaping at contingency agreements without thinking them through.

And sometimes amidst the excruciating boredom of reading appellate cases you run across a bit of pop culture history so sublimely that it makes it all worthwhile. King v. Fox is such a moment.

On his Website, Ed King lays claim to having authored “the most famous riff in rock ’n roll history.” A $30 price from the meagre ATG treasury will go to the first alert reader to identify that riff with a “reasonable degree of specificity.”

Edward King was a California teenager in a garage band called Six Pence. It was the time of the British Invasion. The Beatles and the Stones and Ed Sullivan. Yardbirds. The Animals. You get the angle.

Being Californians, they caught the vibes of psychedelia early and changed their name to — The Strawberry Alarm Clock!

I know. You’re just as overwhelmed as I was.

The one-hit psychedelic bubble-gum band of “Incense and Peppermints” fame, it was 1967, the height of Flower Power. It’s America and commerce had to cash in on the counter-culture. As TV grappled with capturing the Boomer demographic, the Alarm Clock scored appearances on the Jonathan Winters Show and Rowan & Martin’s Laugh-In.

Yes, sock it to me! And that’s not all. A brief moment as themselves singing in that ultimate Hollywood shlock “Beyond the Valley of the Dolls.”

The pop cultural significance of this is just over the top. Indeed so much so that “Incense and Peppermints” was used in 1997 in the first Austin Powers movie as an instantiate meme of a bygone era.

But our story has barely begun. Come 1969-70 and the Boomers all graduated from college. Psychedelia died hard. King and the one-hit band toured dingy clubs as an opening act for total unknowns. One fateful night they opened for a then obscure something called Lynyrd Skynyrd. What a juxtaposition. A true bridge in rock history.

Yes, what is the point of that name? Leonard Skinnard was a gym coach in Jacksonville, Florida who nagged the boys about the length of their hair and gave them the excuse to quit school.

Ed King had a way with a guitar. Soon to be legendary Ronnie Van Zant spotted that talent and recruited him for Lynyrd. Soon thereafter, King went into a recording studio with his new colleagues, they all added up some creativity and walked out with a track called “Sweet Home Alabama.” Southern Rock was born.

I know. I know, The Allman Brothers date back to at least 1968 and Duane had managed heroin addiction and death by motorcycle by 1971. But the line sounded good.

Anyhow, for Lynyrd, the year was 1972, and King rode the wave to the crest, playing guitar and co-writing mega-hits. But King was a Californian after all, and the hard partying and physically violent inter-band conflicts of Southern Rockers got to him. In 1975 he quit the regimen of drugs, booze and demolished hotel rooms.

In one great footnote of the history of rock violence, Lynyrd Skynyrd was set to open for The Who and was warming up by having a dressing room drunken brawl. Pete Townshend7 naively walked through the door nattily outfitted in his show-time velvet suit to be doused from head to toe by a pitcher of beer. Those playful redneck rockers.

Under the MCA recording contract, King was entitled to writer’s and artist’s royalties but he got zilch after he left because his royalties along with other band members’ had been used to do a $1 million buy-out of the former band manager Al Cooper.

At the time, the band was making around a million a year, and King was entitled to roughly one seventh of that.

Hard up for moos, King consulted famous New York entertainment lawyer Allen Grubman who told him he would need a litigator. Grubman got King an advance on royalties and took one third as his fee. Then he passed King along to his old law school classmate Lawrence Fox.

Fox was a litigator all right, but the personal injury kind, and he openly admitted he “knew nothing about the entertainment field.” Like so many clients, King lacked any shred of documentation showing what he sensed he was owed.

Fox phoned the Skynyrd attorney who said King was owed nothing because he quit the band, and in fact owed the band money — and also declined to provide any paperwork on King’s contract with MCA.

On the next King/Fox meeting, the issue of the fee came up. Like so many clients, particularly rock ‘n rollers who have quit a band, King said he had no money. Being a personal injury type lawyer Fox proposed the old one-third contingency which every client adores initially. No up-front money. Lawyer gets nothing if he loses. But of course the dispute will always come. It’s just a question of when.

As John Travolta’s partner says in “A Civil Action:” “The minute the money goes down on the table there’s trouble.”

King says he thought it was one-third of the accumulated back royalties. Fox says the deal was one-third forever. The contingency agreement that King signed read “1/3 of the recovery.”

How’s that for ambiguous?

With his fee secure, Fox got his hands on the MCA contract which predictably said King could get his royalties without going through the band and that quitting the band was not grounds for suspension of royalties. MCA does after all have considerable experience with band members quitting.

Despite the fairly plain face of the contract, Fox decided to sue MCA. Fox claimed MCA “put in a vigorous defense.” Despite this alleged resistance, MCA agreed to pay King everything he was owed which was $213,000.

Remember, these are 1978 dollars when I began the drudgery of college teaching for $18,000 a year.

Next, Fox casually mentioned to King that the deal was a third forever, and while King was “shocked,” like all clients he wanted to get his hands on money and “put it on the back burner.”

In 1981, King asked Fox to represent him in a dispute with MCA over the “Muscle Shoals Masters” — guitar over-dubbing by King of Skynyrd songs from before King joined the band. Fox again sued, and settlement was continued on page 62
reached giving King his royalties. No fee was discussed, both King and Fox assuming it was covered under the original agreement.

Fast forward to 1986 when the issue was again discussed. Fox was representing King in a dispute with the estates of former Skynyrd members.

Yes, Southern rockers will die young. In 1977, Ronnie Van Zant, Steve Gaines and Cassie Gaines went down in a rented plane when it ran out of fuel and plunged a 500-foot swath through a swamp near Gillsburg, Mississippi. Allen Collins survived, but killed his girlfriend in a drunk driving car crash and was himself paralyzed to soon die of pneumonia.

In the meantime, Fox had been taking a third of writer’s and artist’s royalties even though the original dispute had been only over artist’s. The check would go from MCA to Fox who would take out his third and forward the rest to King.

King claims Fox told him the fee arrangement was “approved by the Judge or whatever, and he said he (Fox) couldn’t change it if he wanted to.”

And as a typical client, King never asked for a copy of the court order.

And Fox denies having said the above.

In 1987, King wrote a letter to Fox telling him to quit taking fees from the writer’s royalties and Fox agreed. But he didn’t return any writer’s royalties he had previously taken.

In 1991, King was in the hospital for congestive heart failure. By chance an MCA clerk contacted him to verify his address, and for some reason began sending all checks directly to King. Which meant Fox wasn’t taking a third.

Fox called demanding his fees in 1997, and King like all clients said he didn’t have the money.

In 1997, King got a new lawyer who told him Fox had been ripping him off and sued, saying the agreement was unconscionable. The District Court gave summary judgment to Fox holding that King had ratified the agreement.

Unconscionability

“That which is bargained for by the promisor and given in exchange for the promise by the promisee is not made insufficient as a consideration by the fact that its value in the market is not equal to that which is promised.”

Corbin on Contracts § 127.

In Indian Territory

from page 58

secondary to the original accounts, but they are in many cases primary sources in their own right. Starting in 1853, every word of every journal kept during the expedition was published in an 11-volume edition by the University of Nebraska, and its edition includes a folio volume that reproduces the manuscript maps that were long the best available.

From where the Missouri River enters the

Boy that put you to sleep. And here you thought we were talking about rock n’ roll.

That turgid sentence is Corbin struggling to say that inadequacy of consideration is not a ground for the rescission of a contract. In a free market, buyer and seller meet and strike their bargain. Absent fraud, duress or mistake they are bound by their decision as to the worth of what they are swapping. Of course with the law there are always exceptions, one being the unconscionable contract.

UCC-2-302 provides that the court as a matter of law may find a contract to be unconscionable thereby opening up an infuriatingly vague area of law. “The court” and “as a matter of law” mean this is a judge question on law and not a jury question on the facts of the case.

And what the heck does the big word mean? Unconscionable. Against conscience. Oo-la-la.

Then it’s divided into procedural and substantive. Procedural unconsc: consists of dirty tricks in the making of the contract which are so indistinguishable from fraud that I question whether this area of law needs to exist at all.

Substantive is a question of the unfairness of the contract. Sometimes courts bumble about unequal bargaining power which has never made sense to me because Exxon has to deal with its gas stations and the contracts can’t be unfair purely because of the unequal size of the parties.

In the more comprehensible cases, there will frequently be a limitation of remedy for breach which on the surface seems fair but turns out to be no remedy at all. Yard seller provides in his standard form contract that textile mill must inspect the yard and in return, he of defects within six days. Then seller will replace the defective yard as the sole remedy. But to discover the defects, mill must weaver a sweater and wash it to see if the dye runs. Which takes more than six days. So buyer has no real remedy at all. Unconscionable.

In our current case, the issue seems to be one of the size of the attorney’s fee vis-à-vis work done with maybe some ambiguity and/or trickery in the making of the contract thrown in. The justification for the old one-third is the lawyer is taking a high risk of getting nothing. King’s cases seem to have been pretty much easy lay-ups.

Ratification

Fox claimed King ratified the agreement by not challenging it and by continuing to employ Fox. The Second Circuit said in a normal contract case the eight years between 1978 and 1986 would be enough to show ratification. See, e.g., Benjamin Goldstein Prods., Ltd. v. Fish, 198 A.D. 2d 137 (1st Dep’t 1993) (holding that a party’s knowing acceptance of benefits from a contract for more than a year after the agreement was executed constituted ratification, and barred the party from alleging economic duress in the execution).

But Attorney’s Fees Are Different

Attorney’s fees are held to a higher standard than run-of-the-mill contracts as courts have always held authority over legal fees under “inherent and statutory power to regulate the practice of law.” First Nat’l Bank v. Brewer, 42 N.Y.2d 471, 474, 368 N.E.2d 1240 (1977).


To find unconscionability, the court must explore all facts and circumstances of the agreement including the parties’ intent and value of services in proportion to the fee. See Gsov v. Rarick, 47 A.D.2d 658, 655, 364 N.Y.S.2d 184, 186 (2d Dep’t 1976).

There’s no “magic number” that pushes the deal into unconscionability, fifty percenters having been upheld. See, e.g., Beadwear, Inc. v. Media Brands, LLC, No. 00 Civ. 5438, 2001 U.S. Dist. Lexis 20927, (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 18, 2001).

In Shiva v. Nat’l Comm. of Gibran, 381 F. 2d 602 (2d Cir. 1967) the lawyer Shiva was employed by the estate of Khalil Gibran to secure renewal copyrights for a 25% cut. There was heavy litigation and still more over whether Shiva was entitled to cut of foreign royalties on justified times. The agreement was held ambiguous, but both parties agreed the “prize sought... was the full fruits of the renewal copyrights.” Id. at 607.

Yes, you’ve squirmed through contrived wedding ceremonies where bride and groom pledge their troth by reading Khalil. You’ve heard the ghastly poems, now read the appeals case.

But the Second Circuit found a distinction in that King claims deception and the sheer amount of Fox’s fee — $500,000 “for modest work.” These facts could lead to a finding of unconscionability.

And if it is unconscionable, can the client ratify it? Old New York cases — if we’re talking 1879 type old — seem to say it can be. See Kent v. Quicksilver Mining Co., 78 N.Y. 159, 190 (1879) (“An unconscionable arrangement will not be disturbed when there has been ratification of it with knowledge of all its bearings, after time has been had for consideration.”). And then there are similar cases from 1927 and 1932.

But: none of that involved attorney-client agreements. So, they “certified” it to the New York Court of Appeals to answer the question of whether a client can ratify an unconscionable attorney’s fee agreement.

The mills of the law grind slowly.
And so we wait for the New York Court of Appeals with bated breath.