

People v. Jarod Conner Harsha, 25PDJ33, June 11, 2025.

The Presiding Disciplinary Judge approved the parties' stipulation to discipline and suspended Jarod Conner Harsha (attorney registration number 55360) for three years, all to be stayed upon Harsha's successful completion of a three-year period of probation, with conditions.

Harsha engaged in three episodes of misconduct while working at a law firm. In 2022, a client hired the firm to represent the client in a dissolution of marriage case. Harsha entered his appearance in the case that May. Harsha initially neglected to file the client's sworn financial statement and direct the client to take a mandated parenting class. Harsha filed a memorandum of understanding in the case, which the court adopted as an order on September 1, 2023. In that order, the court ordered the parties to file the required documents to complete a dissolution decree or other status report within fourteen days. Harsha did not file a status report until October 23, 2023, stating that he would file a separation agreement and parenting plan forthwith. He did not do so, however. Nor did he respond to the court's order to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, even though he reviewed that order. In January 2024, the court dismissed the case. Harsha did not notify the client that the case had been dismissed and did not return the client's subsequent communications. In May 2024, the client contacted the law firm, and a partner at the firm successfully moved to reopen the case. Harsha separated from the law firm that month.

In May 2023, while Harsha was with the law firm, a law student interning with the firm drafted a notice of temporary orders for a client, which Harsha then filed in the client's case. But Harsha billed the client 0.2 hour for drafting the notice and 0.1 hour for sending the notice to the intern for filing, and the intern billed the client 0.2 hour for filing the notice. Harsha's and the intern's billable hourly rates were \$340.00 and \$225.00, respectively. They swapped their billing entries to meet what they understood were daily billing expectations.

In early 2024, Harsha contracted, on the law firm's behalf, with a company to provide legal services for clients via the company's online platform, for which the company would pay a fee to the firm. Initially, the law firm used its financial management software to process the fees. After the company began to use a different payment service, Harsha—whose personal checking account was linked with the law firm's business account—negligently selected his personal account rather than the firm's business account to receive the company's payments. From February to May 2024, the company made five payments totaling \$1,642.34 to Harsha's account. In May 2024, Harsha repaid the law firm the full amount, though he was likely entitled to a portion of the fees.

Through this misconduct, Harsha violated Colo. RPC 1.3 (a lawyer must act with reasonable diligence and promptness when representing a client); Colo. RPC 1.4(a)(3)-(4) (a lawyer must keep a client reasonably informed about the status of the matter and must promptly comply with reasonable requests for information); Colo. RPC 1.15A(a) (a lawyer must hold client property separate from the lawyer's own property); Colo. RPC 3.4(c) (a lawyer must not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of a tribunal); Colo. RPC 8.4(c) (it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation); and

Colo. RPC 8.4(d) (it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice). The case file is public per C.R.C.P. 242.41(a).