
BELLWEATHER REPORTS

Competitive Intelligence Report

Family law — Kingsbridge County

EDITION	Illustrative sample
MARKET	Kingsbridge County — a composite US metro of 900,000
COMPETITOR SET	Eight family law firms
NOTE	Market, firms and findings are composites
SOURCES	Public review platforms, Meta Ad Library, competitor websites

Contents

What this report is	2
Summary of findings	2
01 · Review intelligence	4
Rating positions	4
What clients complain about	4
What clients praise	5
How firms handle criticism	5
The commercial read	5
02 · Paid advertising	7
Who is advertising	7
What the advertising says	7
What this means	7
03 · Content and search visibility	9
Publishing activity	9
Structural issues found	10
What nobody is doing	10
04 · Pricing and packaging	11
What is published	11
The two firms that publish	11
The read	12
05 · Positioning	13
Eight firms, one sentence	13
The most crowded sentence in Kingsbridge County	13
What each firm actually owns	13
The ground nobody has taken	14
06 · Recommendations	15
The first ninety days	16
What this report does not recommend	16
Evidence gaps	17
Sources	18

What this report is

This is an illustrative sample. Kingsbridge County is a composite US metropolitan market of approximately 900,000 people, and the eight law firms named in this document do not exist. Every figure, quotation and finding has been constructed to demonstrate the structure, depth and specificity of a Bellweather report. A live report contains the same architecture applied to your real market, with a live source URL behind every number.

This report examines eight family law firms practising in the same county. Seven are competitors of the eighth.

It is built entirely from what those eight firms have chosen to publish, and from what their clients have published about them. Nothing in it came from contacting a competitor, from a false enquiry, or from any source a member of the public could not reach. What it does is read an entire market in a single pass and report the things that only become visible when eight firms are laid side by side.

Every firm in a market of this size knows the names of its competitors. Very few know what those competitors charge, which of them is advertising, what their clients complain about in writing, or how many of them are using the same sentence to describe themselves. Those four things decide where the retainers go.

THE COMPETITOR SET

Firm	Attorneys	Google rating	Reviews	Practising since
Harrow and Bright Family Law (subject)	2	4.7	61	2015
Cavanagh Family Law Group	9	4.8	340	2004
The Bellamy Firm	3	4.9	212	2013
Rowan Divorce Law	4	4.6	129	2011
Quillen Law	1	4.9	96	2019
Sutton and Pell	5	4.5	88	1998
Marchetti Family Law	3	4.7	73	2016
Devereux Family Advocates	6	4.4	47	2008

Summary of findings

Two of the eight firms publish a fixed fee. Six publish no figure of any kind. Quillen Law publishes \$1,850 for an uncontested divorce. The Bellamy Firm publishes a three-tier fixed fee starting at

\$2,400. The remaining six, including the subject firm, publish no consultation fee, no hourly rate, no retainer and no flat fee — and four of those six do not state whether the first conversation costs anything.

Fee surprise is the second most common complaint in this market and it lands almost exclusively on the six firms that publish nothing. Neither firm that publishes a fixed fee carries a fee complaint anywhere in its retrievable reviews. That is the clearest cause-and-effect relationship in this report.

Communication delay is the dominant complaint in Kingsbridge County, appearing in the reviews of six of the eight firms. Unreturned calls, weeks without an update, discovering a hearing date from the opposing party. It is more widespread than fee complaints, outcome complaints and staffing complaints combined, and no firm in this market has made a published commitment about response time.

Two firms advertise. Six do not. Cavanagh runs eleven active placements, Bellamy four. Neither advertises legal representation — both advertise a document. The subject firm runs nothing.

No firm in this market publishes outcomes. Not settlements, not custody results, not appellate work, not anonymised case summaries. Eight firms ask prospective clients to choose an attorney on the basis of biography alone.

The subject firm has accumulated 61 reviews in eleven years. Quillen Law, a solo practice trading since 2019, has 96. The subject firm is collecting reviews at roughly one third of the rate of the newest serious competitor in the market, and one of its two attorneys has no reviews at all.

Six of the eight lead with a version of "aggressive when we need to be, compassionate always." Four of the eight have an attorney with a financial credential. None of the eight leads on financially complex divorce.

01

Review intelligence

Rating positions

The ratings in this market are compressed between 4.4 and 4.9, which means rating is not a differentiator here. Volume is.

Cavanagh holds 340 reviews across nine attorneys and twenty-two years — the largest total in the county and, per attorney, unremarkable. The Bellamy Firm holds 212 across three attorneys, which is the strongest position in the market on any per-attorney measure. Quillen Law holds 96 as a single attorney trading seven years.

Devereux Family Advocates, at 4.4 across 47 reviews after eighteen years and with six attorneys, is the weakest position in the county by a considerable margin. Sutton and Pell, the oldest firm in the market at twenty-eight years, holds 88.

The subject firm's 61 reviews place it sixth of eight on volume. Its 4.7 rating is respectable and largely irrelevant, because in a market where the lowest rating is 4.4 nobody is being excluded on rating.

What clients complain about

Four complaint patterns run through this market. Their relative weights are more useful than their existence.

Communication delay — six of eight firms. This is the market's defining failure. The reviews are consistent and specific: "three weeks and four voicemails," "I found out my own hearing date from my ex," "I paid \$6,000 and then could not get a phone call." Two firms carry it in more than a quarter of their critical reviews. It is the complaint most often described as the reason a client left.

Fee surprise — four of eight. Retainers exhausted faster than expected, billing for administrative contact, a second retainer requested mid-matter. "I was told the retainer would cover most of it and it covered eleven weeks." All four firms carrying this complaint publish no fee information. Neither of the two firms that publish fixed fees carries it.

Delegation to junior staff — four of eight. Clients who retained a named partner and dealt with an associate or a paralegal. "I hired Mr Sutton and I have spoken to Mr Sutton twice in nine months." This complaint appears only at firms with four or more attorneys, which makes it a structural consequence of scale rather than a failure of individuals — and it is the single largest opportunity available to a

small firm in this market.

Outcome and expectation — three of eight. Clients who believed a result had been promised. These are the least actionable complaints and the most damaging in aggregate, because they read as competence failures whether or not they were.

What clients praise

The praise here is thin and personal. Across the eight firms, 64 per cent of five-star reviews name an individual attorney and describe a trait — calm, prepared, straight with me. Very few praise a firm for a decision it made.

The three exceptions matter. Quillen's reviews repeatedly praise the price being known in advance: "I knew what it cost before I walked in, which is more than the other three I called." Bellamy's repeatedly praise the published timeline — clients describing knowing what would happen in the first thirty days. And Marchetti's repeatedly praise a same-day callback, which appears often enough to suggest a real internal standard that the firm has never published.

Those are the only three firms in Kingsbridge County receiving credit for something the business decided rather than something an individual is.

How firms handle criticism

Three of the eight reply to critical reviews.

Cavanagh replies to almost all of them, at length, and the replies are the best-executed public writing in the market: no admission, no defensiveness, a named contact and a direct line. On a nine-attorney firm this is visibly a process, and it works.

Rowan replies selectively and inconsistently — some critical reviews answered within days, others from the same period left alone. The inconsistency is worse than silence, because the pattern a reader infers is that this firm answers the complaints it can win.

Marchetti replies once, to a two-star review about a billing dispute, and the reply discloses matter detail in order to correct the client's account. It is the most damaging single sentence published by any firm in this market, and it will be read by every prospective client who scrolls.

The other five firms, including the subject, reply to nothing. The subject firm has three critical reviews, the most recent from November 2025, all unanswered. One of them describes a nine-day wait for a response and ends with a question the firm has never answered in public.

The commercial read

This market is losing clients on administration. The dominant complaint is not competence, not cost and not outcome — it is that nobody called back. And no firm in the county has made a published

commitment on response time, despite one firm apparently already meeting an internal standard and being praised for it.

The second read is about size. Every complaint about delegation sits at a firm with four or more attorneys. Every firm receiving credit for a business decision rather than a personality has three attorneys or fewer. In Kingsbridge County, small is not a disadvantage that needs explaining away — it is the market's clearest unexploited advantage.

02

Paid advertising

Who is advertising

Firm	Active Meta placements	Earliest active	Format
Cavanagh Family Law Group	11	3 April 2026	Video, static
The Bellamy Firm	4	19 June 2026	Video
All others	0	—	—

Cavanagh has advertised continuously for at least two years, with creative refreshed quarterly. Bellamy began in June 2026 and is running a single campaign in four variants.

What the advertising says

Neither advertiser is advertising a lawyer.

Cavanagh's eleven placements split three ways. Six promote a downloadable guide — "the eleven questions to ask before you file" — behind an email capture on a dedicated subdomain. Three promote a free thirty-minute call framed explicitly as an assessment rather than a consultation. Two are brand placements naming the firm's twenty-two years and its attorney count. The guide campaign is the oldest and the most frequently refreshed, which is the strongest available signal that it is the one that works.

Bellamy's four placements are one video in four cuts, all under thirty seconds, all featuring the same attorney speaking to camera, all opening on the line "there are two decisions that decide your divorce and neither of them is which lawyer you hire." The destination is the firm's published fixed-fee page.

What this means

The two advertisers in this market have both solved the same problem in different ways: they have found something to offer a person who is not yet ready to hire an attorney. Cavanagh offers a document. Bellamy offers a price.

The six non-advertising firms have nothing to offer that person. A firm whose only available call to action is "contact us for a consultation" of undisclosed cost cannot advertise economically, because it is asking for the largest possible commitment from the coldest possible audience. That is why six firms in this county are absent from paid acquisition, and it is a packaging problem rather than a budget problem.

Bellamy's approach is the more instructive of the two, because Bellamy is a three-attorney firm outperforming a nine-attorney firm on reviews per attorney while running a quarter of the advertising. The published fixed fee is doing the work the ad spend would otherwise have to do.

03

Content and search visibility

Publishing activity

Firm	Posts	Posts dated	Most recent	Site pages
Cavanagh Family Law Group	180	Yes	31 July 2026	240
Rowan Divorce Law	88	No	Undated	121
The Bellamy Firm	54	Yes	22 July 2026	96
Sutton and Pell	47	Yes	9 June 2023	88
Quillen Law	31	Yes	4 August 2026	42
Harrow and Bright (subject)	9	Yes	6 February 2024	34
Marchetti Family Law	5	Yes	14 October 2022	27
Devereux Family Advocates	0	—	—	19

Cavanagh publishes weekly and has done so for years. That library is the reason Cavanagh appears for procedural questions no other firm in this county competes for, and it is not catchable.

Rowan's eighty-eight posts are undated. In a practice area where statutes, guidelines and local rules change, an undated article about custody standards is an article a prospective client has no reason to trust. Rowan has built the second largest library in the market and stripped it of the one attribute that would make it persuasive.

Quillen Law is the finding in this table. A solo practice, thirty-one dated posts, publishing this month, forty-two pages — and it is outperforming two firms with five and six attorneys on both review volume and publishing consistency.

The subject firm has nine posts, the most recent from February 2024, and thirty-four pages.

Structural issues found

The subject firm's intake form asks twenty-two questions, including three about finances, before the site displays a telephone number anywhere on the page. In a market whose defining complaint is that nobody calls back, the first experience the firm offers is a form.

The subject firm's contact page publishes no email address at all — form only. Two competitors publish direct attorney addresses.

The subject firm's Google Business Profile lists a practice area the firm's own website no longer offers, which generates enquiries it has to decline.

Devereux, with nineteen pages and no blog, has no attorney biography pages for four of its six attorneys.

Sutton and Pell's site publishes two different office addresses on different pages, one of them a suite number the firm vacated.

What nobody is doing

No firm in Kingsbridge County publishes a page explaining what the process costs and why. Two publish a price; neither explains the mechanics behind it. Nobody publishes a page addressed to somebody who already has a lawyer and is considering changing — despite the phrase appearing across five firms' reviews.

04

Pricing and packaging

What is published

Firm	Fee information	Consultation	Payment terms
Quillen Law	\$1,850 uncontested, flat	Free, 20 minutes	Published
The Bellamy Firm	Three tiers from \$2,400	Free, 30 minutes	Published
Cavanagh Family Law Group	None	Free, 30 minutes	Not stated
Rowan Divorce Law	None	Not stated	Not stated
Sutton and Pell	None	Not stated	Not stated
Marchetti Family Law	None	Not stated	Not stated
Devereux Family Advocates	None	Not stated	Not stated
Harrow and Bright (subject)	None	Not stated	Not stated

Five of the eight firms do not tell a prospective client whether the first conversation costs money. Four of those five carry a fee complaint in their reviews.

The two firms that publish

Quillen publishes a single number for a single defined matter and says plainly what falls outside it. The proposition is narrow and completely legible, and the reviews reward it in almost exactly those words.

Bellamy publishes three tiers and a scope description for each, and pairs it with the published thirty-day timeline that its clients also praise. Bellamy has effectively converted the two things this market refuses to disclose — what it costs and what happens — into its entire marketing position, and is beating a firm three times its size on every per-attorney measure.

The read

Publishing a fee in family law is usually resisted on the grounds that no two matters are alike. Both firms in this market that publish have resolved that objection the same way: they publish a price for the part that is alike and state the boundary. Neither has been punished for it in the reviews, and neither carries a fee complaint at all.

The six silent firms are not protecting margin. They are transferring the entire cost of uncertainty onto a prospective client at the exact moment she is comparing three firms at eleven at night, and two of her three options will give her a number.

05

Positioning

Eight firms, one sentence

Six of the eight homepages lead on a version of the same claim: aggressive when necessary, compassionate throughout, your family deserves better. The wording varies and the promise does not.

Bellamy leads on the process: what it costs, what happens in the first thirty days. Quillen leads on the price.

Six of the eight assert experience as the differentiator. Three of the eight hold a board certification in family law, which means the credential separates a third of the market and is claimed by everybody.

The most crowded sentence in Kingsbridge County

"Compassionate, aggressive representation for families in transition" or a close variant appears on six of eight homepages, and it is the subject firm's headline.

When three quarters of a market makes the same promise, that promise is no longer being evaluated. It is being skipped.

What each firm actually owns

Cavanagh owns scale and search. Twenty-two years, nine attorneys, 180 posts and the only sustained advertising in the county. It also carries the delegation complaint, which is the price of that position.

Bellamy owns predictability, and owns it more completely than any other firm in this report owns anything. Price, timeline, and the advertising all say the same thing.

Quillen owns the uncontested matter outright. It is the only firm in the market that has named a specific job it does at a specific price.

Marchetti owns responsiveness and does not know it. Same-day callbacks appear repeatedly in the reviews and nowhere in the firm's marketing.

Rowan, Sutton and Pell, Devereux and the subject firm own nothing a prospective client could name.

The ground nobody has taken

Nobody in this county is the firm for the financially complex divorce. Four of the eight have an attorney with a financial credential — a CPA, a financial-analyst designation, a valuation qualification — and all four have buried it in a biography. In a market where the dominant client fear is money, this is the largest unclaimed position available and it requires no new capability from any of the four.

Second: nobody has taken responsiveness. The dominant complaint in the market is delay, one firm is already visibly meeting a standard it has never published, and a published commitment — a stated callback window, in writing, with a consequence attached — would answer the market's loudest objection directly and could be implemented in a fortnight.

Third: nobody addresses the client who is already represented and unhappy. The phrase appears in the reviews of five firms. It is a market of people who have already demonstrated willingness to pay, already know they need help, and are actively dissatisfied, and no firm in Kingsbridge County has written a single sentence to them.

06

Recommendations

Priority 1 — Publish a callback commitment this week. A stated window, in writing, on the homepage, with a consequence if it is missed. Communication delay is the dominant complaint at six of eight competitors and no firm in the market has made this commitment. It is the fastest, cheapest and most defensible separation available to a two-attorney firm, and the only cost is the discipline to honour it.

Priority 2 — State what the first conversation costs. Five competitors leave it unstated. Whether the answer is free or \$250, publishing it removes the question that currently sends prospective clients to the two firms that answer it.

Priority 3 — Publish a fixed fee for the uncontested matter. Both firms in this market that publish a fee carry no fee complaints at all, and one of them is beating a nine-attorney firm on every per-attorney measure while doing it. Price the defined part, state the boundary plainly, and stop transferring uncertainty to the client at the moment of comparison.

Priority 4 — Delete twenty of the twenty-two intake questions and put a phone number above them. The current form is the first thing the firm says to a prospective client, and what it says is that the firm would prefer not to speak to her. In a market defined by unreturned calls, this is a self-inflicted version of the market's worst complaint.

Priority 5 — Answer the three critical reviews, and answer the one asking a question first. Copy Cavanagh's shape: no admission, a named contact, a direct number. Do not copy Marchetti's, which disclosed matter detail to win an argument and is now the most damaging paragraph published in this county.

Priority 6 — Take the financially complex position. Four competitors qualify and all four have buried the credential in a biography. The market's dominant client fear is money. Move the credential to the homepage, write the three pages that prove it, and name the client this firm is for.

Priority 7 — Write to the client who already has a lawyer. One page, plainly titled, addressed to somebody nine months into a matter who cannot get a phone call. Five competitors' reviews contain that exact person describing herself. No competitor has written to her.

Priority 8 — Get the second attorney reviewed. One of two attorneys has no reviews, which on a two-attorney firm means half the firm is publicly unevidenced. Route the request at the close of every matter she handles, by name.

Priority 9 — Fix the Google profile and publish outcomes in some form. The profile currently advertises work the firm has stopped doing. And no firm in this county publishes results of any kind, which means anonymised, carefully drafted case summaries would be the only such page in the market.

Priority 10 — Publish nine pages, not ninety. The blog is not recoverable and does not need to be. Nine pages: the fee page, the timeline page, the switching page, the financial-complexity trio, and three answering the questions the reviews show clients arriving with. Cavanagh's 180 posts cannot be caught and do not need to be.

The first ninety days

Days 1 to 14 are Priorities 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9 — the callback commitment, the consultation fee, the intake form, the three unanswered reviews and the Google profile. Every one of these is administrative, none of them changes the business, and together they close most of the visible distance between this firm and the two firms currently taking the market's cold traffic.

Days 15 to 45 are Priorities 3, 6 and 8 — the fixed fee, the financial position, the second attorney's review record. These are decisions rather than tasks and they are the ones that determine whether this firm is distinguishable in twelve months.

Days 46 to 90 are Priorities 7 and 10 — the switching page and the nine pages of content. Content is last deliberately: written before the positioning decision in Priority 6, it would be nine more pages of the market's most crowded sentence.

What this report does not recommend

Do not compete with Cavanagh on content or advertising. Twenty-two years, 180 posts and continuous paid acquisition is a position that cannot be attacked frontally by a two-attorney firm, and the attempt would consume the entire ninety days.

Do not add attorneys to solve the capacity problem. Every delegation complaint in this market sits at a firm with four or more attorneys, and every firm credited for a business decision has three or fewer. Size is currently this firm's advantage.

Do not match Quillen's \$1,850. That price is attached to a narrow, well-defined proposition that Quillen has spent seven years and ninety-six reviews establishing. Publish a fee for a different job.

Evidence gaps

Three limits apply to the research behind this report and are stated here so the findings can be weighted properly.

Review platforms other than Google restrict automated retrieval, and attorney-specific directories commonly expose only the most recent handful of reviews per individual. Where that applied, the complaint patterns reported here reflect the visible set rather than the complete history, and complaint frequency should be read as a floor rather than a total.

Advertising data covers active placements only. A firm showing no active placements may have advertised previously and stopped, and the archive does not reliably expose spend, audience or duration for inactive campaigns. Absence of advertising is a fact about today.

Fees that are not published cannot be verified. Where a firm publishes nothing, this report records the absence rather than an estimate. No fee information was obtained by enquiry, and no assumption has been made about what an undisclosed fee is.

Sources

Competitor websites: Every page of all eight firm websites, including practice area pages, attorney biographies, fee and consultation pages where present, blog archives, sitemaps and page-level modification dates.

Review platforms: Google Business Profiles for all eight firms, plus attorney-level profiles on legal directories for every named attorney, read in full where retrieval permitted and to the platform's visible limit where it did not.

Advertising: Meta Ad Library records for all eight firms, including active placement creative, launch dates, format and destination URLs.

Other: State bar membership and board certification registers for every named attorney; specialisation and mediation credential registers; business registration records; award and listing databases where a firm claimed one.

In a live Bellweather report this section carries a numbered list of every source consulted — typically between 400 and 600 individually cited URLs — with each finding in the body traceable to the specific page it came from. Those citations are omitted here because the market and the firms in this sample are composites and no such pages exist.