



Changing lawyers in the middle of a personal injury case feels risky, and for good reason. Most people hire a lawyer only after a car crash, a fall, a workplace injury, or another event that has already turned life upside down. By the time doubts set in, medical bills may be stacking up, calls from insurance adjusters may be getting more aggressive, and the injured person may already feel behind. The idea of starting over with a different personal injury lawyer can sound exhausting.

Still, clients switch lawyers every day. Sometimes the relationship has broken down. Sometimes the case has stalled. Sometimes the lawyer who seemed attentive during the intake process becomes hard to reach once the file is signed. And sometimes the issue is not personality at all, but strategy. A case may need more urgency, stronger negotiation, trial experience, or simply better communication.

The short answer is that you usually can switch to a new personal injury lawyer, and doing so does not automatically ruin your case. But it does have practical consequences. The old lawyer may assert a fee interest. The new lawyer will need time to review the file. Certain deadlines still keep running, no matter how frustrated you are with your current representation. Whether switching helps or hurts depends on timing, the reason for the change, and how carefully the transition is handled.

You are usually allowed to change lawyers

In most personal injury cases, the client has the right to discharge an attorney and hire another one. That is true even if a contingency fee agreement has already been signed. A lawyer does not own the case. The client does.

That principle matters because many injured people stay in unhappy attorney-client relationships longer than they should. They assume they are locked in because paperwork was signed, because medical records were already collected, or because a settlement demand has gone out. None of that necessarily prevents a switch.

What does complicate things is timing. If the case is in its earliest stages, the transition is usually straightforward. If suit has already been filed, expert deadlines are approaching, or trial is near, the move becomes more delicate. A judge may need to approve substitution of counsel if litigation is active. A new lawyer must have enough time to get up to speed. If not, the new attorney may decline the case, not because it lacks merit, but because the runway is too short.

I have seen situations where a client waited until two weeks before a key deposition to call a new firm. That is much harder than making the change two months after signing up, before substantial strategy decisions have been made. The right to switch exists in both scenarios, but the practical cost is not the same.

Why clients decide to make a change

Many clients assume they need a dramatic reason to fire a lawyer. Usually they do not. The standard is not whether the lawyer committed malpractice. The real question is whether the relationship still works and whether the case is being handled competently.

Sometimes the problem is communication. A client leaves messages for weeks and gets no return call. Emails go unanswered. Medical updates disappear into a void. The client cannot tell whether the case is active or collecting dust.

Sometimes it is a mismatch of expectations. A person hires a firm expecting hands-on attention, then learns the file has been passed to staff and the attorney they met at intake is rarely involved. That structure is not always improper. Some high-volume firms operate that way by design. But if the client expected something else, frustration builds quickly.

There are also strategy concerns. One lawyer may urge a quick settlement while the client is still treating and the future medical picture is unclear. Another may be slow to file suit in a case that obviously needs litigation pressure. In other files, the issue is case value. The client begins to suspect the lawyer is treating a six-figure injury like a nuisance claim.

Occasionally there is a breakdown in trust. Maybe the lawyer missed an appointment, sent a demand letter with obvious mistakes, failed to explain a low offer, or seemed unprepared during a conference call with the insurer. Trust is difficult to rebuild once it slips.

A few warning signs tend to justify a serious second opinion:

- repeated silence when you ask for updates
- pressure to settle before your treatment picture is clear
- obvious confusion about the facts of your case
- missed deadlines, court dates, or unexplained delay
- a relationship that feels adversarial instead of collaborative

One bad week does not always mean you need a new lawyer. A good attorney may be in trial, waiting on records, or dealing with an insurer that simply has not responded. But a pattern matters. If months pass without clarity, it is reasonable to explore other options.

What actually happens after you switch

The mechanics are less dramatic than most people expect. In many cases, the new firm handles the transition. The client signs a new representation agreement, and the new attorney sends a notice terminating prior counsel and requesting the file. If litigation is pending, a substitution or notice of appearance may be filed with the court.

The old lawyer is generally expected to turn over the client file, though rules and timing vary by jurisdiction. That file may include correspondence, pleadings, medical records, photographs, expert materials, insurance information, and internal case notes, depending on local ethics rules and what counts as the client file where the

case is pending. In a pre-suit matter, the transfer can happen quickly. In a litigated case, it may take longer, especially if there are disputes over what must be produced.

The insurer or defense counsel is then informed that a new lawyer represents the injured person. From [CGH Injury Lawyers Personal Injury Lawyer](#) that point forward, negotiations, scheduling, and case strategy run through the new office.

This is the part clients often misunderstand: changing lawyers does not usually reset the case clock. Deadlines remain. The statute of limitations does not restart. Discovery deadlines in litigation do not disappear because you hired someone new. If anything, the new lawyer enters under pressure to learn the file quickly and make up for lost momentum.

That does not mean switching is a mistake. It just means the transition needs to be managed professionally. A strong new attorney will want to see the retainer agreement, understand what work the first lawyer completed, identify pending deadlines immediately, and assess whether any damage control is needed.

Will you owe two attorneys' fees?

This is the question most clients ask first, and the answer is usually no, not in the sense people fear.

In a standard contingency fee injury case, the client does not typically pay one full fee to the old lawyer and another full fee to the new lawyer on top of it. More often, the total attorney fee comes out of the contingency arrangement, and the old and new lawyers later sort out how that fee is divided based on their work, local law, and any contract issues.

That division can happen in different ways. In some jurisdictions, the discharged lawyer may claim a portion of the fee based on quantum meruit, which is a legal way of saying the reasonable value of services performed before termination. In others, fee-sharing may be negotiated between old and new counsel. If the case settles or goes to verdict, the fee dispute is often handled behind the scenes, though sometimes it requires separate resolution.

For the client, the practical concern is whether switching will reduce the net recovery. Sometimes it can, especially if the transition causes duplication of work or if the prior lawyer advanced significant case costs that must be reimbursed. But in many cases, the fee issue does not change the client's percentage at all. What changes is how that attorney fee is allocated between firms.

Costs are different from fees, and this distinction matters. If the first lawyer paid for medical records, filing fees, deposition transcripts, or experts, those case expenses may still need to be reimbursed from any future recovery. A careful new personal injury lawyer will explain this early, because surprises at settlement are where client dissatisfaction tends to erupt.

The transition can help a case, but not always immediately

People sometimes expect the new lawyer to wave a wand. That is rarely how it works. A new attorney may improve the case in meaningful ways, but there is often a short period where things seem slower, not faster.

That happens because good lawyers do not negotiate blind. They read the file, compare medical treatment to claimed damages, assess liability weaknesses, verify liens, and evaluate whether prior demands were realistic. If suit is pending, they study pleadings, written discovery, deposition transcripts, and court orders. If a previous lawyer promised a result by a certain date, the new lawyer may have to reset that expectation after seeing the actual record.

Still, a well-timed switch can materially improve the outcome. I have seen stagnant files come alive once a new attorney sent a focused demand package, pushed for outstanding imaging, retained the right expert, or simply filed suit when the insurer had no incentive to move. The case facts did not change. The pace and posture did.

There are also times when the new lawyer confirms the old one was largely correct. That can be disappointing, but useful. Not every low offer reflects poor lawyering. Sometimes liability is contested. Sometimes treatment gaps hurt causation. Sometimes the available insurance is limited, and there is no realistic pot of money beyond it. A second opinion can clarify whether the problem is the attorney or the case itself.

Risks that come with making a change

Switching lawyers can be smart, but it is not cost-free. One risk is delay. Even the best new counsel needs time to absorb the facts, gather missing records, and establish relationships with the client and medical providers. If the former lawyer's file is disorganized, that delay can stretch.

Another risk is loss of leverage during a sensitive stage. If settlement negotiations are active and the defense knows a transition is happening, it may decide to wait, assuming the new lawyer needs time and the client may be under financial pressure. Most experienced plaintiff attorneys know how to manage that, but it is a real dynamic.

There is also the possibility that the new lawyer declines to take the case after review. This happens more often than clients expect. A person may be unhappy with their lawyer, but the underlying claim may have serious value problems, disputed liability, or weak medical proof. Not every firm wants to inherit a difficult file, especially late in the game.

The most serious risk is missing a deadline while deciding whether to switch. Personal injury claims live and die by timing. Statutes of limitation, notice requirements for claims against public entities, discovery deadlines, and expert disclosures do not pause while you shop for a new attorney. If you are thinking about changing lawyers, start early enough that a new firm can review the case before the calendar becomes dangerous.

How to evaluate whether switching is worth it

The best decision usually comes from a blunt assessment of where the case stands right now. Ask yourself what exactly is wrong. Is the lawyer unresponsive, or are you simply impatient because treatment is taking longer than expected? Has the case stalled because your attorney is passive, or because key medical evidence does not exist yet? Are you upset about a low settlement recommendation because it is truly unreasonable, or because the injury has changed your financial life and any number feels insufficient?

A second opinion can be valuable here. Many reputable injury firms will review an active case and tell you, with varying degrees of candor, whether they see a problem. Some will decline to interfere unless there is a clear issue. Others will be willing to substitute in if they believe they can add value.

The quality of that consultation matters. Be wary of any lawyer who instantly promises a vastly larger result without seeing records, insurance limits, or liability evidence. That kind of salesmanship is common in the market and often disconnected from reality. A serious attorney will ask hard questions. They will want to know how the accident happened, what treatment you have had, whether there are prior injuries, what the insurer has offered, whether suit was filed, and when critical deadlines expire.

Good advice in this setting is rarely theatrical. It sounds more like judgment. You may hear that changing counsel makes sense, but only after one final written request for a status update. Or that the current lawyer has not done anything obviously wrong, yet the communication gap is severe enough that a switch is reasonable. Or that the

case should not be moved because trial is too close and the transition itself could do more harm than the existing representation.

Practical steps if you decide to move forward

Once you decide to hire new counsel, the process should be orderly. Emotion makes people want to fire off angry emails or demand immediate file delivery. That rarely helps. The better approach is disciplined and documented.

- choose the new lawyer before terminating the old one
- ask the new office to identify all upcoming deadlines immediately
- sign a clear authorization for file transfer and representation
- keep copies of contracts, medical bills, and major case correspondence
- confirm in writing who will notify the insurer or defense lawyer

That sequence avoids the most common problem, a representation gap where nobody is clearly responsible for the case. Even a short gap can create confusion about who is receiving notices, offers, or scheduling requests.

It also helps to stay realistic about records. Clients often think the file transfer should happen in a day or two. Sometimes it does. Other times it takes weeks, especially when records, litigation documents, and cost ledgers need to be assembled. If the prior lawyer is slow, the new attorney may need to follow up repeatedly or seek court involvement in a pending lawsuit.

What judges and insurance companies tend to think

Clients often worry that switching lawyers makes them look difficult. That concern is understandable, but usually overstated.

Insurance adjusters see lawyer substitutions regularly. Their reaction depends less on the mere fact of the change and more on who the new attorney is, how the case is positioned, and whether the switch signals increased seriousness. If a defense team learns that a file has moved from a settlement-heavy practice to a lawyer known for trying cases, attention often sharpens. Not because names alone win cases, but because risk changes when the other side believes trial is genuinely possible.

Judges are usually practical about substitutions. Courts understand that attorney-client relationships can break down. A judge may be annoyed if a change is sought on the eve of trial and it appears designed to delay proceedings, but routine substitutions are not unusual. The court's priority is case management, not preserving a broken relationship.

That said, litigated cases require more care. If discovery responses were due last week, experts were not disclosed, or a mediation is scheduled tomorrow, the new lawyer inherits those facts, not a cleaner version of them. Judges generally expect incoming counsel to take the case as it stands.

Special situations where switching deserves extra caution

Some cases call for more restraint before making a move.

If trial is very close, changing lawyers can be risky unless current counsel is plainly incapable or the relationship is beyond repair. Trial preparation is detail-heavy, and a fresh attorney stepping in late may have to relearn years of facts in a few weeks.

If the case has significant liens, such as workers' compensation, Medicare, Medicaid, or hospital liens, the new attorney needs strong lien-resolution experience. A good settlement can shrink quickly if those interests are mishandled.

If the only available recovery is a modest insurance policy, the gain from switching may be limited. For example, where fault is clear but the defendant has only a small policy and no collectible assets, replacing counsel may not increase the pool of money at all. The issue may be case management and service, not value.

If there are allegations that prior counsel missed a major deadline, the matter becomes more sensitive. At that point, the new lawyer may need to assess not just the injury claim but a potential legal malpractice issue. Those are distinct questions and should be evaluated carefully.

The real question is whether the new lawyer can improve the situation

A lot of frustration in personal injury practice comes from clients asking the wrong question. They ask, "Can I switch?" When the better question is, "Will switching likely improve my position enough to justify the disruption?"

Sometimes the answer is clearly yes. A case has been neglected, calls are ignored, no strategy is visible, and the client has lost confidence for good reason. In those circumstances, bringing in a new personal injury lawyer can change the trajectory of the claim.

Sometimes the answer is more restrained. The old lawyer may be doing competent work, but the communication style is poor. A candid meeting or a request for a written case roadmap might solve the problem without a transfer.

And sometimes the answer is no. The dissatisfaction comes from the harsh limits of the case itself, not from the attorney. New counsel cannot create liability where none exists, erase damaging medical gaps, or force an insurer to pay more than a policy limit when there is no other collectible source.

What matters most is timing, clarity, and judgment. If you think your case is drifting, do not wait until the pressure becomes irreversible. Get a second opinion while there is still room to act. A strong lawyer can tell you whether your instinct is right, whether your current counsel deserves more patience, or whether the file needs a new set of hands before more value slips away.

CGH Injury Lawyers

Address: 2701 Lawrence St Ste 201, Denver, CO 80205

FAQ About Personal Injury Lawyer

Is it worth suing for personal injury?

Whether suing is worth it depends on your medical bills, lost wages, and clear proof of fault. It is usually worth it if you have severe injuries, expensive treatments, or uncooperative insurance. It is rarely worth it for minor bumps and bruises where costs and time outweigh the payout.

How hard is it to win a personal injury lawsuit?

Winning a personal injury claim is generally favorable if you have strong proof. About 95% of cases settle out of court, and plaintiffs win roughly 50% of the cases that actually go to a trial. However, success depends heavily on clear facts, the type of accident, and insurance company resistance.

What not to say to a personal injury lawyer?

When talking to your personal injury lawyer, the biggest mistake is hiding facts or minimizing your pain. You should never lie, omit prior injuries, downplay your symptoms, or guess about details you do not know. Absolute honesty is required because your attorney needs to know the bad facts to defend your case against the insurance company.