

Attorney

Lessons learned in the commercial real estate brokerage agreement world*

David Doyle

Bernkopf
Goodman LLP

Two people sign a brokerage agreement. The broker agrees to use best efforts to procure tenants. The owner agrees to pay a brokerage commission for tenants procured if a lease is signed while the agreement remains in effect or within 60 days thereafter. The owner reserves the right to terminate the agreement at any time on 30 days notice. Three years later, the owner terminates the agreement by giving the

Todd Goldberg

Bernkopf
Goodman LLP

required notice, and eighteen months after that, the owner signs a lease with a new tenant and the broker claims a commission. When the owner refuses to pay, the broker sues.

Straightforward facts. The owner terminated the agreement and the lease was signed beyond the 60 day tail period, so the owner owes nothing. Slam dunk, right? Not so fast.

At trial, the jury decides: (1) the

brokerage agreement was terminated, (2) the owner did not terminate the brokerage agreement in bad faith (i.e., in an attempt to avoid payment of a commission), and (3) the broker is entitled to compensation.

How can this be? The owner had a written agreement that clearly described the conditions that needed to be satisfied in order for a commission to be paid to the broker. The owner probably insisted on the written agreement to avoid fee arguments such as this. The agreement had been properly terminated. The lease was not signed before termination or in the 60 day tail period. No one argued that there was anything ambiguous about the agreement. The jury confirmed that the agreement's conditions for earning a commission had not been met.

Isn't that enough? Apparently not – the jury found for the broker. Why? Let's flesh out the story and add a few more facts:

- Once the negotiations for the lease began, the negotiations never suffered a complete breakdown - nothing that would have signaled a clear end to the original lease negotiation and the start of a completely new negotiation;

- After terminating the agreement, the owner sent a lease proposal directly to another broker working with the tenant. Among other things, that proposal recognized the tenant broker and the owner's broker as the only two brokers involved with the lease and said that the owner would pay a brokerage fee to be shared between the two brokers; and

- The final, signed lease stated that

those two brokers were the only brokers involved in the lease transaction.

Let's recap. The broker introduces the tenant to the owner while the broker is the owner's exclusive broker. Although the owner terminates the brokerage agreement, the owner later says it will pay the broker a fee. Lease negotiations ensue and continue until the lease terms are agreed upon and the lease is signed. The lease gives the owner a new revenue stream, and but for the timing of the transaction, it seems like everything the owner wanted from the original brokerage agreement occurred. However, the owner refuses to pay the broker. The owner claims it has no agreement to pay and no obligation to pay.

Mass. law says otherwise.

The jury awarded compensation on the basis of quantum meruit, not contract. Loosely translated from the Latin, quantum meruit means "as much as is deserved" and is an obligation created by law to prevent injustice and unjust enrichment. The owner appealed the jury decision, but the Appeals Court agreed with the jury. The Appeals Court also provided some clarifications, including that to recover on the theory of quantum meruit, the claimant must prove three things:

(1) the claimant conferred a measurable benefit upon another;

(2) the claimant reasonably expected compensation from the party benefited; and

(3) when the party benefitted accepted the benefit, it did so with knowledge that the claimant had a reasonable expectation of payment.

From the 10,000 foot level, the jury had no trouble seeing that the broker had done its job and that the owner had benefited from the broker's actions. The jury also had no trouble finding that the broker expected payment and that its expectation was reasonable, perhaps due to the post-brokerage agreement references to the broker in the proposal and the final lease.

Unfortunately for the owner, and likely due to the owner's steadfast refusal to pay any amount, the jury awarded the brokers a substantial fee.

Could the result have been different? Could the owner have avoided this result? Probably. What if the owner admitted a fee was payable, but then argued about the value of the broker's services instead? Though the brokerage agreement was terminated, it still serves as evidence of the agreement between the owner and broker about the value of the broker's services. If the owner wanted a lease soon, not a year and a half after it terminated the agreement, and the value of the broker's services to it was time sensitive, it needed to say so. What if the commission schedule decreased substantially as time passed? What if the agreement recited that if lease negotiations

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10



Answers, not disclaimers

When you have important business and legal questions, you want clear guidance, not hedges or disclaimers. You want definitive answers, not stacks of research. At Bernkopf Goodman, we handle every real estate, business law and litigation challenge with the straightforward, no-nonsense approach our clients expect and deserve.

STRAIGHT TALK™

BERNKOPF
GOODMAN | LLP

Brokerage-Mass.

Friendly business environment and flexible zoning will help western Mass. start to rebound in 2012

Bill Low



NAI Plotkin

I started this article thinking I'd just leave a blank page. "Intentionally omitted," I laughed, "that sums up the western Massachusetts industrial market." But if I did that I doubt that Patty would ever ask me to write another article. However, after reflecting on the past year, I really wanted to try to impart some knowledge on what is really happening in our market because, frankly, some New England

industrial markets have rebounded nicely.

Of the 40 million s/f of industrial space in western Mass., there are easily 6 to 8 million s/f vacant. Some of my colleagues believe this represents 10 years of inventory. Obviously, this is tough to predict, seeing as by today's activity it could be 15 years, but if we get back to the activity of 2005, it may be 8 years. Essentially, we have a lot of vacant industrial space. Because western Mass. has its roots in over a century of manufacturing, a large percentage of the industrial inventory is older, obsolete manufacturing space. With the northeast trending toward warehouse and distribution businesses, western Mass. seldom makes site selectors short list. So, beyond the traditional functional ob-

In fact, most northeastern states are already on the path to recovery. In order to perpetuate this restoration, we simply need to get out of our own way and allow free enterprise to flourish and hope that the politics of Springfield do the same.

solescent issue western Mass. always faces, what else is going on?

The industrial markets in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and upstate New York seem to be very active.

However, although we always blame "Taxachusetts" as our biggest obstacle to landing and keeping business, here a check of the corporate and sales tax rates give these areas no advantage over us. True, Springfield has high real estate taxes, but in most cases new companies can negotiate these.

Although the "Pioneer Valley" and the "Knowledge Corridor" promote the many colleges and universities in our area, competing regions can make similar claims, it's not the compelling issue. Location is always the driving factor and the elements that create the matrix a company can thrive in and will locate to are varied. All too often we've seen companies pass western Mass. by for various reasons, yet there are also companies that have decided to locate here. I have noticed

two reoccurring themes: workforce inadequacies and, in Springfield's case, political gridlock.

Conclusion: While the industrial market of 2011 may be dubbed the worst in 20 years, with a friendly business environment, favorable tax rates, flexible zoning, and good working relationships with local government, western Mass. will likely rebound in 2012. In fact, most northeastern states are already on the path to recovery. In order to perpetuate this restoration, we simply need to get out of our own way and allow free enterprise to flourish and hope that the politics of Springfield do the same.

William Low is senior vice president at NAI Plotkin, Springfield, Mass.

NAI Plotkin

Commercial Real Estate Services, Worldwide.

41 Taylor Street, Springfield, MA 01103
Phone 413-781-8000, Fax 413-781-2100
www.sdplotkin.com



FOR SALE
SPRINGFIELD

140,240 SF Warehouse/Distribution facility on 7.39 acres 14 docks. 28'-34' ceilings; 40,600 SF freezer - 2,000 Amp service.



FOR SALE
LUDLOW

15,456 SF Office building, great investment or user, some tenants will stay after purchase.



FOR LEASE

SPRINGFIELD
Up to 80,000 SF available in Downtown Springfield's Premier class A office building. Very aggressive rates.



FOR LEASE
WARE

5,664 SF retail, end cap. Rt. 32 Co-tenant with Rite Aid and Dunkin Donuts. Traffic: 13,000 cars per day.



FOR SALE
OTIS

34+ Acres on Otis Reservoir. Approved for 53 luxury townhouses or 29 single family homes. Includes marina with 53 boat slips. Last significant parcel left on Otis Reservoir.



FOR SALE
SPRINGFIELD

26,786 SF former auto dealer building. On 3.2 acres. Showroom/garage; visible from I-91 and across from Basketball Hall of Fame.



FOR LEASE
SPRINGFIELD

239,000 SF warehouse/distribution center 19.2 acres. 55 Docks; fully air conditioned & sprinklered. Fiber Optic; security fence and cameras.



FOR SALE/LEASE
SPRINGFIELD

41,000 SF R&D building; 2 docks 20,000 SF office; 1,600 amp service. Can be purchased with 100 Brookdale.



FOR SALE
SPRINGFIELD

1.05 Acre development site on Rt. 20 retail corridor. Traffic: 27,990 cars per day. 8,000 SF building.

The brokerage world - by Doyle and Goldberg

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

extend beyond an "X"-day window of opportunity, the commission payable would be reduced "Y" for every "Z" days? What if the owner had shown the jury that it accepted a lesser rent, but only on its good faith belief that it could do so without affecting its profitability because it no longer needed to pay a broker's commission?

There are a number of things that could have been done to improve the owner's and broker's positions, both at the agreement-signing stage and subsequently during the litigation stage, that might have led to a different result. Whether you are a property owner or a broker, it's important to review your commission agreements to make sure your expectations are properly documented. Was the 60 day tail period realistic for the broker? To better protect the broker, the tail period could have been defined as 60 days plus the period while lease negotiations are ongoing. Is time of the essence to the owner? In the wake of this decision, should owners consider adding a waiver of claims of quantum meruit and unjust enrichment that survives termination to their brokerage agreements?

Unfortunately for this owner, it got greedy. It took the benefit of the new lease and tried to get it for free. We all know however, there is no such thing as a free lunch. A costly lesson learned.

**In the interest of full disclosure, and with some pride, we note that our partner, Richard Michaud, represented the brokers in the litigation that inspired this article. See Finard & Co., LLC v. Sitt Asset Mgmt., 79 Mass. App. Ct. 226, 945 N.E.2d 404, review denied, 460 Mass. 1103, 949 N.E.2d 924 (2011)*

David Doyle and Todd Goldberg, partners with Bernkopf Goodman LLP, Boston.