# IN BRIEF

January 2016 Issue 127



Malpractice Prevention Education for Oregon Lawyers

# Tips, Traps, and Resources

MAIL DELIVERY: Some law offices have recently encountered longer-than-average delivery times for mail delivered with the U.S. Postal Service. Given that some deadlines are based on date of receipt rather than the date postmarked, this situation illustrates the dangers of waiting to file at the last moment and relying on quick mail delivery. Practitioners should take extra precautions to avoid missing deadlines. The most important step you can take is to be proactive and file early! Additionally, lawyers may opt to supplement mail delivery with an email or phone call alert and/or to use a private messenger service to courier documents.

Thanks to Troy S. Bundy, Hart Wagner, LLP, and the PLF Practice Management Advisors, for their assistance with this tip.

## **Cases of Note**

**DOMESTIC RELATIONS:** In the case of *Pollack and Pollack*, 357 Or 575 (July 30, 2015), the Oregon Supreme Court held that ORS 107.105(1)(f)(F) imposes a mandate on courts to require full disclosure of the parties' assets in making a just and proper division. That statutory duty endures until the court enters a dissolution judgment that effects a just division of the parties' assets. In short, the court said that before deciding whether the mediated agreement should be enforced, the trial court was obligated to decide wife's motion to compel production. www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/docs/S062000.pdf

**POST-CONVICTION RELIEF:** In *Verduzco v. State*, 357 Or 553 (July 30, 2015), the Oregon Supreme Court held that the escape clause in ORS 138.550(3) does not preclude a petitioner from relitigating only those grounds for relief that he was certain he could win when he filed his first post-conviction petition, but rather precludes him from raising, in his second petition, those grounds of relief that he could not reasonably have raised in his first petition. Failure to do so will bar the petitioner from later raising an omitted ground for relief. www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/docs/S062339.pdf

**CONTRACT LAW:** In A&T Siding, Inc. v. Capitol Specialty Insurance Corporation, 358 Or 32 (October 8, 2015), the Oregon Supreme Court decided a certified question from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and held that an addendum executed by the parties cannot equitably reform a settlement agreement on the

### **DISCLAIMER**

This material is provided for informational purposes only and does not establish, report, or create the standard of care for attorneys in Oregon, nor does it represent a complete analysis of the topics presented. Readers should conduct their own appropriate legal research. The information presented does not represent legal advice. This information may not be republished, sold, or used in any other form without the written consent of the Oregon State Bar Professional Liability Fund except that permission is granted for Oregon lawyers to use and modify these materials in their own practices. © 2016 OSB Professional Liability Fund.

# Cases of Note, continued

basis of a mistake of law in which the parties did not foresee the legal consequences of their original agreement. www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/docs/S062330.pdf

CONTRACT LAW: In *Brownstone Homes Condominium Association v. Brownstone Forest Heights, LLC*, 358 Or 223 (November 19, 2015), the Oregon Supreme Court concluded that *Stubblefield v. St. Paul Fire & Marine*, 267 Or 397 (1973), was wrongly decided and should be overruled. The court held that Stubblefield erred when it concluded that a covenant not to execute obtained in exchange for an assignment of rights, by itself, effects a complete release that extinguishes an insured's liability and, by extension, the insurer's liability as well. www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/docs/S061273A.pdf

**MEDIATION CONFIDENTIALITY:** In *Alfieri v. Solomon*, 358 Or 383 (December 10, 2015), the Oregon Supreme Court held that confidential mediation communications under ORS 36.110(7)(a) do not include private communications between a mediating party and his or her attorney outside of mediation proceedings, even if those communications are integrally related to the mediation. www.publications.ojd.state.or.us/docs/S062520.pdf