

**Fleisher's Entire Representation Was a  
Conflict of Interest Due to His  
Undisclosed Law Office Rule  
"Never Sue a Lawyer or Law Firm"**

Fleisher was in violation of **RULE 1.7: CONFLICT OF INTEREST**, because he failed to admit to Schwartz at the onset that he could not engage against another law office.

There were two law offices that should have been directly involved and joined as defendants.

(1) Schwartz had hired an expert law office to prepare the documents and fully direct the administration of the Estate and Trusts. That office should have been joined as a party Defendant.

(2) Also, the new Trustee, Attorney Richard Nelson, took all the Trust money and misrepresented to the Federal Court that the amount he received was much less. He failed to reveal many assets in order to aid the government in prosecuting Schwartz and to preserve his own lucrative fee-earning position as the subsequent Trustee. He ultimately paid Hadassah the full amount.

Hadassah and the Trustees sued Schwartz in the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas. Schwartz told Fleisher that he had been acting under the direction of another law office to prepare the Will and Trusts to manage the Estate. Schwartz therefore needed to actively join a claim against that Law Office.

Fleisher, at Schwartz's insistence, vaguely included that office in a Counterclaim as part of Schwartz's Answer without reference to any particular acts or identifying the appointed lawyer who provided the wrongful guidance. Fleisher failed to take any further steps to follow through with any discovery or aggressive litigation.

Fleisher failed to focus the blame on a hired office that for five years had provided insufficient administration and guidance for which Schwartz was totally blamed. That law office was a primary party to share or take on full responsibility and damages.

When Schwartz later asked Fleisher why he did not pursue the claim, he told Schwartz that it was the strict rule of his office never to sue another lawyer or law firm, because their practice was known to defend lawyers and law firms. It would ruin their reputation.

The involvement of the law office that Schwartz hired to direct him eventually admitted its involvement and shared its negligence. However, without specific exposure of its acts, it paid only a nominal contribution with Schwartz left to pay the unjustified rest. The law office that was directing Schwartz in his work should also have been joined and ordered to disgorge and return its fees.

Nelson fully escaped blame for his blatant misrepresentations to the courts. Fleisher took no action against Nelson, make any mention of his involvement, or attempt to procure any of the needed Trust accounting information.

The reason for Fleisher's obstinance to immediately and aggressively involve that firm was another undisclosed conflict of interest in secret violation of **RULE 1.7: CONFLICT OF INTEREST:**

**(a) A lawyer's acceptance or continuation of representation of a client creates a conflict of interest if...(2) there is a substantial risk that the lawyer's ability to consider, recommend, or carry out an appropriate course of action for that client will be materially limited ... by the lawyer's own personal interests.**

Due to Fleisher's unrevealed conflicts of interest, he set up Schwartz to take the full alleged blame for the claims. The firms could have shared or taken all of the blame, criminal charges and personal losses.

**This was just one of at least FIVE (5) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST by Fleisher.**