## IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI CENTRAL DIVISION

TODD JANSON, et al., on behalf of	)	
themselves and on behalf of all others	)	
similarly situated,	)	
	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 2:10-cv-04018-NKL
	)	
LEGALZOOM.COM, INC.	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

## PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT THAT LEGALZOOM DOES NOT PROVIDE LEGAL ADVICE TO CUSTOMERS

Come now Plaintiffs, by and through counsel, and for their Motion in Limine to exclude any evidence or argument that LegalZoom does not provide legal advice to its customers, states:

Plaintiffs anticipate, based on arguments asserted by LegalZoom in their summary judgment papers, that LegalZoom will attempt to introduce evidence or argument before the jury that LegalZoom does not provide legal advice to its customers and therefore is not engaged in the unlawful practice of law. Such evidence or argument should be excluded because "[e]vidence which is not relevant is not admissible." Fed. R. Evid. 402. Furthermore, such evidence would mislead and confuse the jury.

In *Carpenter v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 250 S.W.3d 697 (Mo. 2008) and *Eisel v. Midwest Bankcentre*, 230 S.W.3d 335 (Mo. 2007), the Missouri Supreme Court confirmed that the preparation of legal documents for compensation by a non-lawyer is actionable under Section 484.020 RSMo. *Eisel*, 230 S.W.3d at 339; *Carpenter*, 250 S.W.3d at 700. In both cases, the plaintiffs contended that mortgage lenders were engaged in the law business, as defined by

Section 484.010.2 RSMo., by charging borrowers for preparation of deeds of trusts, promissory notes and other documents of legal significance in connection with mortgage loans. 230 S.W.3d at 336; 250 S.W.3d at 699.

Notably, neither *Eisel* nor *Carpenter* involved advice or counseling concerning legal matters. As in the present case, there was no contention that the defendant was "advising or counseling for a valuable consideration any person, firm, association, or corporation as to any secular law" as prohibited by the first portion of Section 484.010.2. Rather, those cases, like the present case, were premised on the second portion of Section 484.010.2, which prohibits a non-lawyer from "drawing" or "assisting in the drawing for a valuable consideration of any paper, document or instrument affecting or relating to secular rights." § 484.010.2 RSMo. In short, whether LegalZoom gives its customers legal advice is of no significance.

The *Eisel* and *Carpenter* decisions made it clear that even in the context of a real-estate closing where no expectation of legal representation exists, the preparation of a legal document for a fee by a non-lawyer, i.e., "legal drafting as a business," is prohibited. Simply stated, for a violation of §484.010.2 to be established, no inquiry into whether the defendant gave "personal advice to specific problems to a readily identifiable person" is required.

"Relevant evidence' means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence." Fed. R. Evid. 401. "Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible." Fed. R. Evid. 402. "A defendant has no right to offer and a jury has no right to hear inadmissible evidence." U.S. v. Ceballos, 593 F. Supp. 2d 1054, 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2009). Whether LegalZoom gave legal advice to its customers has no bearing whatsoever on the factual determination to be made by the jury concerning whether LegalZoom violated Section 484.020.1

## RSMo.

This court has broad discretion in determining the admissibility of evidence, *Fortune Funding, LLC v. Ceridian Corp.*, 368 F.3d 985, 990 (8th Cir. 2004), and should exercise its discretion to exclude evidence or argument concerning whether LegalZoom gave legal advice to its customers.

Edward D. Robertson, Jr., # 27183 Mary Doerhoff Winter, # 38328 BARTIMUS, FRICKLETON, ROBERTSON & GORNY 715 Swifts Highway Jefferson City, MO 65109 573.659.4454, 573.659.4460 (fax) chiprob@earthlink.net, marywinter@earthlink.net

Timothy Van Ronzelen, #44382
Matthew A. Clement, #43833
Kari A. Schulte, #57739
COOK, VETTER, DOERHOFF &
LANDWEHR, PC
231 Madison
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
573.635.7977, 573.635.7414 (fax)
tvanronzelen@cvdl.net
mclement@cvdl.net
kschulte@cvdl.net

Steven E. Dyer, #45397 **LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN DYER**10850 Sunset Office Drive, Ste. 300
St. Louis, MO 63127
314.898.6715
jdcpamba@gmail.com

/s/ David T. Butsch

David T. Butsch, # 37539

James J. Simeri, #52506

BUTSCH SIMERI FIELDS LLC
231 S. Bemiston Ave., Ste. 260
Clayton, MO 63105
314.863.5700, 314.863.5711 (fax)
butsch@bsflawfirm.com
simeri@bsflawfirm.com

Randall O. Barnes, #39884

RANDALL O. BARNES & ASSOCIATES
219 East Dunklin Street, Suite A
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
573.634.8884, 573.635.6291 (fax)
rbarnesjclaw@aol.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on August 2, 2011, I filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system. The system sent notification of this filing to the following:

Party	Counsel
Defendant LegalZoom.com, Inc.	Robert M. Thompson James T. Wicks BRYAN CAVE LLP One Kansas City Place 1200 Main Street, Ste. 3500 Kansas City, MO 64105 816.374.3200, 816.374.3300 (fax)  John Michael Clear Michael Biggers James Wyrsch BRYAN CAVE LLP One Metropolitan Square, Ste. 3600 211 N. Broadway St. Louis, MO 63102 314.250.2000, 314.259.2020 (fax)

/s/ David T. Butsch