More Ethics and Chocolate

Anne Reynolds Copps, Esq.
Copps DiPaola Silverman, PLLC, Albany, NY

More Ethics and Chocolate

Annual Interactive Review
of Recent Cases and Ethics Opinions

Presented at the Equinox, Manchester, VT
July 12, 2019

Anne Reynolds Copps, Esq.
Copps DiPaola Silverman, PLLC
126 State Street, 6th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
518-436-4170
arcopps@theCDSLawFirm.com

Fact Patterns

A. Fees – getting paid + sharing fees

1. Carrie Client has engaged Larry Lawyer to assist her in a complex real estate litigation. Carrie Client can no longer meet her payments to her lawyer. Carrie Client and Larry Lawyer have reached an agreement on how the currently due and future fees will be paid. They will be secured by a mortgage on the property which is the subject of the litigation and other real property of the client.
    - Can Larry Lawyer enter into such an arrangement with Carrie Client? If so, what must be done?

2. Andrew Attorney was the sole owner of a law firm when he passed away. Allison Associate was employed by the firm prior to Andrew's death. The Executor dissolved the firm. Allison Associate established her own firm and continued to represent the existing clients of Andrew and new clients. The Executor of Andrew's Estate is seeking to recover fees generated from matters which originated during Andrew's lifetime.

    - Can Allison pay some fees to Andrew's Executor? If so, in what amount and what must be done?

3. Bonnie Barrister is a New York licensed attorney. Her friend Oscar Outstate is licensed to practice in a state other than New York, but lives in New York. Oscar has proposed to affiliate with Bonnie. Oscar would attend the initial meeting with the client but Bonnie would do all of the work. Oscar wants a piece of the fee for bringing in the client. The letterhead would note that Oscar is licensed in another state and not in New York, except in federal courts.

    - Can they do this? Why or why not?

4. Charles Client needs to borrow funds to cover his legal fees to his lawyer. He can afford to make a monthly payment but his credit score does not make him attractive to a traditional lender.
    - Can the lawyer refer him to a finance company?
    - Can the lawyer refer him to finance company in which the lawyer owns an interest?
        - What factors must be considered?

B. Dual Practice

1. Anders Attorney is regularly engaged in the practice of real estate law. He is also a "Certified Financial Planner", said certification having been granted by a non-government and non-legal entity. Anders believes that new home buyers could often benefit from the services of a financial planner. He would like to offer a package of services which would combine both legal and non-legal services.

    - Can he do both legal and non-legal services simultaneously?
    - What are the issues to be considered?
    - May the lawyer advertise both services in a newsletter?
    - May the lawyer refer clients to other service providers such as asset managers or insurance agents who pay referral fees to Anders Attorney?

2. Leslie Lawyer is both an attorney and a licensed professional engineer. He would like to provide both services to clients who are developers.

    - May he operate out of one office?
    - May he include the fact of his dual professions in the name of an entity?
    - Should or must he advise clients that his engineering work is non-legal?

C. Client Communications & Confidentiality

1. Linda Lawyer has prepared a contract for her seller client. The broker has requested a copy of the contract. Linda is reluctant to provide a copy to the broker.

    - Is the contract confidential?
    - Must the lawyer provide a copy of the contract to the broker?
    - Must the lawyer obtain client consent to provide the contract to the broker?

2. Peter Partner represented Chris Client in a matter that resulted in a settlement where payments would be made over time. Peter Partner has not heard from Christ Client in some time. Peter received an email from the attorney for plaintiff asserting that Chris failed to make payments. Peter attempted to reach Chris Client by mail, email and phone without success.

    - Must Peter Partner respond if Plaintiff's attorney brings a motion against Chris Client?

3. Alex Associate represented Carson Client in a matter. Carson has now requested that Alex destroy or return all copies of certain information which Carson provided to Alex in the course of the representation.

Alex Associate is concerned that in the event of a malpractice suit or other collateral claim, Alex would be unable to defend if all such information were destroyed.

- Must Alex Associate destroy or return the copies?
- May Alex condition compliance?
- May Alex prepare and retain a list of items destroyed or returned?

4. Sally Solicitor wants to publish blog on real estate issues. She thinks it would be most informative to use case studies of her actual cases.

    - Can she do that?
    - What issues must she consider?

5. Lawrence Litigator has represented Crimson Client in an action to quiet title. While the action is pending he realizes that he has made an error, missing an entire line of defendants who are heirs to one of the deceased title holders. He discovers this on the eve of trial.

    - Must he inform Crimson Client?
    - On what does this decision turn?
    - What if he discovers this 2 years after representation has ended?
    - What if he discovers it 3 years after representation has ended?
    - What if he discovers an error in a contract when he goes to use the template in another matter?

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Formal Opinion 480 **March 6, 2018**

Confidentiality Obligations for Lawyer Blogging and Other Public Commentary

Lawyers who blog or engage in other public commentary may not reveal information relating to a representation, including information contained in a public record, unless authorized by a provision of the Model Rules.[1]

Introduction

Lawyers comment on legal topics in various formats. The newest format is online publications such as blogs,[2] listserves, online articles, website postings, and brief online statements or microblogs (such as Twitter®) that "followers" (people who subscribe to a writer's online musings) read. Lawyers continue to present education programs and discuss legal topics in articles and chapters in traditional print media such as magazines, treatises, law firm white papers, and law reviews. They also make public remarks in online informational videos such as webinars and podcasts (collectively "public commentary").[3]

Lawyers who communicate about legal topics in public commentary must comply with the Model Rules of Professional Conduct, including the Rules regarding confidentiality of information relating to the representation of a client. A lawyer must maintain the confidentiality of information relating to the representation of a client, unless that client has given informed consent to the disclosure, the disclosure is impliedly authorized to carry out the representation, or the disclosure is permitted by Rule 1.6(b). A lawyer's public commentary may also implicate the lawyer's duties under other Rules, including Model Rules 3.5 (Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal) and 3.6 (Trial Publicity).

Online public commentary provides a way to share knowledge, opinions, experiences, and news. Many online forms of public commentary offer an interactive comment section, and, as such, are also a form of social media.[4] While technological advances have altered how lawyers

---

[1] This opinion is based on the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct as amended by the ABA House of Delegates through August 2016 [hereinafter the "Model Rules"]. The laws, court rules, regulations, rules of professional conduct and opinions promulgated in individual jurisdictions are controlling.

[2] A "blog" is commonly understood to be a website consisting of written entries (posts) regularly updated and typically written in an informal or conversational style by an individual or small group. As recently described in a California State Bar advisory opinion, "[b]logs written by lawyers run the gamut from those having nothing to do with the legal profession, to informational articles, to commentary on legal issues and the state of our system of justice, to self-promotional descriptions of the attorney's legal practice and courtroom successes to overt advertisements for the attorney or her law firm." State Bar of Cal. Comm'n on Prof'l Responsibility & Conduct Op. 2016-196 (2016).

[3] These are just examples of public written communications but this opinion is not limited to these formats. This opinion does not address the various obligations that may arise under Model Rules 7.1-7.5 governing advertising and solicitation, but lawyers may wish to consider their potential application to specific communications.

[4] Lawyers should take care to avoid inadvertently forming attorney-client relationships with readers of their public commentary. Although traditional print format commentary would not give rise to such concerns, lawyers interacting with readers through social media should be aware at least of its possibility. A lawyer commenting publicly about a legal matter standing alone would not create a client-lawyer relationship with readers of the commentary. *See* Model Rule 1.18 for duties to prospective clients. However, the ability of readers/viewers to make comments or to

communicate, and therefore may raise unexpected practical questions, they do not alter lawyers' fundamental ethical obligations when engaging in public commentary.[5]

Duty of Confidentiality Under Rule 1.6

Model Rule 1.6(a) provides:

> A lawyer shall not reveal information relating to the representation of a client unless the client gives informed consent, the disclosure is impliedly authorized in order to carry out the representation or the disclosure is permitted by paragraph (b).

As Comment [2] emphasizes, "[a] fundamental principle in the client-lawyer relationship is that, in the absence of the client's informed consent, the lawyer must not reveal information relating to the representation."

This confidentiality rule "applies not only to matters communicated in confidence by the client but also to all information relating to the representation, whatever its source."[6] In other words, the scope of protection afforded by Rule 1.6 is far broader than attorney-client privileged information.

Unless one of the exceptions to Rule 1.6(a) is applicable, a lawyer is prohibited from commenting publicly about any information related to a representation. Even client identity is protected under Model Rule 1.6.[7] Rule 1.6(b) provides other exceptions to Rule 1.6(a).[8] However, because it is highly unlikely that a disclosure exception under Rule 1.6(b) would apply to a

---

ask questions suggests that, where practicable, a lawyer include appropriate disclaimers on websites, blogs and the like, such as "reading/viewing this information does not create an attorney-client relationship."

Lawyer blogging may also create a positional conflict. *See* D.C. Bar Op. 370 (2016) (discussing lawyers' use of social media advising that "[c]aution should be exercised when stating positions on issues, as those stated positions could be adverse to an interest of a client, thus inadvertently creating a conflict.") *See also* ELLEN J. BENNETT, ELIZABETH J. COHEN & HELEN W. GUNNARSSON, ANNOTATED MODEL RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT 148 (8th ed. 2015) (addressing positional conflicts). *See also* STEPHEN GILLERS, REGULATION OF LAWYERS: PROBLEMS OF LAW AND ETHICS 50-51 (11th ed. 2018) ("[S]ocial media presence can pose a risk for attorneys, who must be careful not to contradict their firm's official position on an issue in a pending case"). This opinion does not address positional conflicts.

[5] *Accord* D.C. Bar Op. 370 (2016) (stating that a lawyer who chooses to use social media must comply with ethics rules to the same extent as one communicating through more traditional forms of communication).

[6] MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.6 cmt. [3] (2017). There is also a general principle noted in the Restatement (Third) of the Law Governing Lawyers that "[c]onfidential client information does not include what a lawyer learns about the law, legal institutions such as courts and administrative agencies, and similar public matters in the course of representing clients." AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE, RESTATEMENT OF THE LAW (THIRD) THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS §59, cmt. e (1998). It is beyond the scope of this opinion to define what specific elements will be considered to distinguish between protected client information and information about the law when they entwine.

[7] *See* Wis. Op. EF-17-02 (2017) ("a client's identity, as well as a former client's identity, is information protected by [Rule 1.6]"); State Bar of Nev. Comm'n on Ethics and Prof'l Responsibility Formal Op. 41, at 2 (2009) ("Even the mere identity of a client is protected by Rule 1.6."); State Bar of Ariz. Comm. on the Rules of Prof'l Conduct Op. 92-04 (1992) (explaining that a firm may not disclose list of client names with receivable amounts to a bank to obtain financing without client consent). *See also* MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 7.2 cmt. [2] (2017) & N.Y. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 7.1(b)(2) (requiring prior written consent to use a client name in advertising). *But see* Cal. Formal Op. 2011-182 (2011) ("...[I]n most situations, the identity of a client is not considered confidential and in such circumstances Attorney may disclose the fact of the representation to Prospective Client without Witness Client's consent.") (*citing to* LA County Bar Ass'n Prof'l Responsibility & Ethics Comm'n Op. 456 (1989)).

[8] *See* MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.6(b)(1)-(7) (2017).

lawyer's public commentary, we assume for this opinion that exceptions arising under Rule 1.6(b) are not applicable.[9]

Significantly, information about a client's representation contained in a court's order, for example, although contained in a public document or record, is *not* exempt from the lawyer's duty of confidentiality under Model Rule 1.6.[10] The duty of confidentiality extends generally to information related to a representation whatever its source and without regard to the fact that others may be aware of or have access to such knowledge.[11]

A violation of Rule 1.6(a) is not avoided by describing public commentary as a "hypothetical" if there is a reasonable likelihood that a third party may ascertain the identity or situation of the client from the facts set forth in the hypothetical.[12] Hence, if a lawyer uses a hypothetical when offering public commentary, the hypothetical should be constructed so that there is no such likelihood.

The salient point is that when a lawyer participates in public commentary that includes client information, if the lawyer has not secured the client's informed consent or the disclosure is

---

[9] For ethical issues raised when a lawyer is participating in an investigation or litigation and the lawyer makes extrajudicial statements, see *infra* at page 6.

[10] *See* ABA Formal Op. 479 (2017). *See also In re* Anonymous, 932 N.E.2d 671 (Ind. 2010) (neither client's prior disclosure of information relating to her divorce representation to friends nor availability of information in police reports and other public records absolved lawyer of violation of Rule 1.6); Iowa S. Ct. Attorney Disciplinary Bd. v. Marzen, 779 N.W.2d 757 (Iowa 2010) (all lawyer-client communications, even those including publicly available information, are confidential); Lawyer Disciplinary Bd. v. McGraw, 461 S.E.2d 850 (W. Va. 1995) ("[t]he ethical duty of confidentiality is not nullified by the fact that the information is part of a public record or by the fact that someone else is privy to it"); State Bar of Ariz. Op. 2000-11 (2000) (lawyer must "maintain the confidentiality of information relating to representation even if the information is a matter of public record"); State Bar of Nev. Op. 41 (2009) (contrasting broad language of Rule 1.6 with narrower language of Restatement (Third) of the Law Governing Lawyers); Pa. Bar Ass'n Informal Op. 2009-10 (2009) (absent client consent, lawyer may not report opponent's misconduct to disciplinary board even though it is recited in court's opinion); Colo. Formal Op. 130 (2017) ("Nor is there an exception for information otherwise publicly available. For example, without informed consent, a lawyer may not disclose information relating to the representation of a client even if the information has been in the news."); *But see In re* Sellers, 669 So. 2d 1204 (La. 1996) (lawyer violated Rule 4.1 by failing to disclose existence of collateral mortgage to third party; because "mortgage was filed in the public record, disclosure of its existence could not be a confidential communication, and was not prohibited by Rule 1.6"); Hunter v. Va. State Bar, 744 S.E.2d 611 (Va. 2013) (rejecting state bar's interpretation of Rule 1.6 as prohibiting lawyer from posting on his blog information previously revealed in completed public criminal trials of former clients). See discussion of *Hunter*, *infra*, at note 20.

[11] ABA Comm. on Ethics & Prof'l Responsibility, Formal Op. 04-433 (2004) ("Indeed, the protection afforded by Rule 1.6 is not forfeited even when the information is available from other sources or publicly filed, such as in a malpractice action against the offending lawyer.")

[12] MODEL RULES OF PROF'L RESPONSIBILITY R. 1.6 cmt. [4] (2017). The possibility of violating Rule 1.6 using hypothetical facts was discussed in ABA Formal Opinion 98-411, which addressed a lawyer's ability to consult with another lawyer about a client's matter. That opinion was issued prior to the adoption of what is now Rule 1.6(b)(4) which permits lawyers to reveal information relating to the representation of a client to the extent the lawyer reasonably believes necessary to secure legal advice about the lawyer's compliance with these Rules. However, the directive provided in Formal Opinion 98-411 remains sound, namely, that a lawyer use caution when constructing a hypothetical. For an illustrative case, see *In re* Peshek, M.R. 23794, 2009 PR 00089 (Ill. 2010). Peshek was suspended for sixty days for violating Rule 1.6. Peshek served as a Winnebago County Public defender for about 19 years. After being assaulted by a client, Peshek began publishing an Internet blog, about a third of which was devoted to discussing her work at the public defender's office and her clients. Peshek's blog contained numerous entries about conversations with clients and various details of their cases, and Peshek referred to her clients by either first name, a derivative of their first name, or their jail ID number, which were held to be disclosures of confidential information in violation of Rule 1.6. She was suspended from practice for 60 days.

not otherwise impliedly authorized to carry out the representation, then the lawyer violates Rule 1.6(a).[13] Rule 1.6 does not provide an exception for information that is "generally known" or contained in a "public record."[14] Accordingly, if a lawyer wants to publicly reveal client information, the lawyer[15] must comply with Rule 1.6(a).[16]

First Amendment Considerations

While it is beyond the scope of the Committee's jurisdiction to opine on legal issues in formal opinions, often the application of the ethics rules interacts with a legal issue. Here lawyer speech relates to First Amendment speech. Although the First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees individuals' right to free speech, this right is not without bounds.[17] Lawyers' professional conduct may be constitutionally constrained by various professional regulatory standards as embodied in the Model Rules, or similar state analogs. For example, when a lawyer acts in a representative capacity, courts often conclude that the lawyer's free speech rights are limited.[18]

---

[13] We again note that Rule 1.6(b) provides other exceptions to Rule 1.6(a).

[14] Model Rule 1.9 addresses the duties lawyers owe to former clients. Rule 1.9(c)(1) permits a lawyer, who has formerly represented a client, to use information related to the representation that has become generally known to the disadvantage of a former client, and Rule 1.9(c)(2) prohibits a lawyer from revealing information relating to the representation except as the Rules permit or require with respect to a current client. This opinion does not address these issues under Model Rule 1.9. The generally known exception in Rule 1.9(c)(1) is addressed in ABA Formal Opinion 479.

[15] Lawyers also have ethical obligations pursuant to Rules 5.1 and 5.3 to assure that lawyers and staff they supervise comply with these confidentiality obligations.

[16] In addition to the requirements of Rules 1.6(a), a lawyer may consider other practical client relations and ethics issues before discussing client information in public commentary to avoid disseminating information that the client may not want disseminated. For instance, Model Rule 1.8(b) reads: "A lawyer shall not use information relating to representation of a client to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules." Rule 1.8(b) could be read to suggest that a lawyer may use client information if it *does not* disadvantage a client. The lawyer, nevertheless, has a common-law fiduciary duty not to profit from using client information even if the use complies with the lawyer's ethical obligations. *See* RESTATEMENT OF THE LAW (THIRD) THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS § 60(2) (1998) ("a lawyer who uses confidential information of a client for the lawyer's pecuniary gain other than in the practice of law must account to the client for any profits made"). *Accord* D.C. Bar Op. 370 (2016) ("It is advisable that the attorney share a draft of the proposed post or blog entry with the client, so there can be no miscommunication regarding the nature of the content that the attorney wishes to make public. It is also advisable, should the client agree that the content may be made public, that the attorney obtain that client's consent in a written form.")

[17] *See* Gregory A. Garbacz, *Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada: Implications for the Media*, 49 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 671 (1992); D. Christopher Albright, *Gentile v. State Bar: Core Speech and a Lawyer's Pretrial Statements to the Press*, 1992 BYU L. REV. 809 (1992); Kathleen M. Sullivan, *The Intersection of Free Speech and the Legal Profession: Constraints on Lawyers' First Amendment Rights*, 67 FORDHAM L. REV. 569 (1998). *See also* Brandon v. Maricopa City, 849 F.3d 837 (9th Cir. 2017) (when a lawyer speaks to the media in her official capacity as an attorney for county officials, such speech involves her conduct as a lawyer and therefore is not "constitutionally protected citizen speech").

[18] *See In re* Snyder, 472 U.S. 634 (1985) (a law license requires conduct "compatible with the role of courts in the administration of justice"); U.S. Dist. Ct. E. Dist. of Wash. v. Sandlin, 12 F.3d 861 (9th Cir. 1993) ("once a lawyer is admitted to the bar, although he does not surrender his freedom of expression, he must temper his criticisms in accordance with professional standards of conduct"); *In re* Shearin, 765 A.2d 930 (Del. 2000) (lawyers' constitutional free speech rights are qualified by their ethical duties); Ky. Bar Ass'n v. Blum, 404 S.W.3d 841 (Ky. 2013) ("It has routinely been upheld that regulating the speech of attorneys is appropriate in order to maintain the public confidence and credibility of the judiciary and as a condition of '[t]he license granted by the court.'" [citing *Snyder*]); State ex rel. Neb. State Bar Ass'n v. Michaelis, 316 N.W.2d 46 (Neb. 1982) ("A layman may, perhaps, pursue his theories of free speech or political activities until he runs afoul of the penalties of libel or slander, or into

The plain language of Model Rule 1.6 dictates that information relating to the representation, even information that is provided in a public judicial proceeding, remains protected by Model Rule 1.6(a).[19] A lawyer may not voluntarily disclose such information, unless the lawyer obtains the client's informed consent, the disclosure is impliedly authorized to carry out the representation, or another exception to the Model Rule applies.[20]

At least since the adoption of the ABA Canons of Ethics, the privilege of practicing law has required lawyers to hold inviolate information about a client or a client's representation beyond that which is protected by the attorney-client privilege. Indeed, lawyer ethics rules in many jurisdictions recognize that the duty of confidentiality is so fundamental that it arises before a lawyer–client relationship forms, even if it never forms,[21] and lasts well beyond the end of the professional relationship.[22] It is principally, if not singularly, the duty of confidentiality that enables and encourages a client to communicate fully and frankly with his or her lawyer.[23]

Ethical Constraints on Trial Publicity and Other Statements

Model Rule 3.5 prohibits a lawyer from seeking to influence a judge, juror, prospective juror, or other official by means prohibited by law. Although using public commentary with the client's informed consent may be appropriate in certain circumstances, lawyers should take care not to run afoul of other limitations imposed by the Model Rules. [24]

---

some infraction of our statutory law. A member of the bar can, and will, be stopped at the point where he infringes our Canons of Ethics.").

[19] *See* ABA Formal Op. 479 (2017). See also cases and authorities cited *supra* at note 10.

[20] One jurisdiction has held that a lawyer is not prohibited from writing a blog that includes information relating to a representation that was disclosed in an open public judicial proceeding after the public proceeding had concluded. In Hunter v. Virginia State Bar, 744 S.E.2d 611 (Va. 2013) the Supreme Court of Virginia held that the application of Virginia Rule of Professional Conduct 1.6(a) to Hunter's blog posts was an unconstitutional infringement of Hunter's free speech rights. The Committee regards *Hunter* as limited to its facts. Virginia's Rule 1.6 is different than the ABA Model Rule. The Virginia Supreme Court rejected the Virginia State Bar's position on the interpretation and importance of Rule 1.6 because there was "no evidence advanced to support it." But see *People vs. Isaac* which acknowledges *Hunter* but finds a violation of Colorado Rule 1.6. We note, further, that the holding in *Hunter* has been criticized. *See* Jan L. Jacobowitz & Kelly Rains Jesson, *Fidelity Diluted: Client Confidentiality Give Way to the First Amendment & Social Media in Virginia State Bar ex rel. Third District Committee v. Horace Frazier Hunter*, 36 CAMPBELL L. REV. 75, 98-106 (2013).

[21] *See* MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.18(b) (2017) (Even when no client-lawyer relationship ensues, a lawyer who has had discussions with a prospective client shall not use or reveal information learned in the consultation except as permitted by the Rules). *Implementation Chart on Model Rule 1.18*, American Bar Ass'n (Sept. 29, 2017), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/mrpc_1_18.authcheckdam.pdf.

[22] *See* MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.9 (2017); *see also* D.C. Bar Op. 324 (Disclosure of Deceased Client's Files) (2004); Swidler & Berlin v. United States, 524 U.S. 399 (1998). *See also* GILLERS, *supra* note 4, at 34 ("[w]hether the [attorney-client] privilege survives death depends on the jurisdiction but in most places it does").

[23] See generally Preamble to ABA Model Rules for a general discussion of the purposes underlying the duty of confidentiality. *See also* GEOFFREY C. HAZARD JR. & W. WILLIAM HODES, THE LAW OF LAWYERING, §§ 9.2 & 9.3 at 9-6, 9-14 (3d ed. Supp. 2012).

[24] *See, e.g., In re* Joyce Nanine McCool 2015-B-0284 (Sup. Ct. La. 2015) (lawyer disciplined for violation of Rule 3.5 by attempting to communicate with potential jurors through public commentary); *see also* The Florida Bar v. Sean William Conway, No. SC08-326 (2008) (Sup. Ct. Fla.) (lawyer found to have violated Rules 8.4(a) and (d) for posting on the internet statements about a judge's qualifications that lawyer knew were false or with reckless disregard as to their truth or falsity).

Lawyers engaged in an investigation or litigation of a matter are subject to Model Rule 3.6, Trial Publicity. Paragraph (a) of Rule 3.6 (subject to the exceptions provided in paragraphs (b) or (c)) provides that:

> A lawyer who is participating or has participated in the investigation or litigation of a matter shall not make an extrajudicial statement that the lawyer knows or reasonably should know will be disseminated by means of public communication and will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding in the matter.

Thus any public commentary about an investigation or ongoing litigation of a matter made by a lawyer would also violate Rule 3.6(a) if it has a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding in the matter, and does not otherwise fall within the exceptions in paragraphs (b) or (c) of Model Rule 3.6.[25]

Conclusion

Lawyers who blog or engage in other public commentary may not reveal information relating to a representation that is protected by Rule 1.6(a), including information contained in a public record, unless disclosure is authorized under the Model Rules.

[25] Pa. Bar Ass'n Formal Op. 2014-300 (2014) (lawyer involved in pending matter may not post about matter on social media). This opinion does not address whether a particular statement "will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding" within the meaning of Model Rule 3.6.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Formal Opinion 481 **April 17, 2018**

A Lawyer's Duty to Inform a Current or Former Client of the Lawyer's Material Error

Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.4 requires a lawyer to inform a current client if the lawyer believes that he or she may have materially erred in the client's representation. Recognizing that errors occur along a continuum, an error is material if a disinterested lawyer would conclude that it is (a) reasonably likely to harm or prejudice a client; or (b) of such a nature that it would reasonably cause a client to consider terminating the representation even in the absence of harm or prejudice. No similar obligation exists under the Model Rules to a former client where the lawyer discovers after the attorney-client relationship has ended that the lawyer made a material error in the former client's representation.

Introduction

Even the best lawyers may err in the course of clients' representations. If a lawyer errs and the error is material, the lawyer must inform a current client of the error.[1] Recognizing that errors

---

[1] A lawyer's duty to inform a current client of a material error has been variously explained or grounded. For malpractice and breach of fiduciary decisions, *see, e.g.*, Leonard v. Dorsey & Whitney LLP, 553 F.3d 609, 629 (8th Cir. 2009) (predicting Minnesota law and concluding that "the lawyer must know that there is a non-frivolous malpractice claim against him such that there is a substantial risk that [his] representation of the client would be materially and adversely affected by his own interest in avoiding malpractice liability" (internal quotation marks omitted)); Beal Bank, SSB v. Arter & Hadden, LLP, 167 P.3d 666, 673 (Cal. 2007) (stating that "attorneys have a fiduciary obligation to disclose material facts to their clients, an obligation that includes disclosure of acts of malpractice"); RFF Family P'ship, LP v. Burns & Levinson, LP, 991 N.E.2d 1066, 1076 (Mass. 2013) (discussing the fiduciary exception to the attorney-client privilege and stating that "a client is entitled to full and fair disclosure of facts that are relevant to the representation, including any bad news"); *In re* Tallon, 447 N.Y.S.2d 50, 51 (App. Div. 1982) ("An attorney has a professional duty to promptly notify his client of his failure to act and of the possible claim his client may thus have against him.").

For disciplinary decisions, *see, e.g.*, Fla. Bar v. Morse, 587 So. 2d 1120, 1120–21 (Fla. 1991) (suspending a lawyer who conspired with his partner to conceal the partner's malpractice from the client); *In re* Hoffman, 700 N.E.2d 1138, 1139 (Ind. 1998) (applying Rule 1.4(b)). *See also* Ill. State Bar Ass'n Mut. Ins. Co. v. Frank M. Greenfield & Assocs., P.C., 980 N.E.2d 1120, 1129 (Ill. App. Ct. 2012) (finding that a voluntary payments provision in a professional liability insurance policy was "against public policy, since it may operate to limit an attorney's disclosure [of his potential malpractice] to his clients").

For ethics opinions, *see, e.g.*, Cal. State Bar Comm. on Prof'l Responsibility & Conduct Op. 2009-178, 2009 WL 3270875, at *4 (2009) [hereinafter Cal. Eth. Op. 2009-178] ("A lawyer has an ethical obligation to keep a client informed of significant developments relating to the representation. . . . Where the lawyer believes that he or she has committed legal malpractice, the lawyer must promptly communicate the factual information pertaining to the client's potential malpractice claim against the lawyer to the client, because it is a 'significant development.'" (citation omitted)); Colo. Bar Ass'n, Ethics Comm., Formal Op. 113, at 3 (2005) [hereinafter Colo. Op. 113] ("Whether a particular error gives rise to an ethical duty to disclose [under Rule 1.4] depends on whether a disinterested lawyer would conclude that the error will likely result in prejudice to the client's right or claim and that the lawyer, therefore, has an ethical responsibility to disclose the error."); Minn. Lawyers Prof'l Responsibility Bd. Op. 21, 2009 WL 8396588, at *1 (2009) (imposing a duty to disclose under Rule 1.4 where "the lawyer knows the lawyer's conduct may reasonably be the basis for a non-frivolous malpractice claim by a current client that materially affects the client's

occur along a continuum, an error is material if a disinterested lawyer would conclude that it is (a) reasonably likely to harm or prejudice a client; or (b) of such a nature that it would reasonably cause a client to consider terminating the representation even in the absence of harm or prejudice.

If a material error relates to a former client's representation and the lawyer does not discover the error until after the representation has been terminated, the lawyer has no obligation under the Model Rules to inform the former client of the error. To illustrate, assume that a lawyer prepared a contract for a client in 2015. The matter is concluded, the representation has ended, and the person for whom the contract was prepared is not a client of the lawyer or law firm in any other matter. In 2018, while using that agreement as a template to prepare an agreement for a different client, the lawyer discovers a material error in the agreement. On those facts, the Model Rules do not require the lawyer to inform the former client of the error. Good business and risk management reasons may exist for lawyers to inform former clients of their material errors when they can do so in time to avoid or mitigate any potential harm or prejudice to the former client. Indeed, many lawyers would likely choose to do so for those or other individual reasons. Those are, however, personal decisions for lawyers rather than obligations imposed under the Model Rules.

The Duty to Inform a Current Client of a Material Error

A lawyer's responsibility to communicate with a client is governed by Model Rule 1.4.[2] Several parts of Model Rule 1.4(a) potentially apply where a lawyer may have erred in the course of a current client's representation. For example, Model Rule 1.4(a)(1) requires a lawyer to promptly inform a client of any decision or circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent may be required. Model Rule 1.4(a)(2) requires a lawyer to "reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished." Model Rule 1.4(a)(3) obligates a lawyer to "keep a client reasonably informed about the status of a matter." Model Rule 1.4(a)(4), which obliges a lawyer to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information, may be implicated if the client asks about the lawyer's conduct or performance of the representation. In addition, Model Rule 1.4(b) requires a lawyer to "explain a

---

interests"); 2015 N.C. State Bar Formal Op. 4, 2015 WL 5927498, at *2 (2015) [hereinafter 2015 N.C. Eth. Op. 4] (applying Rule 1.4 to "material errors that prejudice the client's rights or interests as well as errors that clearly give rise to a malpractice claim"; N.J. Sup. Ct. Advisory Comm. on Prof'l Ethics Op. 684, 1998 WL 35985928, at *1 (1998) [hereinafter N.J. Eth. Op. 684] (discussing Rules 1.4 and 1.7(b) and requiring disclosure "when the attorney ascertains malpractice may have occurred, even though no damage may yet have resulted"); N.Y. State Bar Ass'n Comm. on Prof'l Ethics Eth. Op. 734, 2000 WL 33347720, at *3 (2000) [hereinafter N.Y. Eth. Op. 734] (discussing the prior Code of Professional Responsibility and concluding that the inquirer had a duty to tell the client that it made "a significant error or omission that may give rise to a possible malpractice claim"); Sup. Ct. of Prof'l Ethics Comm. Op. 593, 2010 WL 1026287, at *1 (2010) [Tex. Eth. Op. 593] (opining that the lawyer must also terminate the representation and applying Texas Rules 1.15(d), 2.01, and 8.04(a)(3)). *See also* RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS § 20 cmt. c (2000) (requiring disclosure where the conduct "gives the client a substantial malpractice claim against the lawyer").

[2] MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.4 (2018) ("Communication") [hereinafter MODEL RULES].

matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation." More broadly, the "guiding principle" undergirding Model Rule 1.4 is that "the lawyer should fulfill reasonable client expectations for information consistent with the duty to act in the client's best interests, and the client's overall requirements as to the character of representation."[3] A lawyer may not withhold information from a client to serve the lawyer's own interests or convenience.[4]

Determining whether and when a lawyer must inform a client of an error can sometimes be difficult because errors exist along a continuum. An error may be sufficiently serious that it creates a conflict of interest between the lawyer and the client. Model Rule 1.7(a)(2) provides that a concurrent conflict of interest exists if "there is a significant risk that the representation of one or more clients will be materially limited by . . . a personal interest of the lawyer." Where a lawyer's error creates a Rule 1.7(a)(2) conflict, the client needs to know this fact to make informed decisions regarding the representation, including whether to discharge the lawyer or to consent to the conflict of interest. At the other extreme, an error may be minor or easily correctable with no risk of harm or prejudice to the client.

Several state bars have addressed lawyers' duty to disclose errors to clients.[5] For example, in discussing the spectrum of errors that may arise in clients' representations, the North Carolina State Bar observed that "material errors that prejudice the client's rights or claims are at one end. These include errors that effectively undermine the achievement of the client's primary objective for the representation, such as failing to file the complaint before the statute of limitations runs."[6] At the other end of the spectrum are "nonsubstantive typographical errors" or "missing a deadline that causes nothing more than delay."[7] "Between the two ends of the spectrum are a range of errors that may or may not materially prejudice the client's interests."[8] With respect to the middle ground:

> Errors that fall between the two extremes of the spectrum must be analyzed under the duty to keep the client reasonably informed about his legal matter. If the error will result in financial loss to the client, substantial delay in achieving the client's objectives for the representation, or material disadvantage to the client's legal position, the error must be disclosed to the client. Similarly, if disclosure of the error is necessary for the client to make an informed decision about the representation or for the lawyer to advise the client of significant changes in strategy, timing, or direction of the representation, the lawyer may not withhold information about the error.[9]

---

[3] *Id.* cmt. 5.
[4] *Id.* cmt. 7.
[5] *See supra* note 1 (listing authorities).
[6] 2015 N.C. Eth. Op. 4, *supra* note 1, 2015 WL 5927498, at *2.
[7] *Id.*
[8] *Id.*
[9] *Id.*

Another example is contained in the Colorado Bar Association's Ethics Committee in Formal Opinion 113, which discusses the spectrum of errors that may implicate a lawyers' duty of disclosure. In doing so, it identified errors ranging from those plainly requiring disclosure (a missed statute of limitations or a failure to file a timely appeal) to those "that may never cause harm to the client, either because any resulting harm is not reasonably foreseeable, there is no prejudice to a client's right or claim, or the lawyer takes corrective measures that are reasonably likely to avoid any such prejudice."[10] Errors by lawyers between these two extremes must be analyzed individually. For example, disclosure is not required where the law on an issue is unsettled and a lawyer makes a tactical decision among "equally viable alternatives."[11] On the other hand, "potential errors that may give rise to an ethical duty to disclose include the failure to request a jury in a pleading (or pay the jury fee), the failure to include an acceleration provision in a promissory note, and the failure to give timely notice under a contract or statute."[12] Ultimately, the Colorado Bar concluded that whether a particular error gives rise to an ethical obligation to disclose depends on whether the error is "material," which further "depends on whether a disinterested lawyer would conclude that the error will likely result in prejudice to the client's right or claim."[13]

These opinions provide helpful guidance to lawyers, but they do not—just as we do not—purport to precisely define the scope of a lawyer's disclosure obligations. Still, the Committee believes that lawyers deserve more specific guidance in evaluating their duty to disclose errors to current clients than has previously been available.

In attempting to define the boundaries of this obligation under Model Rule 1.4, it is unreasonable to conclude that a lawyer must inform a current client of an error only if that error may support a colorable legal malpractice claim, because a lawyer's error may impair a client's representation even if the client will never be able to prove all of the elements of malpractice. At the same time, a lawyer should not necessarily be able to avoid disclosure of an error absent apparent harm to the client because the lawyer's error may be of such a nature that it would cause a reasonable client to lose confidence in the lawyer's ability to perform the representation competently, diligently, or loyally despite the absence of clear harm. Finally, client protection and the purposes of legal representation dictate that the standard for imposing an obligation to disclose must be objective.

With these considerations in mind, the Committee concludes that a lawyer must inform a current client of a material error committed by the lawyer in the representation. An error is material if a disinterested lawyer would conclude that it is (a) reasonably likely to harm or prejudice a client; or (b) of such a nature that it would reasonably cause a client to consider terminating the representation even in the absence of harm or prejudice.

---

[10] Colo. Op. 113, *supra* note 1, at 3.
[11] *Id.*
[12] *Id.*
[13] *Id.* at 1, 3.

A lawyer must notify a current client of a material error promptly under the circumstances.[14] Whether notification is prompt will be a case- and fact-specific inquiry. Greater urgency is required where the client could be harmed by any delay in notification. The lawyer may consult with his or her law firm's general counsel, another lawyer, or the lawyer's professional liability insurer before informing the client of the material error.[15] Such consultation should also be prompt. When it is reasonable to do so, the lawyer may attempt to correct the error before informing the client. Whether it is reasonable for the lawyer to attempt to correct the error before informing the client will depend on the facts and should take into account the time needed to correct the error and the lawyer's obligation to keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter.

When a Current Client Becomes a Former Client

As indicated earlier, whether a lawyer must reveal a material error depends on whether the affected person or entity is a current or former client. Substantive law, rather than rules of professional conduct, controls whether an attorney-client relationship exists, or once established, whether it is ongoing or has been concluded.[16] Generally speaking, a current client becomes a former client (a) at the time specified by the lawyer for the conclusion of the representation, and acknowledged by the client, such as where the lawyer's engagement letter states that the representation will conclude upon the lawyer sending a final invoice, or the lawyer sends a disengagement letter upon the completion of the matter (and thereafter acts consistently with the letter);[17] (b) when the lawyer withdraws from the representation pursuant to Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16; (c) when the client terminates the representation;[18] or (d) when overt acts inconsistent with the continuation of the attorney-client relationship indicate that the

---

[14] *See* N.J. Eth. Op. 684, *supra* note 1, 1998 WL 35985928, at *1 ("Clearly, RPC 1.4 requires prompt disclosure in the interest of allowing the client to make informed decisions. Disclosure should therefore occur when the attorney ascertains malpractice may have occurred, even though no damage may yet have resulted."); 2015 N.C. Eth. Op. 4, *supra* note 1, 2015 WL 5927498, at *4 ("The error should be disclosed to the client as soon as possible after the lawyer determines that disclosure of the error to the client is required."); Tex. Eth. Op. 593, *supra* note 1, 2010 WL 1026287, at *1 (requiring disclosure "as promptly as reasonably possible").

[15] *See* MODEL RULES R. 1.6(b)(4) (2018) (permitting a lawyer to reveal information related to a client's representation "to secure legal advice about the lawyer's compliance with these Rules").

[16] United States v. Williams, 720 F.3d 674, 686 (8th Cir. 2013); Rozmus v. West, 13 Vet. App. 386, 387 (U.S. App. Vet. Cl. 2000); *see also* MODEL RULES Scope cmt. 17 (2018) (explaining that "for purposes of determining the lawyer's authority and responsibility, principles of substantive law external to these Rules determine whether a client-lawyer relationship exists").

[17] *See* Artromick Int'l, Inc. v. Drustar Inc., 134 F.R.D. 226, 229 (S.D. Ohio 1991) (observing that "the simplest way for either the attorney or client to end the relationship is by expressly saying so"); *see also, e.g.*, Rusk v. Harstad, 393 P.3d 341, 344 (Utah Ct. App. 2017) (concluding that a would-be client could not have reasonably believed that the law firm represented him where the lawyer had clearly stated in multiple e-mails that the law firm would not represent him).

[18] A client may discharge a lawyer at any time for any reason, or for no reason. White Pearl Inversiones S.A. (Uruguay) v. Cemusa, Inc., 647 F.3d 684, 689 (7th Cir. 2011); Nabi v. Sells, 892 N.Y.S.2d 41, 43 (App. Div. 2009); MODEL RULES R. 1.16 cmt. 4; *see also* STEPHEN GILLERS, REGULATION OF LAWYERS: PROBLEMS OF LAW AND ETHICS 77 (11th ed. 2018) ("Clients, it is said, may fire their lawyers for any reason or no reason.") (citations omitted).

relationship has ended.[19] If a lawyer represents a client in more than one matter, the client is a current client if any of those matters is active or open; in other words, the termination of representation in one or more matters does not transform a client into a former client if the lawyer still represents the client in other matters.

Absent express statements or overt acts by either party, an attorney-client relationship also may be terminated when it would be objectively unreasonable to continue to bind the parties to each other.[20] In such cases, the parties' reasonable expectations often hinge on the scope of the lawyer's representation.[21] In that regard, the court in *National Medical Care, Inc. v. Home Medical of America, Inc.*,[22] suggested that the scope of a lawyer's representation loosely falls into one of three categories: (1) the lawyer is retained as general counsel to handle all of the client's legal matters; (2) the lawyer is retained for all matters in a specific practice area; or (3) the lawyer is retained to represent the client in a discrete matter.[23]

For all three categories identified by the *National Medical Care* court, unless the client or lawyer terminates the representation, the attorney-client relationship continues as long as the lawyer is responsible for a pending matter.[24] With respect to categories one and two above, an attorney-client relationship continues even when the lawyer has no pending matter for the client because the parties reasonably expect that the lawyer will handle all matters for the client in the future as they arise.[25] In the third category, where a lawyer agrees to undertake a specific matter, the attorney-client relationship ends once the matter is concluded.[26]

Although not identified by the *National Medical Care* court, another type of client is what might be called an episodic client, meaning a client who engages the lawyer whenever the client requires legal representation, but whose legal needs are not constant or continuous. In many such

---

[19] *See, e.g.*, Artromick Int'l, Inc., 134 F.R.D. at 230–31 (determining that a man was a former client because he refused to pay the lawyer's bill and then retained other lawyers to replace the first lawyer); Waterbury Garment Corp. v. Strata Prods., 554 F. Supp. 63, 66 (S.D.N.Y. 1982) (concluding that a person was a former client because the law firm represented him only in discrete transactions that had concluded and the person had subsequently retained different counsel).

[20] Artromick Int'l, Inc., 134 F.R.D. at 229.

[21] *Id.* at 229–30.

[22] No. 00-1225, 2002 WL 31068413 (Mass. Super. Ct. Sept. 12, 2002).

[23] *Id.* at *4.

[24] *Id.*; *see also* MODEL RULES R. 1.3 cmt. 4 (2018) (stating that unless the relationship is terminated under Model Rule 1.16, the lawyer "should carry through to conclusion all matters undertaken for a client").

[25] *See* Berry v. McFarland, 278 P.3d 407, 411 (Idaho 2012) (explaining that "[i]f the attorney agrees to handle any matters the client may have, the relationship continues until the attorney or client terminates the relationship"); *see also* MODEL RULES R. 1.3 cmt. 4 (2018) (advising that "[i]f a lawyer has served a client over a substantial period in a variety of matters, the client sometimes may assume that the lawyer will continue to serve on a continuing basis unless the lawyer gives notice of withdrawal").

[26] Simpson v. James, 903 F.2d 372, 376 (5th Cir. 1990); Berry, 278 P.3d at 411; *see also* Revise Clothing, Inc. v. Joe's Jeans Subsidiary, Inc., 687 F. Supp. 2d 381, 389–90 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) (noting that an attorney-client relationship is ordinarily terminated by the accomplishment of the purpose for which it was formed); Thayer v. Fuller & Henry Ltd., 503 F. Supp. 2d 887, 892 (N.D. Ohio 2007) (observing that an attorney-client relationship may terminate when the underlying action has concluded or when the attorney has exhausted all remedies and declined to provide additional legal services); MODEL RULES R. 1.16 cmt. 1 ("Ordinarily, a representation in a matter is completed when the agreed-upon assistance has been concluded.").

instances, the client reasonably expects that the professional relationship will span any intervals and that the lawyer will be available when the client next needs representation.[27] If so, the client should be considered a current client. In other instances, it is possible that the attorney-client relationship ended when the most recent matter concluded.[28] Whether an episodic client is a current or former client will thus depend on the facts of the case.

The Former Client Analysis Under the Model Rules

As explained above, a lawyer must inform a current client of a material error under Model Rule 1.4. Rule 1.4 imposes no similar duty to former clients.

Four of the five subparts in Model Rule 1.4(a) expressly refer to "the client" and the one that does not—Model Rule 1.4(a), governing lawyers' duty to respond to reasonable requests for information—is aimed at responding to requests from a current client. Model Rule 1.4(b) refers to "the client" when describing a lawyer's obligations. Nowhere does Model Rule 1.4 impose on lawyers a duty to communicate with former clients. The comments to Model Rule 1.4 are likewise focused on current clients and are silent with respect to communications with former clients. There is nothing in the legislative history of Model Rule 1.4 to suggest that the drafters meant the duties expressed there to apply to former clients.[29] Had the drafters of the Model Rules intended Rule 1.4 to apply to former clients, they presumably would have referred to former clients in the language of the rule or in the comments to the rule. They did neither despite knowing how to distinguish duties owed to current clients from duties owed to former clients when appropriate, as reflected in the Model Rules regulating conflicts of interest.[30]

---

[27] *See, e.g.*, Parallel Iron, LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc., C.A. No. 12-874-RGA, 2013 WL 789207, at *2–3 (D. Del. Mar. 4, 2013) (concluding that Adobe was a current client in July 2012 when the law firm was doing no work for it; the firm had served as patent counsel to Adobe intermittently between 2006 and February 2012, and had not made clear to Adobe that its representation was terminated); Jones v. Rabanco, Ltd., No. C03-3195P, 2006 WL 2237708, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 3, 2006) (reasoning that the law firm's inclusion as a contact under a contract, the law firm's work for the client after the contract was finalized, and the fact that the client matter was still open in the law firm's files all indicated an existing attorney-client relationship); STEPHEN GILLERS, REGULATION OF LAWYERS: PROBLEMS OF LAW AND ETHICS 78-79 (11th ed. 2018) ("Lawyers might believe that a client is no longer a client if they are doing no work for it at the moment and haven't for a while. . . . [A] firm may have done work for a client two or three times a year for the past five years, creating a reasonable client expectation that the professional relationship continues during the intervals and that the lawyer will be available the next time the client needs her.").

[28] *See, e.g.*, Calamar Enters., Inc. v. Blue Forest Land Grp., Inc., 222 F. Supp. 3d 257, 264–65 (W.D.N.Y. 2016) (rejecting the client's claim of an attorney-client relationship where the relationship between the law firm and the client had been dormant for three years; despite the fact that the attorney-client relationship had not been formally terminated, it ended when the purpose of the parties' retainer agreement had been completed).

[29] AM. BAR ASS'N CTR. FOR PROF'L RESPONSIBILITY, A LEGISLATIVE HISTORY: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ABA MODEL RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, 1982–2013, 71–78 (Arthur H. Garwin ed., 2013).

[30] *Compare* MODEL RULES R. 1.7 (2018) (addressing current client conflicts of interest), *with* MODEL RULES R. 1.9 (2018) (governing former client conflicts of interest).

Because Model Rule 1.4 does not impose on lawyers a duty to communicate with former clients,[31] it is no basis for requiring lawyers to disclose material errors to former clients.

The California State Bar's Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct reached a similar conclusion with respect to California Rule of Professional Conduct 3-500, which states that "[a] member [of the State Bar of California] shall keep a client reasonably informed about significant developments relating to the employment or representation, including promptly complying with reasonable requests for information and copies of significant documents when necessary to keep the client so informed." In concluding that a lawyer had no duty to keep a former client informed of significant developments in the representation, and specifically the former client's possible malpractice claim against the lawyer, the Committee focused on the fact that the lawyer and the former client had "terminated their attorney-client relationship" and on Rule 3-500's reference to a "client," meaning a current client.[32]

Finally, in terms of possible sources of an obligation to disclose material errors to former clients, Model Rule 1.16(d) provides in pertinent part that, upon termination of a representation, "a lawyer shall take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client's interests, such as giving reasonable notice to the client, allowing time for employment of other counsel, surrendering papers and property to which the client is entitled and refunding any advance payment of fee[s] or expense[s] that has not been earned or incurred." This provision does not create a duty to inform former clients of material errors for at least two reasons. First, the wording of the rule demonstrates that the error would have to be discovered while the client was a current client, thereby pushing any duty to disclose back into the current client communication regime. Second, Model Rule 1.16(d) is by its terms limited to actions that may be taken upon termination of the representation or soon thereafter; it cannot reasonably be construed to apply to material errors discovered months or years after termination of the representation.

Conclusion

The Model Rules require a lawyer to inform a current client if the lawyer believes that he or she may have materially erred in the client's representation. Recognizing that errors occur along a continuum, an error is material if a disinterested lawyer would conclude that it is (a) reasonably likely to harm or prejudice a client; or (b) of such a nature that it would reasonably cause a client to consider terminating the representation even in the absence of harm or prejudice. The lawyer

---

[31] *See* Sup. Ct. of Ohio, Bd. of Comm'rs on Grievances & Discipline Adv. Op. 2010-2, 2010 WL 1541844, at *2 (2010) (explaining that Rule 1.4 "applies to ethical duties regarding communication *during a representation*" (emphasis added)); Va. State Bar Comm. on Legal Ethics Eth. Op. 1789, 2004 WL 436386, at *1 (2004) (stating that "*[d]uring the course of the representation*, an attorney's duty to provide information to his client is governed by Rule 1.4(a)") (emphasis added)).

[32] Cal. Eth. Op. 2009-178, *supra* note 1, 2009 WL 3270875, at *6.

must so inform the client promptly under the circumstances. Whether notification is prompt is a case- and fact-specific inquiry.

No similar duty of disclosure exists under the Model Rules where the lawyer discovers after the termination of the attorney-client relationship that the lawyer made a material error in the former client's representation.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Formal Opinion 484 **November 27, 2018**

A Lawyer's Obligations When Clients Use Companies or Brokers to Finance the Lawyer's Fee

Lawyers may refer clients to fee financing companies or brokers in which the lawyers have no ownership or other financial interests provided they comply with Model Rules 1.2(c), 1.4(b), 1.5(a) and (b), 1.6, 1.7(a)(2), and 1.9(a). If a lawyer were to acquire an ownership or other financial interest in a finance company or brokerage and thereafter refer clients to that entity to finance the lawyer's fees, the lawyer would be entering into a business transaction with a client, or obtaining a security or pecuniary interest adverse to the client, or both. In that instance, the lawyer would also be required to comply with Model Rule 1.8(a).[1]

I. Introduction

Some clients may be unable to afford lawyers' fees absent some form of accommodation or assistance. For example, a criminal defense or family law client may be unable to afford a lawyer's flat fee at the outset of a representation.[2] The client may be able to afford the lawyer's fee, however, if the client can finance the fee through a loan from a third-party. Or, a client may simply wish to finance a lawyer's fee rather than pay a lump sum. In some instances, the client may be able to obtain a loan from a bank or other traditional financial institution, but in other cases that option will not be available. In the latter situation, the client may want to finance the lawyer's fee through a finance company. This raises the following questions: (a) whether the lawyer may refer the client to a finance company that will likely loan the client money to pay the lawyer's fees,

---

[1] This opinion is based on the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct as amended by the ABA House of Delegates through August 2018. The laws, court rules, regulations, rules of professional conduct and opinions promulgated in individual jurisdictions are controlling.

[2] A client in such a situation may wish to pay the lawyer's fee by credit card if possible; numerous jurisdictions permit lawyers to accept credit cards to pay fees with certain conditions. *See, e.g.*, ABA Comm. on Ethics & Prof'l Responsibility, Formal Op. 00-419 (2000) (rejecting the reasoning in prior opinions regarding the use of credit cards to pay for non-professional services and merchandise, "the Committee accepted, per se, the propriety of using credit cards to pay legal fees"); Ill. State Bar Ass'n Advisory Op. 14-01 (2014), 2014 WL 2434670, at *2; N.Y. State Bar Ass'n, Comm. on Prof'l Ethics Op. 1112 (2017), 2017 WL 527372 at *1; Or. State Bar Ass'n, Bd. of Gov'rs Op. 2005-172 (2005), 2005 WL 5679599, at *1.

or (b) whether the lawyer may refer the client to a broker who will assist the client in obtaining fee financing. Lawyers have reported several fee financing scenarios.

First, a lawyer may know of a finance company in which the lawyer has no ownership or other financial interest. An interested client applies for a loan for the lawyer's full fee with the finance company, which determines whether to make a loan, the amount of any loan, the interest rate on the loan, and the amount of any financing fee (which reportedly ranges between 5–15%). If the finance company approves the loan, it deposits the full loan amount in the lawyer's bank account, less the financing fee. The lawyer receives nothing from the finance company for the client's participation other than the fee payment; the loan to the client is non-recourse as to the lawyer. The lawyer's fee agreement with the client explains the arrangement. Absent other circumstances permitting or requiring the lawyer to terminate the attorney-client relationship, the lawyer will continue to represent the client even if the client defaults on the loan.[3]

Second, the lawyer agrees to pay an initial fee to the finance company in exchange for the right to submit loan applications from clients. The lawyer has no financial or other interest in the finance company, and the finance company makes all decisions about whether to loan funds to the client, in what amount, and on what terms. The client is solely responsible for repaying any loan; the loan is non-recourse as to the lawyer. The finance company pays the loan proceeds directly to the lawyer, minus a 10% finance fee.[4]

Third, the lawyer knows of a finance company in which the lawyer has no ownership or other interest. The lawyer negotiates a fee with a client consistent with the lawyer's customary

---

[3] Fla. State Bar Ass'n, Comm. on Prof'l Ethics Op. 16-2 (2016), 2016 WL 8648795, at *1 [hereinafter Fla. Ethics Op. 16-2] (describing such an arrangement).
[4] Ill. State Bar Ass'n Advisory Op. 92-9, at 1 (1993) (outlining this arrangement).

practice. "In appropriate circumstances," the lawyer may inform a client of the possibility of financing the fee through the finance company.[5] If the client is interested in financing the fee, the lawyer provides the client with additional information about the financing plan. The client then completes the company's printed credit application in the lawyer's office and the lawyer sends the application to the company. If the company approves the credit application, it will establish a credit facility for the payment of the lawyer's fees up to the credit limit established by the company. The lawyer periodically submits vouchers to the finance company for services rendered to the client. The client must approve the vouchers. If the client approves a voucher, the finance company pays the lawyer the amount of the voucher minus a 10% service charge (up to the client's unused credit limit). The client must repay the amount of each voucher plus interest at a rate comparable to the interest rates banks charge for credit cards. The finance company also requires the client to deposit funds in a reserve account to reduce the finance company's risk of default.

Fourth, the lawyer knows of a finance company in which the lawyer has no ownership or other interest. The lawyer gives clients a link to the finance company's website or posts the link on the lawyer's website, either of which directs clients to the finance company's loan application forms. If a client completes the application, the finance company decides whether to lend the client money and on what terms. The finance company disburses the loan funds directly to the client, but the finance company provides the lawyer with a "portal" through which he or she can learn whether the client applied for a loan, and when and in what amount loan funds were disbursed to the client. To participate in these programs, the lawyer pays a fee to the finance company of

[5] Or. State Bar Ass'n, Bd. of Gov'rs Op. 2005-133, 2005 WL 5679557, at *1 [hereinafter Or. Ethics Op. 2005-133].

several hundred dollars either as a one-time registration fee or as a monthly subscription fee.[6] Again, any loan to a client is non-recourse with respect to the lawyer.

Fifth, a finance company offers a "same as cash" funding program for a lawyer's fees or retainer in which the company provides the physical equipment necessary to carry out the mechanics of the arrangement on-site in the lawyer's office. To initiate the process at the lawyer's office, the client swipes an item of personal financial identification through an identifying device provided to the lawyer by the finance company. The finance company also provides the lawyer with an imaging machine that scans the client's personal check to facilitate the finance company's collection of periodic loan repayments directly from the client's checking account. The finance company then may qualify the client for a loan at a wide range of interest rates depending on the finance company's determination of the risk of non-payment and the length of the repayment period. If the client qualifies, the lawyer provides the client with the loan documents and the finance company pays the lawyer directly. The finance company has no recourse against the lawyer if the client defaults.[7]

Sixth, but similarly, a lawyer may associate with a financial brokerage company that helps clients obtain legal fee financing. The broker is not a lender; it locates banks willing to finance the client's legal fees. The broker charges the lawyer an initial setup fee and a monthly fee to create and maintain a webpage that facilitates the brokerage function. The lawyer also pays a "merchant fee" on the amount of the financed legal fee. More particularly, the broker provides interested clients with loan applications to submit to banks. Approved clients receive offers from competing

---

[6] N.Y. State Bar Ass'n, Comm. on Prof'l Ethics Op. 1108 (2016), www.nysba.org [hereinafter N.Y. Ethics Op. 1108] (explaining this arrangement, and identifying factors the lawyer should consider).

[7] Utah State Bar, Ethics Advisory Opinion Comm. Op. 13-05 (2013), 2013 WL 7393113, at *1 (explaining this arrangement and addressing the conflicts and other issues the lawyer should consider).

banks, and are free to pick the offer that works best for them, or to decline all offers. If the client accepts an offer, the lending bank pays the loan amount to the client. The client then pays the lawyer's fee in accordance with their fee agreement.[8] Once again the loan is non-recourse insofar as the lawyer is concerned.

As explained below, fee financing arrangements of the types described here are ethically permissible provided that the lawyer complies with Model Rules of Professional Conduct 1.2(c), 1.4(b), 1.5(a) and (b), 1.6, 1.7(a)(2), and 1.9(a).[9]

II. Analysis

First, a lawyer who is willing to allow a client to finance the lawyer's fee must under Model Rule 1.4(b) explain the arrangement to the client to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions about the representation. Depending on the facts, this may include explaining (1) the lawyer's relationship with the finance company or broker, including any fees paid by the lawyer to the company or broker, the payments received by the lawyer, and whether the company or broker is also a client of the lawyer; (2) how the lawyer's fee will be paid by the finance company or bank where the finance company or bank disburses funds directly to the lawyer, or how the client is expected to pay the lawyer's fee where the finance company or bank disburses the loan funds to the client; (3) that the finance company will inform the lawyer when it makes a loan to the client and disburses funds to the client, as in the third scenario outlined above; (4) the costs and benefits of the transaction to the client; (5) the terms of the arrangement

[8] 2018 N.C. State Bar Formal Op. 4 (2018), 2018 WL 2215870, at *1 [hereinafter N.C. Ethics Op. 4] (describing this arrangement and identifying factors the lawyer should consider).

[9] MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT (2018) [hereinafter MODEL RULES]. The Committee expresses no opinion on whether such arrangements may violate consumer protection or usury laws. Should they do so, a lawyer who facilitates the arrangements may risk violating Model Rules 1.2(d), 4.1(a), 8.4(b), and 8.4(d).

between the finance company or broker and the client as known or understood by the lawyer; (6) alternative payment options for the client; (7) any payment terms that the lawyer intends to impose if the finance company disburses the loan proceeds to the client rather than to the lawyer; (8) whether the lawyer will charge a higher fee than he or she would charge otherwise because of the financing arrangement, as perhaps to recoup any financing or other fee the lawyer must pay to the finance company or broker;[10] (9) the lawyer's obligation to maintain the confidentiality of client information with respect to the finance company, broker, or bank; (10) that paying the lawyer through fee financing may affect the rights and remedies the client might have to obtain the repayment or return of those funds or the forgiveness or reduction of the client's debt in a dispute arising out of the lawyer's performance; and (11) any other factor that the lawyer knows or reasonably should know to be material to the financing of the representation.

A lawyer may not want to advise a client about the costs and benefits of financing the lawyer's fee or the terms of any such agreement or transaction. For example, the lawyer may view those conversations as more suitably held between the client and representatives of the finance company or broker, or between the client and the client's family or other advisors. If so, and given the possibility that a client might believe that the lawyer is exercising professional judgment in recommending the finance company or broker, or that the lawyer has evaluated the loan terms and believes them to be suitable for the client, the lawyer must limit the scope of the representation in accordance with Model Rule 1.2(c).[11]

---

[10] A lawyer always has a duty to communicate to the client "the basis or rate of the fee and expenses for which the client will be responsible" unless the lawyer "will charge a regularly represented client on the same basis or rate." MODEL RULES R. 1.5(b) (2018).

[11] *See* MODEL RULES R. 1.2(c) (2018) ("A lawyer may limit the scope of the representation if the limitation is reasonable under the circumstances and the client gives informed consent."); *see also* N.Y. Ethics Op. 1108, *supra* note 6 (endorsing the lawyer's limitation of the representation under Rule 1.2(c) where a potential client might

The lawyer may wish to advise the client that the finance company, broker, or bank will not direct or regulate the lawyer's professional judgment in representing the client in accordance with Model Rule 5.4(c).[12] Admittedly, Model Rule 5.4(c) does not apply to any of the scenarios under consideration because the finance company, broker, or bank is not paying the lawyer—the client is paying the lawyer with borrowed funds.[13] Furthermore, unlike litigation funding or financing, a legal fee lender in the scenarios described above has no direct financial interest in the outcome of the matter, and therefore no incentive to attempt to influence the lawyer's advice, strategy, or tactics. Accordingly, the lawyer generally has no obligation to inform the client of the professional independence that Model Rule 5.4(c) assures in appropriate cases. Even so, because the loaned funds are tied to the representation and because an unsophisticated client may view the finance company, broker, or lending bank as "paying" the lawyer, a lawyer may see value in assuring the client of the lawyer's obligation to exercise independent professional judgment in representing the client regardless of the source of the funds used to pay the lawyer.

Second, any fee that the lawyer charges the client must be reasonable.[14] If the lawyer increases the fee for the representation above what the lawyer normally charges for a similar matter to account for any finance fee or subscription the lawyer must pay to the finance company or

---

believe that the lawyer is exercising professional judgment in recommending financing, recommending a particular financier, or has evaluated the loan terms).

[12] *See* MODEL RULES R. 5.4(c) (2018) ("A lawyer shall not permit a person who recommends, employs, or pays the lawyer to direct or regulate the lawyer's professional judgment in rendering such legal services.").

[13] Model Rule 1.8(f) does not apply because the client is paying the lawyer with the client's own funds; this is not a situation where someone other than the client is paying the lawyer to represent the client. The fact that the client has borrowed the funds used to pay the lawyer does not change the fact that the funds belong to the client. *See id.* (stating that a lawyer "shall not accept compensation for representing a client from one other than the client" unless three conditions are met). *But see* N.Y. Ethics Op. 1108, *supra* note 6 (noting that "For all practical purposes, the lawyer is accepting fees 'from one other than the client' (the lender). . . . [A]lthough the funds are not paid directly to the lawyer, the lender informs the lawyer when the funds are disbursed, presumably to help ensure that the lawyer gets paid. When the lender gives the lawyer information about a disbursement, that information is something 'of value' that triggers Rule 1.8(f).")

[14] MODEL RULES R. 1.5(a) (2018) (stating that a lawyer "shall not make an agreement for, charge, or collect an unreasonable fee or an unreasonable amount for expenses").

broker, the fee charged to the client must still be reasonable.[15] Furthermore, the lawyer must inform the client that the lawyer will be charging the client a higher fee to account for the finance or subscription fee that the lawyer must pay to the finance company or broker.[16]

Third, if a lawyer accepts loan proceeds to pay a flat fee, the lawyer must deposit those funds in the lawyer's trust account or operating account and treat them as unearned or earned just as the jurisdiction provides for the payment of flat fees generally.[17] If either the client or the lawyer terminates the representation before the lawyer fully earns the flat fee, the lawyer must refund the unearned funds to the client. The failure to do so would result in the lawyer collecting an unreasonable fee in violation of Model Rule 1.5(a).

Fourth, while a lawyer may refer a client to a finance company or broker, the lawyer may not reveal information regarding the client's representation to the company, broker, or lending bank except as permitted under Rules 1.6(a) or (b).

Fifth, in referring a client to a finance company or broker, a lawyer must be alert to the possibility of a material limitation conflict of interest under Model Rule 1.7(a)(2).[18] Arguably the greatest risk is that the lawyer will recommend the finance company or broker to the client even though fee financing is not in the client's interests because the client's arrangement of financing

---

[15] In some jurisdictions, a lawyer may be prohibited from charging a higher fee because the fee is being financed. *See, e.g.*, FLA. RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT 4-1.5(h) (2015) ("A lawyer or law firm may accept payment under a credit plan. No higher fee shall be charged and no additional charge shall be imposed by reason of a lawyer's or law firm's participation in a credit plan.").

[16] MODEL RULES R. 1.4(b) (2018).

[17] Some jurisdictions permit lawyers to treat flat fees as earned upon receipt and therefore not entrusted. In those jurisdictions, lawyers who elect to treat flat fees as earned upon receipt must deposit them in their operating accounts to avoid commingling allegations. Other jurisdictions hold that because flat fees are merely advance fee payments, they must be held in trust until earned through the lawyer's performance of the agreed services.

[18] *See* MODEL RULES R. 1.7(a)(2) (2018) (stating that a concurrent conflict of interest exists if "there is a significant risk that the representation of one or more clients will be limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or by a personal interest of the lawyer").

best assures payment or timely payment of the lawyer's fee. A conflict of interest might also exist if the finance company or broker is also a client of the lawyer. A lawyer may avoid a conflict in the first instance by not recommending fee financing to the client. As the North Carolina State Bar has explained, "[a] lawyer does not put his own financial interests ahead of those of his client by providing payment options to a client who requires financial assistance in paying the lawyer's fees. However, given the lawyer's self interest in being paid in full for his services, the lawyer may not recommend one payment option over another."[19] In either instance, the client may give informed consent to the representation notwithstanding any material limitation conflict provided that the Model Rule 1.7(b) requirements are satisfied.[20]

Sixth, if the lawyer previously represented the finance company, broker, or lender in connection with loans to clients of other lawyers and is representing his or her current client in obtaining fee financing from the finance company, broker, or lender, the lawyer must consider whether the current client's interests are materially adverse to the former client's interests. If they are, the lawyer must obtain the former client's informed consent to the representation at hand and confirm it in writing.[21]

As noted earlier, some finance companies charge a lawyer a financing or subscription fee. For example, if a finance company loans a client $10,000 to pay a lawyer's flat fee, the company may deduct a 5% financing fee from the loan proceeds paid to the lawyer, such that the lawyer receives $9,500 for his or her services rather than the full $10,000. Such terms do not constitute

---

[19] N.C. Ethics Op. 4, *supra* note 8, at *1.
[20] *See, e.g.*, Or. Ethics Op. 2005-133, *supra* note 5, at *3 (noting the risk that the lawyer might encourage a client to enter into a financing plan to assure the payment of fees or to avoid the expense of collecting fees even if the plan was not necessarily in the client's best interests, but stating that the client could give informed consent to the representation notwithstanding the Rule 1.7(a)(2) material limitation conflict).
[21] MODEL RULES R. 1.9(a) (2018).

fee sharing in violation of Model Rule 5.4(a)[22] because the financing or subscription fee is basically an administrative fee that is deducted from the payment to the lawyer.[23] This is akin to a merchant fee that credit card companies charge.[24] It is settled that lawyers' payment of credit card merchant fees does not constitute impermissible fee-sharing.[25] Additionally, the prohibition on fee-sharing is intended to protect a lawyer's "professional independence of judgment."[26] As previously explained, a legal fee financier has no direct financial interest in the outcome of the matter, and thus no incentive to influence the lawyer's professional judgment. In short, this is not a situation to which the Model Rule 5.4(a) prohibition on fee-sharing is meant to apply.

Finally, although not among the fee financing scenarios of which the Committee has been made aware, it is conceivable that a lawyer might acquire an ownership or other financial interest in a finance company or brokerage, or wish to form such a business. If a lawyer did so and referred a client to that entity, the lawyer would be entering into a business transaction with the client or would be acquiring a security or pecuniary interest adverse to the client, or both. In those situations, the lawyer would need to comply with Model Rule 1.8(a). Compliance with Rule 1.8(a)

---

[22] *Id. See also* MODEL RULES R. 5.4(a) (2018) (stating that a lawyer or law firm "shall not share legal fees with a nonlawyer" except in circumstances not pertinent here).

[23] *See* Pa. Bar Ass'n, Comm. on Legal Ethics & Prof'l Responsibility Op. 94-30 (1994), 1994 WL 928021, at *1–2 (discussing a fee financing service in which the amounts charged to the lawyer were for the collection of fees rather than for legal services rendered); Sup. Ct. of Tex., Prof'l Ethics Comm. Op. 481, 1994 WL 848496, at *1 (stating that "the retention by the finance corporation of a reasonable portion of the amount borrowed by the client is properly viewed as finance arrangement rather than a fee-splitting arrangement").

[24] *See* Fla. Ethics Op. 16-2, *supra* note 3, 2016 WL 8648795, at *2 (reasoning that legal fee financing is not impermissible fee sharing because it is a form of credit plan and Florida ethics rules permit lawyers to accept payments through credit plans, which include credit cards); Or. Ethics Op. 2005-133, *supra* note 5, at *3 (describing a fee financing plan in which the finance company deducts a 10% service fee from every payment to the lawyer as analogous to the client's use of a credit card to pay legal fees).

[25] *See, e.g.*, 2010 N.C. State Bar Formal Op. 4 (2010), 2010 WL 4730432, at *3 (discussing fee sharing under Rule 5.4(a) in connection with a barter exchange and stating that "[t]he use of credit cards to pay for legal services has long been allowed, although credit card banks routinely charge a 'discount fee' that is a percentage of the legal fee charged to the credit card"); Phila. Bar Ass'n, Prof'l Guidance Comm. Op. 00-10 (2000), 2000 WL 33173001, at *1 (stating that "allowing clients to use credit cards to pay legal fees and expenses does not constitute a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct").

[26] MODEL RULES R. 5.4 cmt. 1 (2018).

would require the lawyer to (1) ensure that the terms and transaction are fair and reasonable to the client, and fully disclose and transmit the terms and an explanation of the transaction to the client in a manner that the client could reasonably understand; (2) advise the client of the desirability of seeking independent legal advice regarding the transaction and afford the client a reasonable opportunity to do so; and (3) obtain the client's informed written consent to the transaction's essential terms and the lawyer's role in the transaction, including whether the lawyer is representing the client in the transaction.

III. Conclusion

Lawyers may participate in the fee financing arrangements described in Part I of this opinion provided they comply with Model Rules 1.2(c), 1.4(b), 1.5(a), 1.6, 1.7(a)(2), and 1.9(a). They may further acquire an interest in or form a finance company or brokerage and thereafter refer clients to that entity provided that they comply with Model Rule 1.8(a).

RULE 1.4:
COMMUNICATION

(a) A lawyer shall:

(1) promptly inform the client of:

(i) any decision or circumstance with respect to which the client's informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(j), is required by these Rules;

(ii) any information required by court rule or other law to be communicated to a client; and

(iii) material developments in the matter including settlement or plea offers.

(2) reasonably consult with the client about the means by which the client's objectives are to be accomplished;

(3) keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter;

(4) promptly comply with a client's reasonable requests for information; and

(5) consult with the client about any relevant limitation on the lawyer's conduct when the lawyer knows that the client expects assistance not permitted by these Rules or other law.

(b) A lawyer shall explain a matter to the extent reasonably necessary to permit the client to make informed decisions regarding the representation.

Comment

[1] Reasonable communication between the lawyer and the client is necessary for the client to participate effectively in the representation.

Communicating with Client

[2] In instances where these Rules require that a particular decision about the representation be made by the client, paragraph (a)(1) requires that the lawyer promptly consult with the client and secure the client's consent prior to taking action, unless prior discussions with the client have resolved what action the client wants the lawyer to take. For example, paragraph (a)(1)(iii) requires that a lawyer who receives from opposing counsel an offer of settlement in a civil controversy or a proffered plea bargain in a criminal case must promptly inform the client of its substance unless the client has previously made clear that the proposal will be acceptable or unacceptable or has authorized the lawyer to accept or to reject the offer. *See* Rule 1.2(a).

[3] Paragraph (a)(2) requires that the lawyer reasonably consult with the client about the means to be used to accomplish the client's objectives. In some situations — depending on both the importance of the action under consideration and the feasibility of consulting with the client — this duty will require consultation prior to taking action. In other circumstances, such as during a trial when an immediate decision must be made, the exigency of the situation may require the lawyer to act without prior consultation. In such cases, the lawyer must nonetheless act reasonably to inform the client of actions the lawyer has taken on the client's behalf. Likewise, for routine matters such as scheduling decisions not materially affecting the interests of the client, the lawyer need not consult in advance, but should keep the client reasonably informed thereafter. Additionally, paragraph (a)(3) requires that the lawyer keep the client reasonably informed about the status of the matter, such as significant developments affecting the timing or the substance of the representation.

[4] A lawyer's regular communication with clients will minimize the occasions on which a client will need to request information concerning the representation. When a client makes a reasonable request for information, however, paragraph (a)(4) requires prompt compliance with the request, or if a prompt response is not feasible, that the lawyer or a member of the lawyer's staff acknowledge receipt of the request and advise the client when a response may be expected. A lawyer should promptly respond to or acknowledge client communications, or arrange for an appropriate person who works with the lawyer to do so.

Explaining Matters

[5] The client should have sufficient information to participate intelligently in decisions concerning the objectives of the representation and the means by which they are to be pursued, to the extent the client is willing and able to do so. Adequacy of communication depends in part on the kind of advice or assistance that is involved. For example, when there is time to explain a proposal made in a negotiation, the lawyer should review all important provisions with the client before proceeding to an agreement. In litigation a lawyer should explain the general strategy and prospects of success and ordinarily should consult the client on tactics that are likely to result in significant expense or to injure or coerce others. On the other hand, a lawyer ordinarily will not be expected to describe trial or negotiation strategy in detail. The guiding principle is that the lawyer should fulfill reasonable client expectations for information consistent with the duty to act in the client's best interest and the client's overall requirements as to the character of representation. In certain circumstances, such as when a lawyer asks a client to consent to a representation affected by a conflict of interest, the client must give informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(j).

[6] Ordinarily, the information to be provided is that appropriate for a client who is a comprehending and responsible adult. However, fully informing the client according to this standard may be impracticable, for example, where the client is a child or suffers from diminished capacity. *See* Rule 1.14. When the client is an organization or group, it is often impossible or inappropriate to inform every one of its members about its legal affairs; ordinarily, the lawyer should address communications to those who the lawyer reasonably believes to be appropriate persons within the organization. *See* Rule 1.13. Where many routine matters are involved, a system of limited or occasional reporting may be arranged with the client.

Withholding Information

[7] In some circumstances, a lawyer may be justified in delaying transmission of information when the client would be likely to react imprudently to an immediate communication. Thus, a lawyer might withhold a psychiatric diagnosis of a client when the examining psychiatrist indicates that disclosure would harm the client. A lawyer may not withhold information to serve the lawyer's own interest or convenience or the interests or convenience of another person. Rules or court orders governing litigation may provide that information supplied to a lawyer may not be disclosed to the client. Rule 3.4(c) directs compliance with such rules or orders.

RULE 1.5:
FEES AND DIVISION OF FEES

(a) A lawyer shall not make an agreement for, charge, or collect an excessive or illegal fee or expense. A fee is excessive when, after a review of the facts, a reasonable lawyer would be left with a definite and firm conviction that the fee is excessive. The factors to be considered in determining whether a fee is excessive may include the following:

(1) the time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly;

(2) the likelihood, if apparent or made known to the client, that the acceptance of the particular employment will preclude other employment by the lawyer;

(3) the fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services;

(4) the amount involved and the results obtained;

(5) the time limitations imposed by the client or by circumstances;

(6) the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client;

(7) the experience, reputation and ability of the lawyer or lawyers performing the services; and

(8) whether the fee is fixed or contingent.

(b) A lawyer shall communicate to a client the scope of the representation and the basis or rate of the fee and expenses for which the client will be responsible. This information shall be communicated to the client before or within a reasonable time after commencement of the representation and shall be in writing where required by statute or court rule. This provision shall not apply when the lawyer will charge a regularly represented client on the same basis or rate and perform services that are of the same general kind as previously rendered to and paid for by the client. Any changes in the scope of the representation or the basis or rate of the fee or expenses shall also be communicated to the client.

(c) A fee may be contingent on the outcome of the matter for which the service is rendered, except in a matter in which a contingent fee is prohibited by paragraph (d) or other law. Promptly after a lawyer has been employed in a contingent fee matter, the lawyer shall provide the client with a writing stating the method by which the fee is to be determined, including the percentage or percentages that shall accrue to the lawyer in the event of settlement, trial or appeal; litigation and other expenses to be deducted from the recovery; and whether such expenses are to be deducted before or, if not prohibited by statute or court rule, after the contingent fee is calculated. The writing must clearly notify

the client of any expenses for which the client will be liable regardless of whether the client is the prevailing party. Upon conclusion of a contingent fee matter, the lawyer shall provide the client with a writing stating the outcome of the matter and, if there is a recovery, showing the remittance to the client and the method of its determination.

(d) A lawyer shall not enter into an arrangement for, charge or collect:

(1) a contingent fee for representing a defendant in a criminal matter;

(2) a fee prohibited by law or rule of court;

(3) a fee based on fraudulent billing;

(4) a nonrefundable retainer fee; provided that a lawyer may enter into a retainer agreement with a client containing a reasonable minimum fee clause if it defines in plain language and sets forth the circumstances under which such fee may be incurred and how it will be calculated; or

(5) any fee in a domestic relations matter if:

(i) the payment or amount of the fee is contingent upon the securing of a divorce or of obtaining child custody or visitation or is in any way determined by reference to the amount of maintenance, support, equitable distribution, or property settlement;

(ii) a written retainer agreement has not been signed by the lawyer and client setting forth in plain language the nature of the relationship and the details of the fee arrangement; or

(iii) the written retainer agreement includes a security interest, confession of judgment or other lien without prior notice being provided to the client in a signed retainer agreement and approval from a tribunal after notice to the adversary. A lawyer shall not foreclose on a mortgage placed on the marital residence while the spouse who consents to the mortgage remains the titleholder and the residence remains the spouse's primary residence.

(e) In domestic relations matters, a lawyer shall provide a prospective client with a Statement of Client's Rights and Responsibilities at the initial conference and prior to the signing of a written retainer agreement.

(f) Where applicable, a lawyer shall resolve fee disputes by arbitration at the election of the client pursuant to a fee arbitration program established by the Chief Administrator of the Courts and approved by the Administrative Board of the Courts.

(g) A lawyer shall not divide a fee for legal services with another lawyer who is not associated in the same law firm unless:

(1) the division is in proportion to the services performed by each lawyer or, by a writing given to the client, each lawyer assumes joint responsibility for the representation;

(2) the client agrees to employment of the other lawyer after a full disclosure that a division of fees will be made, including the share each lawyer will receive, and the client's agreement is confirmed in writing; and

(3) the total fee is not excessive.

(h) Rule 1.5(g) does not prohibit payment to a lawyer formerly associated in a law firm pursuant to a separation or retirement agreement.

Comment

[1] Paragraph (a) requires that lawyers not charge fees that are excessive or illegal under the circumstances. The factors specified in paragraphs (a)(1) through (a)(8) are not exclusive, nor will each factor be relevant in each instance. The time and labor required for a matter may be affected by the actions of the lawyer's own client or by those of the opposing party and counsel. Paragraph (a) also requires that expenses for which the client will be charged must not be excessive or illegal. A lawyer may seek payment for services performed in-house, such as copying, or for other expenses incurred in-house, such as telephone charges, either by charging an amount to which the client has agreed in advance or by charging an amount that reflects the cost incurred by the lawyer, provided in either case that the amount charged is not excessive.

[1A] A billing is fraudulent if it is knowingly and intentionally based on false or inaccurate information. Thus, under an hourly billing arrangement, it would be fraudulent to knowingly and intentionally charge a client for more than the actual number of hours spent by the lawyer on the client's matter; similarly, where the client has agreed to pay the lawyer's cost of in-house services, such as for photocopying or telephone calls, it would be fraudulent knowingly and intentionally to charge a client more than the actual costs incurred. Fraudulent billing requires an element of scienter and does not include inaccurate billing due to an innocent mistake.

[1B] A supervising lawyer who submits a fraudulent bill for fees or expenses to a client based on submissions by a subordinate lawyer has not automatically violated this Rule. In this situation, whether the lawyer is responsible for a violation must be determined by reference to Rules 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. As noted in Comment [8] to Rule 5.1, nothing in that Rule alters the personal duty of each lawyer in a firm to abide by these Rules and in some situations, other Rules may impose upon a supervising lawyer a duty to ensure that the books and records of a firm are accurate. *See* Rule 1.15(j).

Basis or Rate of Fee

[2] When the lawyer has regularly represented a client, they ordinarily will have evolved an understanding concerning the basis or rate of the fee and the expenses for which the client will be responsible. In a new client-lawyer relationship, however, an understanding as to fees and expenses must be promptly established. Court rules regarding engagement letters require that such an understanding be memorialized in writing in certain cases. *See* 22 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 1215. Even where not required, it is desirable to furnish the client with at least a simple memorandum or copy of the lawyer's customary fee arrangements that states the general nature of the legal services to be provided, the basis, rate or total amount of the fee, and whether and to what extent the client will be responsible for any costs, expenses or disbursements in the course of the representation. A written statement concerning the terms of the engagement reduces the possibility of misunderstanding.

[3] Contingent fees, like any other fees, are subject to the excessiveness standard of paragraph (a). In determining whether a particular contingent fee is excessive, or whether it is excessive to charge any form of contingent fee, a lawyer must consider the factors that are relevant under the circumstances. Applicable law may impose limitations on contingent fees, such as a ceiling on the percentage allowable, or may regulate the type or amount of the fee that may be charged.

Terms of Payment

[4] A lawyer may require advance payment of a fee, but is obliged to return any unearned portion. *See* Rule 1.16(e). A lawyer may charge a minimum fee, if that fee is not excessive, and if the wording of the minimum fee clause of the retainer agreement meets the requirements of paragraph (d)(4). A lawyer may accept property in payment for services, such as an ownership interest in an enterprise, providing this does not involve acquisition of a proprietary interest in the cause of action or subject matter of the litigation contrary to Rule 1.8(i). A fee paid in property instead of money may, however, be subject to the requirements of Rule 1.8(a), because such fees often have the essential qualities of a business transaction with the client.

[5] An agreement may not be made if its terms might induce the lawyer improperly to curtail services for the client or perform them in a way contrary to the client's interest. For example, a lawyer should not enter into an agreement whereby services are to be provided only up to a stated amount when it is foreseeable that more extensive services probably will be required, unless the situation is adequately explained to the client. Otherwise, the client might have to bargain for further assistance in the midst of a proceeding or transaction. In matters in litigation, the court's approval for the lawyer's withdrawal may be required. *See* Rule 1.16(d). It is proper, however, to define the extent of services in light of the client's ability to pay. A lawyer should not exploit a fee arrangement based primarily on hourly charges by using wasteful procedures.

[5A] The New York Court Rules require every lawyer with an office located in New York to post in that office, in a manner visible to clients of the lawyer, a "Statement of Client's Rights." See 22 N.Y.C.R.R. § 1210.1. Paragraph (e) requires a lawyer in a domestic relations

matter, as defined in Rule 1.0(g), to provide a prospective client with the "Statement of Client's Rights and Responsibilities," as further set forth in 22 N.Y.C.R.R. § 1400.2, at the initial conference and, in any event, prior to the signing of a written retainer agreement.

Prohibited Contingent Fees

[6] Paragraph (d) prohibits a lawyer from charging a contingent fee in a domestic relations matter when payment is contingent upon the securing of a divorce or upon the amount of alimony or support or property settlement to be obtained or upon obtaining child custody or visitation. This provision also precludes a contract for a contingent fee for legal representation in connection with the recovery of post-judgment balances due under support, alimony or other financial orders. *See* Rule 1.0(g) (defining "domestic relations matter" to include an action to enforce such a judgment).

Division of Fee

[7] A division of fee is a single billing to a client covering the fee of two or more lawyers who are not affiliated in the same firm. A division of fee facilitates association of more than one lawyer in a matter in which neither alone could serve the client as well. Paragraph (g) permits the lawyers to divide a fee either on the basis of the proportion of services they render or if each lawyer assumes responsibility for the representation as a whole in a writing given to the client. In addition, the client must agree to the arrangement, including the share that each lawyer is to receive, and the client's agreement must be confirmed in writing. Contingent fee arrangements must comply with paragraph (c). Joint responsibility for the representation entails financial and ethical responsibility for the representation as if the lawyers were associated in a partnership. *See* Rule 5.1. A lawyer should refer a matter only to a lawyer who the referring lawyer reasonably believes is competent to handle the matter. *See* Rule 1.1.

[8] Paragraph (g) does not prohibit or regulate division of fees to be received in the future for work done when lawyers were previously associated in a law firm. Paragraph (h) recognizes that this Rule does not prohibit payment to a previously associated lawyer pursuant to a separation or retirement agreement.

Disputes over Fees

[9] A lawyer should seek to avoid controversies over fees with clients and should attempt to resolve amicably any differences on the subject. The New York courts have established a procedure for resolution of fee disputes through arbitration and the lawyer must comply with the procedure when it is mandatory. Even when it is voluntary, the lawyer should conscientiously consider submitting to it.

RULE 1.6:
CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION

(a) A lawyer shall not knowingly reveal confidential information, as defined in this Rule, or use such information to the disadvantage of a client or for the advantage of the lawyer or a third person, unless:

(1) the client gives informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(j);

(2) the disclosure is impliedly authorized to advance the best interests of the client and is either reasonable under the circumstances or customary in the professional community; or

(3) the disclosure is permitted by paragraph (b).

"Confidential information" consists of information gained during or relating to the representation of a client, whatever its source, that is (a) protected by the attorney-client privilege, (b) likely to be embarrassing or detrimental to the client if disclosed, or (c) information that the client has requested be kept confidential. "Confidential information" does not ordinarily include (i) a lawyer's legal knowledge or legal research or (ii) information that is generally known in the local community or in the trade, field or profession to which the information relates.

(b) A lawyer may reveal or use confidential information to the extent that the lawyer reasonably believes necessary:

(1) to prevent reasonably certain death or substantial bodily harm;

(2) to prevent the client from committing a crime;

(3) to withdraw a written or oral opinion or representation previously given by the lawyer and reasonably believed by the lawyer still to be relied upon by a third person, where the lawyer has discovered that the opinion or representation was based on materially inaccurate information or is being used to further a crime or fraud;

(4) to secure legal advice about compliance with these Rules or other law by the lawyer, another lawyer associated with the lawyer's firm or the law firm;

(5) (i) to defend the lawyer or the lawyer's employees and associates against an accusation of wrongful conduct; or

(ii) to establish or collect a fee; or

(6) when permitted or required under these Rules or to comply with other law or court order.

(c) A lawyer shall exercise reasonable care to prevent the lawyer's employees, associates, and others whose services are utilized by the lawyer from disclosing or using confidential information of a client, except that a lawyer may reveal the information permitted to be disclosed by paragraph (b) through an employee.

Comment

Scope of the Professional Duty of Confidentiality

[1] This Rule governs the disclosure of information protected by the professional duty of confidentiality. Such information is described in these Rules as "confidential information" as defined in this Rule. Other rules also deal with confidential information. See Rules 1.8(b) and 1.9(c)(1) for the lawyer's duties with respect to the use of such information to the disadvantage of clients and former clients; Rule 1.9(c)(2) for the lawyer's duty not to reveal information relating to the lawyer's prior representation of a former client; Rule 1.14(c) for information relating to representation of a client with diminished capacity; Rule 1.18(b) for the lawyer's duties with respect to information provided to the lawyer by a prospective client; Rule 3.3 for the lawyer's duty of candor to a tribunal; and Rule 8.3(c) for information gained by a lawyer or judge while participating in an approved lawyer assistance program.

[2] A fundamental principle in the client-lawyer relationship is that, in the absence of the client's informed consent, or except as permitted or required by these Rules, the lawyer must not knowingly reveal information gained during and related to the representation, whatever its source. See Rule 1.0(j) for the definition of informed consent. The lawyer's duty of confidentiality contributes to the trust that is the hallmark of the client-lawyer relationship. The client is thereby encouraged to seek legal assistance and to communicate fully and frankly with the lawyer, even as to embarrassing or legally damaging subject matter. The lawyer needs this information to represent the client effectively and, if necessary, to advise the client to refrain from wrongful conduct. Typically, clients come to lawyers to determine their rights and what is, in the complex of laws and regulations, deemed to be legal and correct. Based upon experience, lawyers know that almost all clients follow the advice given, and the law is thereby upheld.

[3] The principle of client-lawyer confidentiality is given effect in three related bodies of law: the attorney-client privilege of evidence law, the work-product doctrine of civil procedure and the professional duty of confidentiality established in legal ethics codes. The attorney-client privilege and the work-product doctrine apply when compulsory process by a judicial or other governmental body seeks to compel a lawyer to testify or produce information or evidence concerning a client. The professional duty of client-lawyer confidentiality, in contrast, applies to a lawyer in all settings and at all times, prohibiting the lawyer from disclosing confidential information unless permitted or required by these Rules or to comply with other law or court order. The confidentiality duty applies not only to matters communicated in confidence by the client, which are protected by the attorney-client privilege, but also to all information gained during and relating to the representation, whatever its source. The confidentiality duty, for example, prohibits a lawyer from volunteering confidential information to a friend or to any other person except in compliance with the provisions of this Rule, including the Rule's reference to other law that may compel disclosure. *See* Comments [12]-[13]; *see also* Scope.

RULE 1.7:
CONFLICT OF INTEREST: CURRENT CLIENTS

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a lawyer shall not represent a client if a reasonable lawyer would conclude that either:

(1) the representation will involve the lawyer in representing differing interests; or

(2) there is a significant risk that the lawyer's professional judgment on behalf of a client will be adversely affected by the lawyer's own financial, business, property or other personal interests.

(b) Notwithstanding the existence of a concurrent conflict of interest under paragraph (a), a lawyer may represent a client if:

(1) the lawyer reasonably believes that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each affected client;

(2) the representation is not prohibited by law;

(3) the representation does not involve the assertion of a claim by one client against another client represented by the lawyer in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal; and

(4) each affected client gives informed consent, confirmed in writing.

Comment

General Principles

[1] Loyalty and independent judgment are essential aspects of a lawyer's relationship with a client. The professional judgment of a lawyer should be exercised, within the bounds of the law, solely for the benefit of the client and free of compromising influences and loyalties. Concurrent conflicts of interest, which can impair a lawyer's professional judgment, can arise from the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person, or from the lawyer's own interests. A lawyer should not permit these competing responsibilities or interests to impair the lawyer's ability to exercise professional judgment on behalf of each client. For specific Rules regarding certain concurrent conflicts of interest, see Rule 1.8. For former client conflicts of interest, see Rule 1.9. For conflicts of interest involving prospective clients, see Rule 1.18. For definitions of "differing interests," "informed consent" and "confirmed in writing," see Rules 1.0(f), (j) and (e), respectively.

[2] Resolution of a conflict of interest problem under this Rule requires the lawyer, acting reasonably, to: (i) identify clearly the client or clients, (ii) determine whether a conflict of interest exists, *i.e.*, whether the lawyer's judgment may be impaired or the lawyer's loyalty may be divided if the lawyer accepts or continues the representation, (iii) decide whether the

representation may be undertaken despite the existence of a conflict, *i.e.*, whether the conflict is consentable under paragraph (b); and if so (iv) consult with the clients affected under paragraph (a) and obtain their informed consent, confirmed in writing. The clients affected under paragraph (a) include all of the clients who may have differing interests under paragraph (a)(1) and any clients whose representation might be adversely affected under paragraph (a)(2).

[3] A conflict of interest may exist before representation is undertaken, in which event the representation must be declined, unless the lawyer obtains the informed consent of each client under the conditions of paragraph (b). *See* Rule 1.10(e), which requires every law firm to create, implement and maintain a conflict-checking system.

[4] If a conflict arises after representation has been undertaken, the lawyer ordinarily must withdraw from the representation unless the lawyer has obtained the informed consent of the client under the conditions of paragraph (b). *See* Rule 1.16(b)(1). Where more than one client is involved, whether the lawyer may continue to represent any of the clients is determined both by the lawyer's ability to comply with duties owed to the former client and by the lawyer's ability to represent adequately the remaining client or clients, given the lawyer's duties to the former client. *See* Rule 1.9; *see also* Comments [5], [29A].

[5] Unforeseeable developments, such as changes in corporate and other organizational affiliations or the addition or realignment of parties in litigation, might create conflicts in the midst of a representation, as when a company sued by the lawyer on behalf of one client is acquired by another client represented by the lawyer in an unrelated matter. Depending on the circumstances, the lawyer may have the option to withdraw from one of the representations in order to avoid the conflict. The lawyer must seek court approval where necessary and take steps to minimize harm to the clients. See Rules 1.16(d) and (e). The lawyer must continue to protect the confidences of the client from whose representation the lawyer has withdrawn. *See* Rule 1.9(c).

Identifying Conflicts of Interest

[6] The duty to avoid the representation of differing interest prohibits, among other things, undertaking representation adverse to a current client without that client's informed consent. For example, absent consent, a lawyer may not advocate in one matter against another client that the lawyer represents in some other matter, even when the matters are wholly unrelated. The client as to whom the representation is adverse is likely to feel betrayed and the resulting damage to the client-lawyer relationship is likely to impair the lawyer's ability to represent the client effectively. In addition, the client on whose behalf the adverse representation is undertaken may reasonably fear that the lawyer will pursue that client's case less effectively out of deference to the other client, that is, that the lawyer's exercise of professional judgment on behalf of that client will be adversely affected by the lawyer's interest in retaining the current client. Similarly, a conflict may arise when a lawyer is required to cross-examine a client appearing as a witness in a lawsuit involving another client, as when the testimony will be damaging to the client represented in the lawsuit. On the other hand, simultaneous representation in unrelated matters of clients whose interests are only economically adverse, such as representation of competing economic enterprises in unrelated litigation, does not ordinarily constitute a conflict of interest and thus may not require consent of the respective clients.

[7] Differing interests can also arise in transactional matters. For example, if a lawyer is asked to represent the seller of a business in negotiations with a buyer represented by the lawyer, not in the same transaction but in another, unrelated matter, the lawyer could not undertake the representation without the informed consent of each client.

[8] Differing interests exist if there is a significant risk that a lawyer's exercise of professional judgment in considering, recommending or carrying out an appropriate course of action for the client will be adversely affected or the representation would otherwise be materially limited by the lawyer's other responsibilities or interests. For example, the professional judgment of a lawyer asked to represent several individuals operating a joint venture is likely to be adversely affected to the extent that the lawyer is unable to recommend or advocate all possible positions that each client might take because of the lawyer's duty of loyalty to the others. The conflict in effect forecloses alternatives that would otherwise be available to the client. The mere possibility of subsequent harm does not itself require disclosure and consent. The critical questions are the likelihood that a difference in interests will eventuate and, if it does, whether it will adversely affect the lawyer's professional judgment in considering alternatives or foreclose courses of action that reasonably should be pursued on behalf of the client.

Lawyer's Responsibilities to Former Clients and Other Third Persons

[9] In addition to conflicts with other current clients, a lawyer's duties of loyalty and independence may be adversely affected by responsibilities to former clients under Rule 1.9, or by the lawyer's responsibilities to other persons, such as fiduciary duties arising from a lawyer's service as a trustee, executor or corporate director.

Personal-Interest Conflicts

[10] The lawyer's own financial, property, business or other personal interests should not be permitted to have an adverse effect on representation of a client. For example, if the probity of a lawyer's own conduct in a transaction is in serious question, it may be difficult or impossible for the lawyer to give a client detached advice. Similarly, when a lawyer has discussions concerning possible employment with an opponent of the lawyer's client or with a law firm representing the opponent, such discussions could materially limit the lawyer's representation of the client. In addition, a lawyer may not allow related business interests to affect representation, for example, by referring clients to an enterprise in which the lawyer has an undisclosed financial interest. *See* Rule 5.7 on responsibilities regarding nonlegal services and Rule 1.8 pertaining to a number of personal-interest conflicts, including business transactions with clients.

[11] When lawyers representing different clients in the same matter or in substantially related matters are closely related, there may be a significant risk that client confidences will be revealed and that the lawyer's family relationship will interfere with both loyalty and professional judgment. As a result, each client is entitled to know of the existence and implications of the relationship between the lawyers, before the lawyer agrees to undertake the representation. Thus, a lawyer who has a significant intimate or close family relationship with

another lawyer ordinarily may not represent a client in a matter where that other lawyer is representing another party, unless each client gives informed consent, as defined in Rule 1.0(j).

[12] A lawyer is prohibited from engaging in sexual relations with a client in domestic relations matters. In all other matters a lawyer's sexual relations with a client are circumscribed by the provisions of Rule 1.8(j).

Interest of Person Paying for Lawyer's Services

[13] A lawyer may be paid from a source other than the client, including a co-client, if the client is informed of that fact and consents and the arrangement does not compromise the lawyer's duty of loyalty or independent judgment to the client. See Rule 1.8(f). If acceptance of the payment from any other source presents a significant risk that the lawyer's exercise of professional judgment on behalf of a client will be adversely affected by the lawyer's own interest in accommodating the person paying the lawyer's fee or by the lawyer's responsibilities to a payer who is also a co-client, then the lawyer must comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) before accepting the representation, including determining whether the conflict is consentable and, if so, that the client has adequate information about the material risks of the representation.

Prohibited Representations

[14] Ordinarily, clients may consent to representation notwithstanding a conflict. As paragraph (b) indicates, however, some conflicts are nonconsentable. If a lawyer does not reasonably believe that the conditions set forth in paragraph (b) can be met, the lawyer should neither ask for the client's consent nor provide representation on the basis of the client's consent. A client's consent to a nonconsentable conflict is ineffective. When the lawyer is representing more than one client, the question of consentability must be resolved as to each client.

[15] Consentability is typically determined by considering whether the interests of the clients will be adequately protected if the clients consent to representation burdened by a conflict of interest. Thus, under paragraph (b)(1), notwithstanding client consent, a representation is prohibited if, in the circumstances, the lawyer cannot reasonably conclude that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation. See Rule 1.1 regarding competence and Rule 1.3 regarding diligence.

[16] Paragraph (b)(2) describes conflicts that are nonconsentable because the representation is prohibited by applicable law. For example, federal criminal statutes prohibit certain representations by a former government lawyer despite the informed consent of the former governmental client. In addition, there are some instances where conflicts are nonconsentable under decisional law.

[17] Paragraph (b)(3) describes conflicts that are nonconsentable because of the institutional interest in vigorous development of each client's position when the clients are aligned directly against each other in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal. Whether clients are aligned directly against each other within the meaning of this paragraph requires examination of the context of the proceeding. Although this paragraph does not preclude a lawyer's multiple representation of adverse parties to mediation (because mediation is

not a proceeding before a "tribunal" as defined in Rule 1.0(w)), such representation may be precluded by paragraph (b)(1).

Informed Consent

[18] Informed consent requires that each affected client be aware of the relevant circumstances, including the material and reasonably foreseeable ways that the conflict could adversely affect the interests of that client. Informed consent also requires that the client be given the opportunity to obtain other counsel if the client so desires. *See* Rule 1.0(j). The information that a lawyer is required to communicate to a client depends on the nature of the conflict and the nature of the risks involved, and a lawyer should take into account the sophistication of the client in explaining the potential adverse consequences of the conflict. There are circumstances in which it is appropriate for a lawyer to advise a client to seek the advice of a disinterested lawyer in reaching a decision as to whether to consent to the conflict. When representation of multiple clients in a single matter is undertaken, the information must include the implications of the common representation, including possible effects on loyalty, confidentiality and the attorney-client privilege, and the advantages and risks involved. *See* Comments [30] and [31] concerning the effect of common representation on confidentiality.

[19] Under some circumstances it may be impossible to make the disclosure necessary to obtain consent. For example, when the lawyer represents different clients in related matters and one client refuses to consent to the disclosure necessary to permit the other client to make an informed decision, the lawyer cannot properly ask the latter to consent. In some cases the alternative to common representation is that each party obtains separate representation with the possibility of incurring additional costs. These costs, along with the benefits of securing separate representation, are factors that may be considered by the affected client in determining whether common representation is in the client's interests. Where the fact, validity or propriety of client consent is called into question, the lawyer has the burden of establishing that the client's consent was properly obtained in accordance with the Rule.

Client Consent Confirmed in Writing

[20] Paragraph (b) requires the lawyer to obtain the informed consent of the client, confirmed in writing. Such a writing may consist of (i) a document from the client, (ii) a document that the lawyer promptly transmits to the client confirming an oral informed consent, or (iii) a statement by the client made on the record of any proceeding before a tribunal, whether before, during or after a trial or hearing. *See* Rule 1.0(e) for the definition of "confirmed in writing." *See also* Rule 1.0(x) ("writing" includes electronic transmission). If it is not feasible to obtain or transmit the writing at the time the client gives informed consent, then the lawyer must obtain or transmit it within a reasonable time thereafter. The Rule does not require that the information communicated to the client by the lawyer necessary to make the consent "informed" be in writing or in any particular form in all cases. *See* Rules 1.0(e) and (j). The requirement of a writing does not supplant the need in most cases for the lawyer to talk with the client to explain the risks and advantages, if any, of representation burdened with a conflict of interest, as well as reasonably available alternatives, and to afford the client a reasonable opportunity to consider the risks and alternatives and to raise questions and concerns. Rather, the writing is required in order to impress upon clients the seriousness of the decision the client is being asked to make and to

avoid disputes or ambiguities that might later occur in the absence of a writing. *See* Comment [18].

Revoking Consent

[21] A client who has given consent to a conflict may revoke the consent and, like any other client, may terminate the lawyer's representation at any time. Whether revoking consent to the client's own representation precludes the lawyer from continuing to represent other clients depends on the circumstances, including the nature of the conflict, whether the client revoked consent because of a material change in circumstances, the reasonable expectations of the other clients, and whether material detriment to the other clients or the lawyer would result.

Consent to Future Conflict

[22] Whether a lawyer may properly request a client to waive conflicts that might arise in the future is subject to the conditions set forth in paragraph (b). The effectiveness of advance waivers is generally determined by the extent to which the client reasonably understands the material risks that the waiver entails. At a minimum, the client should be advised generally of the types of possible future adverse representations that the lawyer envisions, as well as the types of clients and matters that may present such conflicts. The more comprehensive the explanation and disclosure of the types of future representations that might arise and the actual and reasonably foreseeable adverse consequences of those representations, the greater the likelihood that the client will have the understanding necessary to make the consent "informed" and the waiver effective. *See* Rule 1.0(j). The lawyer should also disclose the measures that will be taken to protect the client should a conflict arise, including procedures such as screening that would be put in place. *See* Rule 1.0(t) for the definition of "screening." The adequacy of the disclosure necessary to obtain valid advance consent to conflicts may also depend on the sophistication and experience of the client. For example, if the client is unsophisticated about legal matters generally or about the particular type of matter at hand, the lawyer should provide more detailed information about both the nature of the anticipated conflict and the adverse consequences to the client that may ensue should the potential conflict become an actual one. In other instances, such as where the client is a child or an incapacitated or impaired person, it may be impossible to inform the client sufficiently, and the lawyer should not seek an advance waiver. On the other hand, if the client is an experienced user of the legal services involved and is reasonably informed regarding the risk that a conflict may arise, an advance waiver is more likely to be effective, particularly if, for example, the client is independently represented or advised by in-house or other counsel in giving consent. Thus, in some circumstances, even general and open-ended waivers by experienced users of legal services may be effective.

[22A] Even if a client has validly consented to waive future conflicts, however, the lawyer must reassess the propriety of the adverse concurrent representation under paragraph (b) when an actual conflict arises. If the actual conflict is materially different from the conflict that has been waived, the lawyer may not rely on the advance consent previously obtained. Even if the actual conflict is not materially different from the conflict the client has previously waived, the client's advance consent cannot be effective if the particular circumstances that have created an actual conflict during the course of the representation would make the conflict nonconsentable under paragraph (b). *See* Comments [14]-[17] and [28] addressing nonconsentable conflicts.

Conflicts in Litigation

[23] Paragraph (b)(3) prohibits representation of opposing parties in the same litigation, regardless of the clients' consent. On the other hand, simultaneous representation of parties whose interests in litigation may conflict, such as co-plaintiffs or co-defendants, is governed by paragraph (a)(1). A conflict may exist by reason of substantial discrepancy in the parties' testimony, incompatibility in positions in relation to an opposing party or the fact that there are substantially different possibilities of settlement of the claims or liabilities in question. Such conflicts can arise in criminal as well as civil cases. Some examples are those in which a lawyer is asked to represent co-defendants in a criminal case, co-plaintiffs or co-defendants in a personal injury case, an insured and insurer, or beneficiaries of the estate of a decedent. In a criminal case, the potential for conflict of interest in representing multiple defendants is so grave that ordinarily a lawyer should decline to represent more than one co-defendant. On the other hand, multiple representation of persons having similar interests in civil litigation is proper if the requirements of paragraph (b) are met.

[24] Ordinarily a lawyer may take inconsistent legal positions in different tribunals at different times on behalf of different clients. The mere fact that advocating a legal position on behalf of one client might create precedent adverse to the interests of a client represented by the lawyer in an unrelated matter does not create a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest exists, however, if there is a significant risk that a lawyer's action on behalf of one client will materially limit the lawyer's representation of another client in a different case; for example, when a decision favoring one client will create a precedent likely to weaken seriously the position taken on behalf of the other client. Factors relevant in determining whether the clients need to be advised of this risk include: (i) where the cases are pending, (ii) whether the issue is substantive or procedural, (iii) the temporal relationship between the matters, (iv) the significance of the issue to the immediate and long-term interests of the clients involved, and (v) the clients' reasonable expectations in retaining the lawyer. Similar concerns may be present when lawyers advocate on behalf of clients before other entities, such as regulatory authorities whose regulations or rulings may significantly implicate clients' interests. If there is significant risk of an adverse effect on the lawyer's professional judgment, then absent informed consent of the affected clients, the lawyer must decline the representation.

[25] When a lawyer represents or seeks to represent a class of plaintiffs or defendants in a class-action lawsuit, unnamed members of the class are ordinarily not considered to be clients of the lawyer for purposes of applying paragraph (a)(1). Thus, the lawyer does not typically need to get the consent of such a person before representing a client suing the person in an unrelated matter. Similarly, a lawyer seeking to represent an opponent in a class action does not typically need the consent of an unnamed member of the class whom the lawyer represents in an unrelated matter.

Nonlitigation Conflicts

[26] Conflicts of interest under paragraph (a)(1) arise in contexts other than litigation. For a discussion of such conflicts in transactional matters, see Comment [7]. Regarding paragraph (a)(2), relevant factors in determining whether there is a significant risk that the lawyer's professional judgment will be adversely affected include: (i) the importance of the

matter to each client, (ii) the duration and intimacy of the lawyer's relationship with the client or clients involved, (iii) the functions being performed by the lawyer, (iv) the likelihood that significant disagreements will arise, (v) the likelihood that negotiations will be contentious, (vi) the likelihood that the matter will result in litigation, and (vii) the likelihood that the client will suffer prejudice from the conflict. The issue is often one of proximity (how close the situation is to open conflict) and degree (how serious the conflict will be if it does erupt). *See* Comments [8], [29] and [29A].

[27] For example, conflict questions may arise in estate planning and estate administration. A lawyer may be called upon to prepare wills for several family members, such as husband and wife, and, depending upon the circumstances, a conflict of interest may be present at the outset or may arise during the representation. In order to avoid the development of a disqualifying conflict, the lawyer should, at the outset of the common representation and as part of the process of obtaining each client's informed consent, advise each client that information will be shared (and regardless of whether it is shared, may not be privileged in a subsequent dispute between the parties) and that the lawyer will have to withdraw from one or both representations if one client decides that some matter material to the representation should be kept secret from the other. *See* Comment [31].

[28] Whether a conflict is consentable depends on the circumstances. For example, a lawyer may not represent multiple parties to a negotiation if their interests are fundamentally antagonistic to one another, but common representation is permissible where the clients are generally aligned in interest, even though there is some difference in interest among them. Thus, a lawyer may seek to establish or adjust a relationship between clients on an amicable and mutually advantageous basis. Examples include helping to organize a business in which two or more clients are entrepreneurs, working out the financial reorganization of an enterprise in which two or more clients have an interest, and arranging a property distribution in settlement of an estate. The lawyer seeks to resolve potentially adverse interests by developing the parties' mutual interests. Otherwise, each party might have to obtain separate representation, with the possibility of incurring additional cost, complication or even litigation. Given these and other relevant factors, the clients may prefer that the lawyer act for all of them.

Special Considerations in Common Representation

[29] In civil matters, two or more clients may wish to be represented by a single lawyer in seeking to establish or adjust a relationship between them on an amicable and mutually advantageous basis. For example, clients may wish to be represented by a single lawyer in helping to organize a business, working out a financial reorganization of an enterprise in which two or more clients have an interest, arranging a property distribution of an estate or resolving a dispute between clients. The alternative to common representation can be that each party may have to obtain separate representation, with the possibility of incurring additional cost, complication or even litigation that might otherwise be avoided, or that some parties will have no lawyer at all. Given these and other relevant factors, clients may prefer common representation to separate representation or no representation. A lawyer should consult with each client concerning the implications of the common representation, including the advantages and the risks involved, and the effect on the attorney-client privilege, and obtain each client's informed consent, confirmed in writing, to the common representation.

[29A] Factors may be present that militate against a common representation. In considering whether to represent multiple clients in the same matter, a lawyer should be mindful that if the common representation fails because the potentially adverse interests cannot be reconciled, the result can be additional cost, embarrassment and recrimination. Ordinarily, absent the informed consent of all clients, the lawyer will be forced to withdraw from representing all of the clients if the common representation fails. *See* Rule 1.9(a). In some situations, the risk of failure is so great that multiple representation is plainly impossible. For example, a lawyer cannot undertake common representation of clients where contentious litigation or negotiations between them are imminent or contemplated. Moreover, because the lawyer is required to be impartial between or among commonly represented clients, representation of multiple clients is improper when it is unlikely that impartiality can be maintained. Generally, if the relationship between the parties has already assumed antagonism, it is unlikely that the clients' interests can be adequately served by common representation. For example, a lawyer who has represented one of the clients for a long period or in multiple matters might have difficulty being impartial between that client and one to whom the lawyer has only recently been introduced.

[30] A particularly important factor in determining the appropriateness of common representation is the effect on client-lawyer confidentiality and the attorney-client privilege. With regard to the attorney-client privilege, the prevailing rule is that, as between commonly represented clients, the privilege does not attach. It must therefore be assumed that if litigation eventuates between the clients, the privilege will not protect any such communications, and the clients should be so advised.

[31] As to the duty of confidentiality, continued common representation will almost certainly be inadequate if one client asks the lawyer not to disclose to the other client information relevant to the common representation. This is so because the lawyer has an equal duty of loyalty to each client, and each client has the right to be informed of anything bearing on the representation that might affect that client's interests and the right to expect that the lawyer will use that information to that client's benefit. *See* Rule 1.4. At the outset of the common representation and as part of the process of obtaining each client's informed consent, the lawyer should advise each client that information will be shared and that the lawyer will have to withdraw if one client decides that some matter material to the representation should be kept from the other. In limited circumstances, it may be appropriate for the lawyer to proceed with the representation when the clients have agreed, after being properly informed, that the lawyer will keep certain information confidential even as among the commonly represented clients. For example, the lawyer may reasonably conclude that failure to disclose one client's trade secrets to another client will not adversely affect representation involving a joint venture between the two clients and agree to keep that information confidential with the informed consent of both clients.

[32] When seeking to establish or adjust a relationship between clients, the lawyer should make clear that the lawyer's role is not that of partisanship normally expected in other circumstances and, thus, that the clients may be required to assume greater responsibility for decisions than when each client is separately represented. Any limitation on the scope of the representation made necessary as a result of the common representation should be fully explained to the clients at the outset of the representation. *See* Rule 1.2(c).

[33] Subject to the above limitations, each client in the common representation has the right to loyal and diligent representation and the protection of Rule 1.9 concerning the obligations to a former client. The client also has the right to discharge the lawyer as stated in Rule 1.16.

Organizational Clients

[34] A lawyer who represents a corporation or other organization does not, simply by virtue of that representation, necessarily represent any constituent or affiliated organization, such as a parent or subsidiary. *See* Rule 1.13(a). Although a desire to preserve good relationships with clients may strongly suggest that the lawyer should always seek informed consent of the client organization before undertaking any representation that is adverse to its affiliates, Rule 1.7 does not require the lawyer to obtain such consent unless: (i) the lawyer has an understanding with the organizational client that the lawyer will avoid representation adverse to the client's affiliates, (ii) the lawyer's obligations to either the organizational client or the new client are likely to adversely affect the lawyer's exercise of professional judgment on behalf of the other client, or (iii) the circumstances are such that the affiliate should also be considered a client of the lawyer. Whether the affiliate should be considered a client will depend on the nature of the lawyer's relationship with the affiliate or on the nature of the relationship between the client and its affiliate. For example, the lawyer's work for the client organization may be intended to benefit its affiliates. The overlap or identity of the officers and boards of directors, and the client's overall mode of doing business, may be so extensive that the entities would be viewed as "alter egos." Under such circumstances, the lawyer may conclude that the affiliate is the lawyer's client despite the lack of any formal agreement to represent the affiliate.

[34A] Whether the affiliate should be considered a client of the lawyer may also depend on: (i) whether the affiliate has imparted confidential information to the lawyer in furtherance of the representation, (ii) whether the affiliated entities share a legal department and general counsel, and (iii) other factors relating to the legitimate expectations of the client as to whether the lawyer also represents the affiliate. Where the entities are related only through stock ownership, the ownership is less than a controlling interest, and the lawyer has had no significant dealings with the affiliate or access to its confidences, the lawyer may reasonably conclude that the affiliate is not the lawyer's client.

[34B] Finally, before accepting a representation adverse to an affiliate of a corporate client, a lawyer should consider whether the extent of the possible adverse economic impact of the representation on the entire corporate family might be of such a magnitude that it would materially limit the lawyer's ability to represent the client opposing the affiliate. In those circumstances, Rule 1.7 will ordinarily require the lawyer to decline representation adverse to a member of the same corporate family, absent the informed consent of the client opposing the affiliate of the lawyer's corporate client.

Lawyer as Corporate Director

[35] A lawyer for a corporation or other organization who is also a member of its board of directors should determine whether the responsibilities of the two roles may conflict. The lawyer may be called on to advise the corporation in matters involving actions of the

directors. Consideration should be given to the frequency with which such situations may arise, the potential intensity of the conflict, the effect of the lawyer's resignation from the board, and the possibility of the corporation's obtaining legal advice from another lawyer in such situations. If there is material risk that the dual role will compromise the lawyer's professional judgment, the lawyer should not serve as a director or should cease to act as the corporation's lawyer when conflicts of interest arise. The lawyer should advise the other members of the board that, in some circumstances, matters discussed at board meetings while the lawyer is present in the capacity of director might not be protected by the attorney-client privilege and that conflict of interest considerations might require the lawyer's recusal as a director or might require the lawyer and the lawyer's firm to decline representation of the corporation in a matter.

[4] Paragraph (a) prohibits a lawyer from knowingly revealing confidential information as defined by this Rule. This prohibition also applies to disclosures by a lawyer that do not in themselves reveal confidential information but could reasonably lead to the discovery of such information by a third person. A lawyer's use of a hypothetical to discuss issues relating to the representation with persons not connected to the representation is permissible so long as there is no reasonable likelihood that the listener will be able to ascertain the identity of the client.

[4A] Paragraph (a) protects all factual information "gained during or relating to the representation of a client." Information relates to the representation if it has any possible relevance to the representation or is received because of the representation. The accumulation of legal knowledge or legal research that a lawyer acquires through practice ordinarily is not client information protected by this Rule. However, in some circumstances, including where the client and the lawyer have so agreed, a client may have a proprietary interest in a particular product of the lawyer's research. Information that is generally known in the local community or in the trade, field or profession to which the information relates is also not protected, unless the client and the lawyer have otherwise agreed. Information is not "generally known" simply because it is in the public domain or available in a public file.

Use of Information Related to Representation

[4B] The duty of confidentiality also prohibits a lawyer from using confidential information to the advantage of the lawyer or a third person or to the disadvantage of a client or former client unless the client or former client has given informed consent. See Rule 1.0(j) for the definition of "informed consent." This part of paragraph (a) applies when information is used to benefit either the lawyer or a third person, such as another client, a former client or a business associate of the lawyer. For example, if a lawyer learns that a client intends to purchase and develop several parcels of land, the lawyer may not (absent the client's informed consent) use that information to buy a nearby parcel that is expected to appreciate in value due to the client's purchase, or to recommend that another client buy the nearby land, even if the lawyer does not reveal any confidential information. The duty also prohibits disadvantageous use of confidential information unless the client gives informed consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules. For example, a lawyer assisting a client in purchasing a parcel of land may not make a competing bid on the same land. However, the fact that a lawyer has once served a client does not preclude the lawyer from using generally known information about that client, even to the disadvantage of the former client, after the client-lawyer relationship has terminated. *See* Rule 1.9(c)(1).

Authorized Disclosure

[5] Except to the extent that the client's instructions or special circumstances limit that authority, a lawyer may make disclosures of confidential information that are impliedly authorized by a client if the disclosures (i) advance the best interests of the client and (ii) are either reasonable under the circumstances or customary in the professional community. In some situations, for example, a lawyer may be impliedly authorized to admit a fact that cannot properly be disputed or to make a disclosure that facilitates a satisfactory conclusion to a matter. In addition, lawyers in a firm may, in the course of the firm's practice, disclose to each other

information relating to a client of the firm, unless the client has instructed that particular information be confined to specified lawyers. Lawyers are also impliedly authorized to reveal information about a client with diminished capacity when necessary to take protective action to safeguard the client's interests. See Rules 1.14(b) and (c).

Disclosure Adverse to Client

[6] Although the public interest is usually best served by a strict rule requiring lawyers to preserve the confidentiality of information relating to the representation of their clients, the confidentiality rule is subject to limited exceptions that prevent substantial harm to important interests, deter wrongdoing by clients, prevent violations of the law, and maintain the impartiality and integrity of judicial proceedings. Paragraph (b) permits, but does not require, a lawyer to disclose information relating to the representation to accomplish these specified purposes.

[6A] The lawyer's exercise of discretion conferred by paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(3) requires consideration of a wide range of factors and should therefore be given great weight. In exercising such discretion under these paragraphs, the lawyer should consider such factors as: (i) the seriousness of the potential injury to others if the prospective harm or crime occurs, (ii) the likelihood that it will occur and its imminence, (iii) the apparent absence of any other feasible way to prevent the potential injury, (iv) the extent to which the client may be using the lawyer's services in bringing about the harm or crime, (v) the circumstances under which the lawyer acquired the information of the client's intent or prospective course of action, and (vi) any other aggravating or extenuating circumstances. In any case, disclosure adverse to the client's interest should be no greater than the lawyer reasonably believes necessary to prevent the threatened harm or crime. When a lawyer learns that a client intends to pursue or is pursuing a course of conduct that would permit disclosure under paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(2) or (b)(3), the lawyer's initial duty, where practicable, is to remonstrate with the client. In the rare situation in which the client is reluctant to accept the lawyer's advice, the lawyer's threat of disclosure is a measure of last resort that may persuade the client. When the lawyer reasonably believes that the client will carry out the threatened harm or crime, the lawyer may disclose confidential information when permitted by paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(2) or (b)(3). A lawyer's permissible disclosure under paragraph (b) does not waive the client's attorney-client privilege; neither the lawyer nor the client may be forced to testify about communications protected by the privilege, unless a tribunal or body with authority to compel testimony makes a determination that the crime-fraud exception to the privilege, or some other exception, has been satisfied by a party to the proceeding. For a lawyer's duties when representing an organizational client engaged in wrongdoing, see Rule 1.13(b).

[6B] Paragraph (b)(1) recognizes the overriding value of life and physical integrity and permits disclosure reasonably necessary to prevent reasonably certain death or substantial bodily harm. Such harm is reasonably certain to occur if it will be suffered imminently or if there is a present and substantial risk that a person will suffer such harm at a later date if the lawyer fails to take action necessary to eliminate the threat. Thus, a lawyer who knows that a client has accidentally discharged toxic waste into a town's water supply may reveal this information to the authorities if there is a present and substantial risk that a person who drinks the water will contract a life-threatening or debilitating disease and the lawyer's disclosure is necessary to

eliminate the threat or reduce the number of victims. Wrongful execution of a person is a life-threatening and imminent harm under paragraph (b)(1) once the person has been convicted and sentenced to death. On the other hand, an event that will cause property damage but is unlikely to cause substantial bodily harm is not a present and substantial risk under paragraph (b)(1); similarly, a remote possibility or small statistical likelihood that any particular unit of a mass-distributed product will cause death or substantial bodily harm to unspecified persons over a period of years does not satisfy the element of reasonably certain death or substantial bodily harm under the exception to the duty of confidentiality in paragraph (b)(1).

[6C] Paragraph (b)(2) recognizes that society has important interests in preventing a client's crime. Disclosure of the client's intention is permitted to the extent reasonably necessary to prevent the crime. In exercising discretion under this paragraph, the lawyer should consider such factors as those stated in Comment [6A].

[6D] Some crimes, such as criminal fraud, may be ongoing in the sense that the client's past material false representations are still deceiving new victims. The law treats such crimes as continuing crimes in which new violations are constantly occurring. The lawyer whose services were involved in the criminal acts that constitute a continuing crime may reveal the client's refusal to bring an end to a continuing crime, even though that disclosure may also reveal the client's past wrongful acts, because refusal to end a continuing crime is equivalent to an intention to commit a new crime. Disclosure is not permitted under paragraph (b)(2), however, when a person who may have committed a crime employs a new lawyer for investigation or defense. Such a lawyer does not have discretion under paragraph (b)(2) to use or disclose the client's past acts that may have continuing criminal consequences. Disclosure is permitted, however, if the client uses the new lawyer's services to commit a further crime, such as obstruction of justice or perjury.

[6E] Paragraph (b)(3) permits a lawyer to withdraw a legal opinion or to disaffirm a prior representation made to third parties when the lawyer reasonably believes that third persons are still relying on the lawyer's work and the work was based on "materially inaccurate information or is being used to further a crime or fraud." *See* Rule 1.16(b)(1), requiring the lawyer to withdraw when the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the representation will result in a violation of law. Paragraph (b)(3) permits the lawyer to give only the limited notice that is implicit in withdrawing an opinion or representation, which may have the collateral effect of inferentially revealing confidential information. The lawyer's withdrawal of the tainted opinion or representation allows the lawyer to prevent further harm to third persons and to protect the lawyer's own interest when the client has abused the professional relationship, but paragraph (b)(3) does not permit explicit disclosure of the client's past acts unless such disclosure is permitted under paragraph (b)(2).

[7] [Reserved.]

[8] [Reserved.]

[9] A lawyer's confidentiality obligations do not preclude a lawyer from securing confidential legal advice about compliance with these Rules and other law by the lawyer, another lawyer in the lawyer's firm, or the law firm. In many situations, disclosing information to secure

such advice will be impliedly authorized for the lawyer to carry out the representation. Even when the disclosure is not impliedly authorized, paragraph (b)(4) permits such disclosure because of the importance of a lawyer's compliance with these Rules, court orders and other law.

[10] Where a claim or charge alleges misconduct of the lawyer related to the representation of a current or former client, the lawyer may respond to the extent the lawyer reasonably believes necessary to establish a defense. Such a claim can arise in a civil, criminal, disciplinary or other proceeding and can be based on a wrong allegedly committed by the lawyer against the client or on a wrong alleged by a third person, such as a person claiming to have been defrauded by the lawyer and client acting together or by the lawyer acting alone. The lawyer may respond directly to the person who has made an accusation that permits disclosure, provided that the lawyer's response complies with Rule 4.2 and Rule 4.3, and other Rules or applicable law. A lawyer may make the disclosures authorized by paragraph (b)(5) through counsel. The right to respond also applies to accusations of wrongful conduct concerning the lawyer's law firm, employees or associates.

[11] A lawyer entitled to a fee is permitted by paragraph (b)(5) to prove the services rendered in an action to collect it. This aspect of the rule expresses the principle that the beneficiary of a fiduciary relationship may not exploit it to the detriment of the fiduciary.

[12] Paragraph (b) does not mandate any disclosures. However, other law may require that a lawyer disclose confidential information. Whether such a law supersedes Rule 1.6 is a question of law beyond the scope of these Rules. When disclosure of confidential information appears to be required by other law, the lawyer must consult with the client to the extent required by Rule 1.4 before making the disclosure, unless such consultation would be prohibited by other law. If the lawyer concludes that other law supersedes this Rule and requires disclosure, paragraph (b)(6) permits the lawyer to make such disclosures as are necessary to comply with the law.

[13] A tribunal or governmental entity claiming authority pursuant to other law to compel disclosure may order a lawyer to reveal confidential information. Absent informed consent of the client to comply with the order, the lawyer should assert on behalf of the client nonfrivolous arguments that the order is not authorized by law, the information sought is protected against disclosure by an applicable privilege or other law, or the order is invalid or defective for some other reason. In the event of an adverse ruling, the lawyer must consult with the client to the extent required by Rule 1.4 about the possibility of an appeal or further challenge, unless such consultation would be prohibited by other law. If such review is not sought or is unsuccessful, paragraph (b)(6) permits the lawyer to comply with the order.

[14] Paragraph (b) permits disclosure only to the extent the lawyer reasonably believes the disclosure is necessary to accomplish one of the purposes specified in paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(6). Before making a disclosure, the lawyer should, where practicable, first seek to persuade the client to take suitable action to obviate the need for disclosure. In any case, a disclosure adverse to the client's interest should be no greater than the lawyer reasonably believes necessary to accomplish the purpose, particularly when accusations of wrongdoing in the representation of a client have been made by a third party rather than by the client. If the disclosure will be made in connection with an adjudicative proceeding, the disclosure should be

made in a manner that limits access to the information to the tribunal or other persons having a need to know the information, and appropriate protective orders or other arrangements should be sought by the lawyer to the fullest extent practicable.

[15] Paragraph (b) permits but does not require the disclosure of information relating to a client's representation to accomplish the purposes specified in paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(6). A lawyer's decision not to disclose as permitted by paragraph (b) does not violate this Rule. Disclosure may, however, be required by other Rules or by other law. *See* Comments [12]-[13]. Some Rules require disclosure only if such disclosure would be permitted by paragraph (b). *E.g.*, Rule 8.3(c)(1). Rule 3.3(c), on the other hand, requires disclosure in some circumstances whether or not disclosure is permitted or prohibited by this Rule.

Withdrawal

[15A] If the lawyer's services will be used by the client in materially furthering a course of criminal or fraudulent conduct, the lawyer must withdraw pursuant to Rule 1.16(b)(1). Withdrawal may also be required or permitted for other reasons under Rule 1.16. After withdrawal, the lawyer is required to refrain from disclosing or using information protected by Rule 1.6, except as this Rule permits such disclosure. Neither this Rule, nor Rule 1.9(c), nor Rule 1.16(e) prevents the lawyer from giving notice of the fact of withdrawal. For withdrawal or disaffirmance of an opinion or representation, see paragraph (b)(3) and Comment [6E]. Where the client is an organization, the lawyer may be in doubt whether the organization will actually carry out the contemplated conduct. Where necessary to guide conduct in connection with this Rule, the lawyer may, and sometimes must, make inquiry within the organization. *See* Rules 1.13(b) and (c).

Duty to Preserve Confidentiality

[16] Paragraph (c) requires a lawyer to exercise reasonable care to prevent disclosure of information related to the representation by employees, associates and others whose services are utilized in connection with the representation. *See also* Rules 1.1, 5.1 and 5.3. However, a lawyer may reveal the information permitted to be disclosed by this Rule through an employee.

[17] When transmitting a communication that includes information relating to the representation of a client, the lawyer must take reasonable precautions to prevent the information from coming into the hands of unintended recipients. This duty does not require that the lawyer use special security measures if the method of communication affords a reasonable expectation of privacy. Special circumstances, however, may warrant special precautions. Factors to be considered in determining the reasonableness of the lawyer's expectation of confidentiality include the sensitivity of the information and the extent to which the privacy of the communication is protected by law or by a confidentiality agreement. A client may require the lawyer to use a means of communication or security measures not required by this Rule, or may give informed consent (as in an engagement letter or similar document) to the use of means or measures that would otherwise be prohibited by this Rule.

Lateral Moves, Law Firm Mergers, and Confidentiality

[18A] When lawyers or law firms (including in-house legal departments) contemplate a new association with other lawyers or law firms though lateral hiring or merger, disclosure of limited information may be necessary to resolve conflicts of interest pursuant to Rule 1.10 and to address financial, staffing, operational, and other practical issues. However, Rule 1.6(a) requires lawyers and law firms to protect their clients' confidential information, so lawyers and law firms may not disclose such information for their own advantage or for the advantage of third parties absent a client's informed consent or some other exception to Rule 1.6.

[18B] Disclosure without client consent in the context of a possible lateral move or law firm merger is ordinarily permitted regarding basic information such as: (i) the identities of clients or other parties involved in a matter; (ii) a brief summary of the status and nature of a particular matter, including the general issues involved; (iii) information that is publicly available; (iv) the lawyer's total book of business; (v) the financial terms of each lawyer-client relationship; and (vi) information about aggregate current and historical payment of fees (such as realization rates, average receivables, and aggregate timeliness of payments). Such information is generally not "confidential information" within the meaning of Rule 1.6.

[18C] Disclosure without client consent in the context of a possible lateral move or law firm merger is ordinarily *not* permitted, however, if information is protected by Rule 1.6(a), 1.9(c), or Rule 1.18(b). This includes information that a lawyer knows or reasonably believes is protected by the attorney-client privilege, or is likely to be detrimental or embarrassing to the client, or is information that the client has requested be kept confidential. For example, many clients would not want their lawyers to disclose their tardiness in paying bills; the amounts they spend on legal fees in particular matters; forecasts about their financial prospects; ir information relating to sensitive client matters (e.g., an unannounced corporate takeover, an undisclosed possible divorce, or a criminal investigation into the client's conduct).

[18D] When lawyers are exploring a new association, whether by lateral move or by merger, all lawyers involved must individually consider fiduciary obligations to their existing firms that may bear on the timing and scope of disclosures to clients relating to conflicts and financial concerns, and should consider whether to ask clients for a waiver of confidentiality if consistent with these fiduciary duties – *see* Rule 1.10(e) (requiring law firms to check for conflicts of interest). Questions of fiduciary duty are legal issues beyond the scope of the Rules.

[18E] For the unique confidentiality and notice provisions that apply to a lawyer or law firm seeking to sell all or part of its practice, see Rule 1.17 and Comment [7] to that Rule.

[18F] Before disclosing information regarding a possible lateral move or law firm merger, law firms and lawyers moving between firms – both those providing information and those receiving information – should use reasonable measures to minimize the risk of any improper, unauthorized or inadvertent disclosures, whether or not the information is protected by Rule 1.6(a), 1.9(c), or 1.18(b). These steps might include such measures as: (1) disclosing client information in stages; initially identifying only certain clients and providing only limited information, and providing a complete list of clients and more detailed financial information only at subsequent stages; (2) limiting disclosure to those at the firm, or even a single person at the firm, directly involved in clearing conflicts and making the business decision whether to move forward to the next stage regarding the lateral hire or law firm merger; and/or (3) agreeing not to

disclose financial or conflict information outside the firm(s) during and after the lateral hiring negotiations or merger process.

RULE 1.17:
SALE OF LAW PRACTICE

(a) A lawyer retiring from a private practice of law; a law firm, one or more members of which are retiring from the private practice of law with the firm; or the personal representative of a deceased, disabled or missing lawyer, may sell a law practice, including goodwill, to one or more lawyers or law firms, who may purchase the practice. The seller and the buyer may agree on reasonable restrictions on the seller's private practice of law, notwithstanding any other provision of these Rules. Retirement shall include the cessation of the private practice of law in the geographic area, that is, the county and city and any county or city contiguous thereto, in which the practice to be sold has been conducted.

(b) Confidential information.

(1) With respect to each matter subject to the contemplated sale, the seller may provide prospective buyers with any information not protected as confidential information under Rule 1.6.

(2) Notwithstanding Rule 1.6, the seller may provide the prospective buyer with information as to individual clients:

(i) concerning the identity of the client, except as provided in paragraph (b)(6);

(ii) concerning the status and general nature of the matter;

(iii) available in public court files; and

(iv) concerning the financial terms of the client-lawyer relationship and the payment status of the client's account.

(3) Prior to making any disclosure of confidential information that may be permitted under paragraph (b)(2), the seller shall provide the prospective buyer with information regarding the matters involved in the proposed sale sufficient to enable the prospective buyer to determine whether any conflicts of interest exist. Where sufficient information cannot be disclosed without revealing client confidential information, the seller may make the disclosures necessary for the prospective buyer to determine whether any conflict of interest exists, subject to paragraph (b)(6). If the prospective buyer determines that conflicts of interest exist prior to reviewing the information, or determines during the course of review that a conflict of interest exists, the prospective buyer shall not review or continue to review the information unless the seller shall have obtained the consent of the client in accordance with Rule 1.6(a)(1).

(4) Prospective buyers shall maintain the confidentiality of and shall not use any client information received in connection with the proposed sale in the same

manner and to the same extent as if the prospective buyers represented the client.

(5) Absent the consent of the client after full disclosure, a seller shall not provide a prospective buyer with information if doing so would cause a violation of the attorney-client privilege.

(6) If the seller has reason to believe that the identity of the client or the fact of the representation itself constitutes confidential information in the circumstances, the seller may not provide such information to a prospective buyer without first advising the client of the identity of the prospective buyer and obtaining the client's consent to the proposed disclosure.

(c) Written notice of the sale shall be given jointly by the seller and the buyer to each of the seller's clients and shall include information regarding:

(1) the client's right to retain other counsel or to take possession of the file;

(2) the fact that the client's consent to the transfer of the client's file or matter to the buyer will be presumed if the client does not take any action or otherwise object within 90 days of the sending of the notice, subject to any court rule or statute requiring express approval by the client or a court;

(3) the fact that agreements between the seller and the seller's clients as to fees will be honored by the buyer;

(4) proposed fee increases, if any, permitted under paragraph (e); and

(5) the identity and background of the buyer or buyers, including principal office address, bar admissions, number of years in practice in New York State, whether the buyer has ever been disciplined for professional misconduct or convicted of a crime, and whether the buyer currently intends to resell the practice.

(d) When the buyer's representation of a client of the seller would give rise to a waivable conflict of interest, the buyer shall not undertake such representation unless the necessary waiver or waivers have been obtained in writing.

(e) The fee charged a client by the buyer shall not be increased by reason of the sale, unless permitted by a retainer agreement with the client or otherwise specifically agreed to by the client.

Comment

[1] The practice of law is a profession, not merely a business. Clients are not commodities that can be purchased and sold at will. Pursuant to this Rule, when a lawyer or an entire firm ceases to practice, and other lawyers or firms take over the representation, the selling

lawyer or firm may obtain compensation for the reasonable value of the practice, as may withdrawing partners of law firms.

Termination of Practice by Seller

[2] The requirement that all of the private practice be sold is satisfied if the seller in good faith makes the entire practice available for sale to the buyers. The fact that a number of the seller's clients decide not to be represented by the buyers but take their matters elsewhere, therefore, does not result in a violation. Return to private practice as a result of an unanticipated change in circumstances does not necessarily result in a violation. For example, a lawyer who has sold the practice to accept an appointment to judicial office does not violate the requirement that the sale be attendant to cessation of practice if the lawyer later resumes private practice upon being defeated in a contested or a retention election for the office or resigns from a judiciary position. Although the requirements of this Rule may not be violated in these situations, contractual provisions in the agreement governing the sale of the practice may contain reasonable restrictions on a lawyer's resuming private practice. *See* Rule 5.6, Comment [1], regarding restrictions on right to practice.

[3] The private practice of law refers to a private law firm or lawyer, not to a public agency, legal services entity, or in-house counsel to a business. The requirement that the seller cease to engage in the private practice of law therefore does not prohibit employment as a lawyer on the staff of a public agency or a legal services entity that provides legal services to the poor, or as in-house counsel to a business.

[4] The Rule permits a sale of an entire practice attendant upon retirement from the private practice of law within a geographic area, defined as the county and city and any county or city contiguous thereto, in which the practice to be sold has been conducted. Its provisions therefore accommodate the lawyer who sells the practice on the occasion of moving to another city and county that does not border on the city or county.

[5] [Reserved.]

Sale of Entire Practice

[6] The Rule requires that the seller's entire practice be sold. The prohibition against sale of less than an entire practice protects those clients whose matters are less lucrative and who might find it difficult to secure other counsel if a sale could be limited to substantial fee-generating matters. The buyers are required to undertake all client matters in the practice, subject to client consent. This requirement is not violated even if a buyer is unable to undertake a particular client matter because of a conflict of interest and the seller therefore remains as attorney of record for the matter in question.

Client Confidences, Consent and Notice

[7] Giving the buyer access to client-specific information relating to the representation and to the file requires client consent. Rule 1.17 provides that before such information can be disclosed by the seller to the buyer, the client must be given actual written notice of the contemplated sale, including the identity of the buyer, and must be told that the

decision to consent or make other arrangements must be made within 90 days. If nothing is heard from the client within that time, consent to the sale is presumed under paragraph (c)(2).

[8] A lawyer or law firm ceasing to practice cannot be required to remain in practice because some clients cannot be given actual notice of the proposed purchase. The selling lawyer must make a good-faith effort to notify all of the lawyer's current clients. Where clients cannot be given actual notice and therefore cannot themselves consent to the purchase or direct any other disposition of their files, they are nevertheless protected by the fact that the buyer has the duty to maintain their confidences under paragraph (b)(4).

[9] All elements of client autonomy, including the client's absolute right to discharge a lawyer and transfer the representation to another, survive the sale of the practice.

Fee Arrangements Between Client and Buyer

[10] The sale may not be financed by increases in fees charged to the clients of the purchased practice except to the extent permitted by subparagraph (e) of this Rule. Under subparagraph (e), the buyer must honor existing arrangements between the seller and the client as to fees unless the seller's retainer agreement with the client permits a fee increase or the buyer obtains a client's specific agreement to a fee increase in compliance with the strict standards of Rule 1.8(a) (governing business transactions between lawyers and clients).

Other Applicable Ethical Standards

[11] Lawyers participating in the sale or purchase of a law practice are subject to the ethical standards applicable to involving another lawyer in the representation of a client. Examples include (i) the seller's obligation to exercise competence in identifying a buyer qualified to assume the practice and the buyer's obligation to undertake the representation competently under Rule 1.1, (ii) the obligation of the seller and the buyer to avoid disqualifying conflicts, and to secure the client's informed consent for those conflicts that can be agreed to under Rule 1.7, and (iii) the obligation of the seller and the buyer to protect information relating to the representation under Rule 1.6 and Rule 1.9. *See also* Rule 1.0(j) for the definition of "informed consent."

[12] If approval of the substitution of the purchasing lawyer for the selling lawyer is required by the rules of any tribunal in which a matter is pending, such approval must be obtained before the matter can be included in the sale. *See* Rule 1.16. If a tribunal refuses to give its permission for the substitution and the seller therefore must continue in the matter, the seller does not thereby violate the portion of this Rule requiring the seller to cease practice in the described geographic area.

Applicability of the Rule

[13] [Reserved.]

[14] This Rule does not apply to: (i) admission to or retirement from a law partnership or professional association, (ii) retirement plans and similar arrangements, (iii) a sale of tangible assets of a law practice, or (iv) the transfers of legal representation between lawyers when such

transfers are unrelated to the sale of a practice. This Rule governs the sale of an entire law practice upon retirement, which is defined in paragraph (a) as the cessation of the private practice of law in a given geographic area. Rule 5.4(a)(2) provides for the compensation of a lawyer who undertakes to complete one or more unfinished pieces of legal business of a deceased lawyer.

RULE 1.8:
CURRENT CLIENTS:
SPECIFIC CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES

(a) A lawyer shall not enter into a business transaction with a client if they have differing interests therein and if the client expects the lawyer to exercise professional judgment therein for the protection of the client, unless:

(1) the transaction is fair and reasonable to the client and the terms of the transaction are fully disclosed and transmitted in writing in a manner that can be reasonably understood by the client;

(2) the client is advised in writing of the desirability of seeking, and is given a reasonable opportunity to seek, the advice of independent legal counsel on the transaction; and

(3) the client gives informed consent, in a writing signed by the client, to the essential terms of the transaction and the lawyer's role in the transaction, including whether the lawyer is representing the client in the transaction.

(b) A lawyer shall not use information relating to representation of a client to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules.

(c) A lawyer shall not:

(1) solicit any gift from a client, including a testamentary gift, for the benefit of the lawyer or a person related to the lawyer; or

(2) prepare on behalf of a client an instrument giving the lawyer or a person related to the lawyer any gift, unless the lawyer or other recipient of the gift is related to the client and a reasonable lawyer would conclude that the transaction is fair and reasonable.

For purposes of this paragraph, related persons include a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, grandparent or other relative, or individual with whom the lawyer or the client maintains a close, familial relationship.

(d) Prior to conclusion of all aspects of the matter giving rise to the representation or proposed representation of the client or prospective client, a lawyer shall not negotiate or enter into any arrangement or understanding with:

(1) a client or a prospective client by which the lawyer acquires an interest in literary or media rights with respect to the subject matter of the representation or proposed representation; or

(2) any person by which the lawyer transfers or assigns any interest in

literary or media rights with respect to the subject matter of the representation of a client or prospective client.

(e) While representing a client in connection with contemplated or pending litigation, a lawyer shall not advance or guarantee financial assistance to the client, except that:

(1) a lawyer may advance court costs and expenses of litigation, the repayment of which may be contingent on the outcome of the matter;

(2) a lawyer representing an indigent or pro bono client may pay court costs and expenses of litigation on behalf of the client; and

(3) a lawyer, in an action in which an attorney's fee is payable in whole or in part as a percentage of the recovery in the action, may pay on the lawyer's own account court costs and expenses of litigation. In such case, the fee paid to the lawyer from the proceeds of the action may include an amount equal to such costs and expenses incurred.

(f) A lawyer shall not accept compensation for representing a client, or anything of value related to the lawyer's representation of the client, from one other than the client unless:

(1) the client gives informed consent;

(2) there is no interference with the lawyer's independent professional judgment or with the client-lawyer relationship; and

(3) the client's confidential information is protected as required by Rule 1.6.

(g) A lawyer who represents two or more clients shall not participate in making an aggregate settlement of the claims of or against the clients, absent court approval, unless each client gives informed consent in a writing signed by the client. The lawyer's disclosure shall include the existence and nature of all the claims involved and of the participation of each person in the settlement.

(h) A lawyer shall not:

(1) make an agreement prospectively limiting the lawyer's liability to a client for malpractice; or

(2) settle a claim or potential claim for such liability with an unrepresented client or former client unless that person is advised in writing of the desirability of seeking, and is given a reasonable opportunity to seek, the advice of independent legal counsel in connection therewith.

(i) A lawyer shall not acquire a proprietary interest in the cause of action or subject matter of litigation the lawyer is conducting for a client, except that the lawyer may:

(1) acquire a lien authorized by law to secure the lawyer's fee or expenses; and

(2) contract with a client for a reasonable contingent fee in a civil matter subject to Rule 1.5(d) or other law or court rule.

(j) (1) A lawyer shall not:

(i) as a condition of entering into or continuing any professional representation by the lawyer or the lawyer's firm, require or demand sexual relations with any person;

(ii) employ coercion, intimidation or undue influence in entering into sexual relations incident to any professional representation by the lawyer or the lawyer's firm; or

(iii) in domestic relations matters, enter into sexual relations with a client during the course of the lawyer's representation of the client.

(2) Rule 1.8(j)(1) shall not apply to sexual relations between lawyers and their spouses or to ongoing consensual sexual relationships that predate the initiation of the client-lawyer relationship.

(k) Where a lawyer in a firm has sexual relations with a client but does not participate in the representation of that client, the lawyers in the firm shall not be subject to discipline under this Rule solely because of the occurrence of such sexual relations.

Comment

Business Transactions Between Client and Lawyer

[1] A lawyer's legal skill and training, together with the relationship of trust and confidence between lawyer and client, create the possibility of overreaching when the lawyer participates in a business, property or financial transaction with a client, for example, a loan or sales transaction or a lawyer's investment on behalf of a client. For these reasons business transactions between a lawyer and client are not advisable. If a lawyer nevertheless elects to enter into a business transaction with a current client, the requirements of paragraph (a) must be met if the client and lawyer have differing interests in the transaction and the client expects the lawyer to exercise professional judgment therein for the benefit of the client. This will ordinarily be the case even when the transaction is not related to the subject matter of the representation, as when a lawyer drafting a will for a client learns that the client needs money for unrelated expenses and offers to make a loan to the client. The Rule applies to lawyers engaged in the sale

of goods or services related to the practice of law, such as the sale of title insurance or investment services to existing clients of the lawyer's legal practice. *See* Rule 5.7. It also applies to lawyers purchasing property from estates they represent.

[2] Paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2) and (a)(3) set out the conditions that a lawyer must satisfy under this Rule. Paragraph (a)(1) requires that the transaction itself be fair to the client and that its essential terms be communicated in writing to the client in a manner that can be reasonably understood. Paragraph (a)(2) requires that the client also be advised in writing of the desirability of seeking the advice of independent legal counsel. It also requires that the client be given a reasonable opportunity to obtain such advice. Paragraph (a)(3) requires that the lawyer obtain the client's informed consent, in a writing signed by the client, both to the essential terms of the transaction and to the lawyer's role. When necessary, the lawyer should discuss both the material risks of the proposed transaction, including any risk presented by the lawyer's involvement and the existence of reasonably available alternatives, and should explain why the advice of independent legal counsel is desirable. See Rule 1.0(j) for the definition of "informed consent."

[3] The risk to a client is greatest when the client expects the lawyer to represent the client in the transaction itself or when the lawyer's financial interest otherwise poses a significant risk that the lawyer's representation of the client will be materially adversely affected by the lawyer's financial interest in the transaction. Here the lawyer's role requires that the lawyer must comply, not only with the requirements of paragraph (a), but also with the requirements of Rule 1.7. Under that Rule, the lawyer must disclose the risks associated with the lawyer's dual role as both legal adviser and participant in the transaction, such as the risk that the lawyer will structure the transaction or give legal advice in a way that favors the lawyer's interests at the client's expense. Moreover, the lawyer must obtain the client's informed consent. In some cases, the lawyer's interest may be such that Rule 1.7 will preclude the lawyer from seeking the client's consent to the transaction. A lawyer has a continuing duty to monitor the inherent conflicts of interest that arise out of the lawyer's business transaction with a client or because the lawyer has an ownership interest in property in which the client also has an interest. A lawyer is also required to make such additional disclosures to the client as are necessary to obtain the client's informed consent to the continuation of the representation.

[3A] The self-interest of a lawyer resulting from a business transaction with a client may interfere with the lawyer's exercise of independent judgment on behalf of the client. If such interference will occur should a lawyer agree to represent a prospective client, the lawyer should decline the proffered employment. After accepting employment, a lawyer should not acquire property rights that would adversely affect the lawyer's professional judgment in representing the client. Even if the property interests of a lawyer do not presently interfere with the exercise of independent judgment, but the likelihood of interference can be reasonably foreseen by the lawyer, the lawyer should explain the situation to the client and should decline employment or withdraw unless the client gives informed consent to the continued representation, confirmed in writing. A lawyer should not seek to persuade a client to permit the lawyer to invest in an undertaking of the client nor make improper use of a professional relationship to influence the client to invest in an enterprise in which the lawyer is interested.

[4] If the client is independently represented in the transaction, paragraph (a)(2) is inapplicable, and the requirement of full disclosure in paragraph (a)(1) is satisfied by a written disclosure by either the lawyer involved in the transaction or the client's independent counsel. The fact that the client was independently represented in the transaction is relevant in determining whether the agreement was fair and reasonable to the client, as paragraph (a)(1) further requires.

[4A] Rule 1.8(a) does not apply to business transactions with former clients, but the line between current and former clients is not always clear. A lawyer entering into a business transaction with a former client may not use information relating to the representation to the disadvantage of the former client unless the information has become generally known. *See* Rule 1.9(c).

[4B] The Rule does not apply to standard commercial transactions between the lawyer and the client for products or services that the client generally markets to others, for example, banking or brokerage services, medical services, products manufactured or distributed by the client, and utilities services. In such transactions, the lawyer has no advantage in dealing with the client, and the restrictions in paragraph (a) are unnecessary and impracticable.

[4C] This Rule also does not apply to ordinary fee arrangements between client and lawyer reached at the inception of the client-lawyer relationship, which are governed by Rule 1.5. The requirements of the Rule ordinarily must be met, however, when the lawyer accepts an interest in the client's business or other nonmonetary property as payment of all or part of the lawyer's fee. For example, the requirements of paragraph (a) must ordinarily be met if a lawyer agrees to take stock (or stock options) in the client in lieu of cash fees. Such an exchange creates a risk that the lawyer's judgment will be skewed in favor of closing a transaction to such an extent that the lawyer may fail to exercise professional judgment as to whether it is in the client's best interest for the transaction to close. This may occur where the client expects the lawyer to provide professional advice in structuring a securities-for-services exchange. If the lawyer is expected to play any role in advising the client regarding the securities-for-services exchange, especially if the client lacks sophistication, the requirements of fairness, full disclosure and written consent set forth in paragraph (a) must be met. When a lawyer represents a client in a transaction concerning literary property, Rule 1.8(d) does not prohibit the lawyer from agreeing that the lawyer's fee shall consist of a share of the ownership of the literary property or a share of the royalties or license fees from the property, but the lawyer must ordinarily comply with Rule 1.8(a).

[4D] An exchange of securities for legal services will also trigger the requirements of Rule 1.7 if the lawyer's ownership interest in the client would, or reasonably may, affect the lawyer's exercise of professional judgment on behalf of the client. For example, where a lawyer has agreed to accept securities in a client corporation as a fee for negotiating and documenting an equity investment, or for representing a client in connection with an initial public offering, there is a risk that the lawyer's judgment will be skewed in favor of closing the transaction to such an extent that that the lawyer may fail to exercise professional judgment. (The lawyer's judgment may be skewed because unless the transaction closes, the securities will be worthless.) Unless a lawyer reasonably concludes that he or she will be able to provide competent, diligent and loyal representation to the client, the lawyer may not undertake or continue the representation, even

with the client's consent. To determine whether a reasonable possibility of such an adverse effect on the representation exists, the lawyer should analyze the nature and relationship of the particular interest and the specific legal services to be rendered. Some salient factors may be (i) the size of the lawyer's investment in proportion to the holdings of other investors, (ii) the potential value of the investment in relation to the lawyer's or law firm's earnings or other assets, and (iii) whether the investment is active or passive.

[4E] If the lawyer reasonably concludes that the lawyer's representation of the client will not be adversely affected by the agreement to accept client securities as a legal fee, the Rules permit the representation, but only if full disclosure is made to the client and the client's informed consent is obtained and confirmed in writing. *See* Rules 1.0(e) (defining "confirmed in writing"), 1.0(j) (defining "informed consent"), and 1.7.

[4F] A lawyer must also consider whether accepting securities in a client as payment for legal services constitutes charging or collecting an unreasonable or excessive fee in violation of Rule 1.5. Determining whether a fee accepted in the form of securities is unreasonable or excessive requires a determination of the value of the securities at the time the agreement is reached and may require the lawyer to engage the services of an investment professional to appraise the value of the securities to be given. The lawyer and client can then make their own advised decisions as to whether the securities-for-fees exchange results in a reasonable fee.

[5] A lawyer's use of information relating to the representation to the disadvantage of the client violates the lawyer's duty of loyalty. Paragraph (b) applies when the information is used to benefit either the lawyer or a third person, such as another client or a business associate of the lawyer, at the expense of a client. For example, if a lawyer leans that a client intends to purchase and develop several parcels of land, the lawyer may not use that information to purchase one of the parcels in competition with the client or to recommend that another client make such a purchase. But the rule does not prohibit uses that do not disadvantage the client. For example, a lawyer who learns a government agency's interpretation of trade legislation during the representation of one client may properly use that information to benefit other clients. Paragraph (b) prohibits use of client information to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules. Rules that permit or require use of client information to the disadvantage of the client include Rules 1.6, 1.9(c) and 3.3.

Gifts to Lawyers

[6] A lawyer may accept a gift from a client if the transaction meets general standards of fairness. If a client offers the lawyer a gift, paragraph (c) does not prohibit the lawyer from accepting it, although such a gift may be voidable by the client. Before accepting a gift offered by a client, a lawyer should urge the client to secure disinterested advice from an independent, competent person who is cognizant of all of the circumstances. In any event, due to concerns about overreaching and imposition on clients, a lawyer may not suggest that a gift be made to the lawyer or for the lawyer's benefit.

[6A] This Rule does not apply to success fees, bonuses and the like from clients for legal services. These are governed by Rule 1.5.

[7] If effectuation of a gift requires preparing a legal instrument such as a will or conveyance, the client should have the detached advice that another lawyer can provide. The sole exception to this Rule is where the client is related to the donee and a reasonable lawyer would conclude that the transaction is fair and reasonable, as set forth in paragraph (c).

[8] This Rule does not prohibit a lawyer or a partner or associate of the lawyer from being named as executor of the client's estate or named to another fiduciary position. Nevertheless, such appointments will be subject to the general conflict of interest provision in Rule 1.7 when there is a significant risk that the lawyer's interest in obtaining the appointment will adversely affect the lawyer's professional judgment in advising the client concerning the choice of an executor or other fiduciary. In obtaining the client's informed consent to the conflict, the lawyer should advise the client concerning the nature and extent of the lawyer's financial interest in the appointment, as well as the availability of alternative candidates for the position.

Literary or Media Rights

[9] An agreement by which a lawyer acquires literary or media rights concerning the subject matter of the representation creates a conflict between the interest of the client and the personal interests of the lawyer. The lawyer may be tempted to subordinate the interests of the client to the lawyer's own anticipated pecuniary gain. For example, a lawyer in a criminal case who obtains from the client television, radio, motion picture, newspaper, magazine, book, or other literary or media rights with respect to the case may be influenced, consciously or unconsciously, to a course of conduct that will enhance the value of the literary or media rights to the prejudice of the client. To prevent this adverse impact on the representation, such arrangements should be scrupulously avoided prior to the termination of all aspects of the matter giving rise to the representation, even though the representation has previously ended. Likewise, arrangements with third parties, such as book, newspaper or magazine publishers or television, radio or motion picture producers, pursuant to which the lawyer conveys whatever literary or media rights the lawyer may have, should not be entered into prior to the conclusion of all aspects of the matter giving rise to the representation.

[9A] Rule 1.8(d) does not prohibit a lawyer representing a client in a transaction concerning intellectual property from agreeing that the lawyer's fee shall consist of an ownership share in the property, if the arrangement conforms to paragraph (a) and Rule 1.5.

Financial Assistance

[9B] Paragraph (e) eliminates the former requirement that the client remain "ultimately liable" to repay any costs and expenses of litigation that were advanced by the lawyer regardless of whether the client obtained a recovery. Accordingly, a lawyer may make repayment from the client contingent on the outcome of the litigation, and may forgo repayment if the client obtains no recovery or a recovery less than the amount of the advanced costs and expenses. A lawyer may also, in an action in which the lawyer's fee is payable in whole or in part as a percentage of the recovery, pay court costs and litigation expenses on the lawyer's own account. However, like the former New York rule, paragraph (e) limits permitted financial assistance to court costs directly related to litigation. Examples of permitted expenses include filing fees, expenses of

investigation, medical diagnostic work connected with the matter under litigation and treatment necessary for the diagnosis, and the costs of obtaining and presenting evidence. Permitted expenses do not include living or medical expenses other than those listed above.

[10] Lawyers may not subsidize lawsuits or administrative proceedings brought on behalf of their clients, including making or guaranteeing loans to their clients for living expenses, because to do so would encourage clients to pursue lawsuits that might not otherwise be brought and because such assistance gives lawyers too great a financial stake in the litigation. These dangers do not warrant a prohibition against a lawyer lending a client money for court costs and litigation expenses, including the expenses of medical examination and testing and the costs of obtaining and presenting evidence, because these advances are virtually indistinguishable from contingent fee agreements and help ensure access to the courts. Similarly, an exception is warranted permitting lawyers representing indigent or pro bono clients to pay court costs and litigation expenses whether or not these funds will be repaid.

Person Paying for a Lawyer's Services

[11] Lawyers are frequently asked to represent clients under circumstances in which a third person will compensate them, in whole or in part. The third person might be a relative or friend, an indemnitor (such as a liability insurance company) or a co-client (such as a corporation sued along with one or more of its employees). Third-party payers frequently have interests that may differ from those of the client. A lawyer is therefore prohibited from accepting or continuing such a representation unless the lawyer determines that there will be no interference with the lawyer's professional judgment and there is informed consent from the client. *See also* Rule 5.4(c), prohibiting interference with a lawyer's professional judgment by one who recommends, employs or pays the lawyer to render legal services for another.

[12] Sometimes it will be sufficient for the lawyer to obtain the client's informed consent regarding the fact of the payment and the identity of the third-party payer. If, however, the fee arrangement creates a conflict of interest for the lawyer, then the lawyer must comply with Rule 1.7. The lawyer must also conform to the requirements of Rule 1.6 concerning confidentiality. Under Rule 1.7(a), a conflict of interest may exist if the lawyer will be involved in representing differing interests or if there is a significant risk that the lawyer's professional judgment on behalf of the client will be adversely affected by the lawyer's own interest in the fee arrangement or by the lawyer's responsibilities to the third-party payer (for example, when the third-party payer is a co-client). Under Rule 1.7(b), the lawyer may accept or continue the representation with the informed consent of each affected client, unless the conflict is nonconsentable under that paragraph. Under Rule 1.7(b), the informed consent must be confirmed in writing. *See* Rules 1.0(e) (definition of "confirmed in writing"), 1.0(j) (definition of "informed consent"), and 1.0(x) (definition of "writing" or "written").

Aggregate Settlements

[13] Differences in willingness to make or accept an offer of settlement are among the risks of common representation of multiple clients by a single lawyer. Under Rule 1.7, this is one of the risks that should be discussed before undertaking the representation, as part of the process of obtaining the clients' informed consents. In addition, Rule 1.2(a) protects each

client's right to have the final say in deciding whether to accept or reject an offer of settlement. Paragraph (g) is a corollary of both these Rules and provides that, before any settlement offer is made or accepted on behalf of multiple clients, the lawyer must inform each of them about all the material terms of the settlement, including what the other clients will receive or pay if the settlement is accepted. *See also* Rule 1.0(j) (definition of "informed consent"). Lawyers representing a class of plaintiffs or defendants, or those proceeding derivatively, may not have a full client-lawyer relationship with each member of the class; nevertheless, such lawyers must comply with applicable rules regulating notification of class members and other procedural requirements designed to ensure adequate protection of the entire class.

Limiting Liability and Settling Malpractice Claims

[14] Agreements prospectively limiting a lawyer's liability for malpractice are prohibited because they are likely to undermine competent and diligent representation. Also, many clients are unable to evaluate the desirability of making such an agreement before a dispute has arisen, particularly if they are currently represented by the lawyer seeking the agreement. This paragraph does not, however, prohibit a lawyer from entering into an agreement with the client to arbitrate legal malpractice claims, provided such agreements are enforceable and the client is fully informed of the scope and effect of the agreement. Nor does this paragraph limit the ability of lawyers to practice in the form of a limited-liability entity, where permitted by law, provided that each lawyer remains personally liable to the client for the lawyer's own conduct and the firm complies with any conditions required by law, such as provisions requiring client notification or maintenance of adequate liability insurance. Nor does it prohibit an agreement in accordance with Rule 1.2 that defines the scope of the representation, although a definition of scope that makes the obligations of representation illusory will amount to an attempt to limit liability.

[15] Agreements settling a claim or a potential claim for malpractice are not prohibited by this Rule. Nevertheless, in view of the danger that a lawyer will take unfair advantage of an unrepresented client or former client, the lawyer must first advise such a person in writing of the appropriateness of independent representation in connection with such a settlement. In addition, the lawyer must give the client or former client a reasonable opportunity to find and consult independent counsel.

Acquiring Proprietary Interest in Litigation

[16] Paragraph (i) states the traditional general rule that lawyers are prohibited from acquiring a proprietary interest in litigation. Like paragraph (e), the general rule has its basis in common law champerty and maintenance and is designed to avoid giving the lawyer too great an interest in the representation. In addition, when the lawyer acquires an ownership interest in the subject of the representation, it will be more difficult for a client to discharge the lawyer if the client so desires. The rule is subject to specific exceptions developed in decisional law and continued in these Rules. The exception for certain advances of the costs of litigation is set forth in paragraph (e). In addition, paragraph (i) sets forth exceptions for liens authorized by law to secure the lawyer's fees or expenses and contracts for reasonable contingent fees. These may include liens granted by statute, liens originating in common law and liens acquired by contract with the client. When a lawyer acquires by contract a security interest in property other than that

recovered through the lawyer's efforts in the litigation, such an acquisition is a business or financial transaction with a client and is governed by the requirements of paragraph (a). Contracts for contingent fees in civil matters are governed by Rule 1.5.

Client-Lawyer Sexual Relationships

[17] The relationship between lawyer and client is a fiduciary one in which the lawyer occupies the highest position of trust and confidence. The relationship is often unequal; thus, a sexual relationship between lawyer and client can involve unfair exploitation of the lawyer's fiduciary role, in violation of the lawyer's basic ethical obligation not to use the trust of the client to the client's disadvantage. In addition, such a relationship presents a significant danger that if the sexual relationship leads to the lawyer's emotional involvement, the lawyer will be unable to represent the client without impairing the lawyer's exercise of professional judgment. Moreover, a blurred line between the professional and personal relationships may make it difficult to predict the extent to which client confidences will be protected by the attorney-client evidentiary privilege. A client's sexual involvement with the client's lawyer, especially if the sexual relations create emotional involvement, will often render it unlikely that the client could rationally determine whether to consent to the conflict created by the sexual relations. If a client were to consent to the conflict created by the sexual relations without fully appreciating the nature and implications of that conflict, there is a significant risk of harm to client interests. Therefore, sexual relations between lawyers and their clients are dangerous and inadvisable. Out of respect for the desires of consenting adults, however, paragraph (j) does not flatly prohibit client-lawyer sexual relations in matters other than domestic relations matters. Even when sexual relations between a lawyer and client are permitted under paragraph (j), however, they may lead to incompetent representation in violation of Rule 1.1. Because domestic relations clients are often emotionally vulnerable, domestic relations matters entail a heightened risk of exploitation of the client. Accordingly, lawyers are flatly prohibited from entering into sexual relations with domestic relations clients during the course of the representation even if the sexual relationship is consensual and even if prejudice to the client is not immediately apparent. For a definition of "sexual relations" for the purposes of this Rule, see Rule 1.0(u).

[17A] The prohibitions in paragraph (j)(1) apply to all lawyers in a firm who know of the representation, whether or not they are personally representing the client. The Rule prohibits any lawyer in the firm from exploiting the client-lawyer relationship by directly or indirectly requiring or demanding sexual relations as a condition of representation by the lawyer or the lawyer's firm. Paragraph (j)(1)(i) thus seeks to prevent a situation where a client may fear that a willingness or unwillingness to have sexual relations with a lawyer in the firm may have an impact on the representation, or even on the firm's willingness to represent or continue representing the client. The Rule also prohibits the use of coercion, undue influence or intimidation to obtain sexual relations with a person known to that lawyer to be a client or a prospective client of the firm. Paragraph (j)(1)(ii) thus seeks to prevent a lawyer from exploiting the professional relationship between the client and the lawyer's firm. Even if a lawyer does not know that the firm represents a person, the lawyer's use of coercion or intimidation to obtain sexual relations with that person might well violate other Rules or substantive law. Where the representation of the client involves a domestic relations matter, the restrictions stated in paragraphs (j)(1)(i) and (j)(1)(ii), and not the per se prohibition imposed by paragraph (j)(1)(iii), apply to lawyers in a firm who know of the representation but who are not personally

representing the client. Nevertheless, because domestic relations matters may be volatile and may entail a heightened risk of exploitation of the client, the risk that a sexual relationship with a client of the firm may result in a violation of other Rules is likewise heightened, even if the sexual relations are not per se prohibited by paragraph (j).

[17B] A law firm's failure to educate lawyers about the restrictions on sexual relations – or a firm's failure to enforce those restrictions against lawyers who violate them – may constitute a violation of Rule 5.1, which obligates a law firm to make reasonable efforts to ensure that all lawyers in the firm conform to these Rules.

[18] Sexual relationships between spouses or those that predate the client-lawyer relationship are not prohibited. Issues relating to the exploitation of the fiduciary relationship and client dependency are diminished when the sexual relationship existed prior to the commencement of the client-lawyer relationship. However, before proceeding with the representation in these circumstances, the lawyer should consider whether the lawyer's ability to represent the client will be materially limited by the sexual relationship and therefore constitute an impermissible conflict of interest. See Rule 1.7(a)(2).

[19] When the client is an organization, paragraph (j) applies to sexual relations between a lawyer for the organization (whether inside counsel or outside counsel) and a constituent of the organization who supervises, directs or regularly consults with that lawyer or a lawyer in that lawyer's firm concerning the organization's legal matters.

Imputation of Prohibitions

[20] Where a lawyer who is not personally representing a client has sexual relations with a client of the firm in violation of paragraph (j), the other lawyers in the firm are not subject to discipline solely because those improper sexual relations occurred. There may be circumstances, however, where a violation of paragraph (j) by one lawyer in a firm gives rise to violations of other Rules by the other lawyers in the firm through imputation. For example, sexual relations between a lawyer and a client may give rise to a violation of Rule 1.7(a), and such a conflict under Rule 1.7 may be imputed to all other lawyers in the firm under Rule 1.10(a).

RULE 5.4:
PROFESSIONAL INDEPENDENCE OF A LAWYER

(a) A lawyer or law firm shall not share legal fees with a nonlawyer, except that:

(1) an agreement by a lawyer with the lawyer's firm or another lawyer associated in the firm may provide for the payment of money, over a reasonable period of time after the lawyer's death, to the lawyer's estate or to one or more specified persons;

(2) a lawyer who undertakes to complete unfinished legal business of a deceased lawyer may pay to the estate of the deceased lawyer that portion of the total compensation that fairly represents the services rendered by the deceased lawyer; and

(3) a lawyer or law firm may compensate a nonlawyer employee or include a nonlawyer employee in a retirement plan based in whole or in part on a profit-sharing arrangement.

(b) A lawyer shall not form a partnership with a nonlawyer if any of the activities of the partnership consist of the practice of law.

(c) Unless authorized by law, a lawyer shall not permit a person who recommends, employs or pays the lawyer to render legal service for another to direct or regulate the lawyer's professional judgment in rendering such legal services or to cause the lawyer to compromise the lawyer's duty to maintain the confidential information of the client under Rule 1.6.

(d) A lawyer shall not practice with or in the form of an entity authorized to practice law for profit, if:

(1) a nonlawyer owns any interest therein, except that a fiduciary representative of the estate of a lawyer may hold the stock or interest of the lawyer for a reasonable time during administration;

(2) a nonlawyer is a member, corporate director or officer thereof or occupies a position of similar responsibility in any form of association other than a corporation; or

(3) a nonlawyer has the right to direct or control the professional judgment of a lawyer.

Comment

[1] The provisions of this Rule express traditional limitations on sharing fees. These limitations are to protect the lawyer's professional independence of judgment. Where someone other than the client pays the lawyer's fee or salary, or recommends employment of the lawyer,

that arrangement does not modify the lawyer's obligation to the client. As stated in paragraph (c), such arrangements should not interfere with the lawyer's professional judgment.

[1A] Paragraph (a)(2) governs the compensation of a lawyer who undertakes to complete one or more unfinished pieces of legal business of a deceased lawyer. Rule 1.17 governs the sale of an entire law practice upon retirement, which is defined as the cessation of the private practice of law in a given geographic area.

[1B] Paragraph (a)(3) permits limited fee sharing with a nonlawyer employee, where the employee's compensation or retirement plan is based in whole or in part on a profit-sharing arrangement. Such sharing of profits with a nonlawyer employee must be based on the total profitability of the law firm or a department within a law firm and may not be based on the fee resulting from a single case.

[2] This Rule also expresses traditional limitations on permitting a third party to direct or regulate the lawyer's professional judgment in rendering legal services to another. *See also* Rule 1.8(f), providing that a lawyer may accept compensation from a third party as long as there is no interference with the lawyer's professional judgment and the client gives informed consent.

RULE 5.5:
UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW

(a) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction.

(b) A lawyer shall not aid a nonlawyer in the unauthorized practice of law.

Comment

[1] A lawyer may practice law only in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice. A lawyer may be admitted to practice law in a jurisdiction on a regular basis or may be authorized by court rule or order or by law to practice for a limited purpose or on a restricted basis. Paragraph (a) applies to unauthorized practice of law in another jurisdiction by a lawyer through the lawyer's direct action, and paragraph (b) prohibits a lawyer from aiding a nonlawyer in the unauthorized practice of law.

[2] The definition of the "practice of law" is established by law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to members of the bar protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified persons. This Rule does not prohibit a lawyer from employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. *See* Rule 5.3.

RULE 5.7:
RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING NONLEGAL SERVICES

(a) With respect to lawyers or law firms providing nonlegal services to clients or other persons:

(1) A lawyer or law firm that provides nonlegal services to a person that are not distinct from legal services being provided to that person by the lawyer or law firm is subject to these Rules with respect to the provision of both legal and nonlegal services.

(2) A lawyer or law firm that provides nonlegal services to a person that are distinct from legal services being provided to that person by the lawyer or law firm is subject to these Rules with respect to the nonlegal services if the person receiving the services could reasonably believe that the nonlegal services are the subject of a client-lawyer relationship.

(3) A lawyer or law firm that is an owner, controlling party or agent of, or that is otherwise affiliated with, an entity that the lawyer or law firm knows to be providing nonlegal services to a person is subject to these Rules with respect to the nonlegal services if the person receiving the services could reasonably believe that the nonlegal services are the subject of a client-lawyer relationship.

(4) For purposes of paragraphs (a)(2) and (a)(3), it will be presumed that the person receiving nonlegal services believes the services to be the subject of a client-lawyer relationship unless the lawyer or law firm has advised the person receiving the services in writing that the services are not legal services and that the protection of a client-lawyer relationship does not exist with respect to the nonlegal services, or if the interest of the lawyer or law firm in the entity providing nonlegal services is *de minimis*.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (a), a lawyer or law firm that is an owner, controlling party, agent, or is otherwise affiliated with an entity that the lawyer or law firm knows is providing nonlegal services to a person shall not permit any nonlawyer providing such services or affiliated with that entity to direct or regulate the professional judgment of the lawyer or law firm in rendering legal services to any person, or to cause the lawyer or law firm to compromise its duty under Rule 1.6(a) and Rule 1.6(c) with respect to the confidential information of a client receiving legal services.

(c) For purposes of this Rule, "nonlegal services" shall mean those services that lawyers may lawfully provide and that are not prohibited as an unauthorized practice of law when provided by a nonlawyer.

Comment

[1] For many years, lawyers have provided nonlegal services to their clients. By participating in the delivery of these services, lawyers can serve a broad range of economic and

other interests of clients. Whenever a lawyer directly provides nonlegal services, the lawyer must avoid confusion on the part of the client as to the nature of the lawyer's role, so that the person for whom the nonlegal services are performed understands that the services may not carry with them the legal and ethical protections that ordinarily accompany a client-lawyer relationship. The recipient of the nonlegal services may expect, for example, that the protection of client confidences and secrets, prohibitions against representation of persons with conflicting interests, and obligations of a lawyer to maintain professional independence apply to the provision of nonlegal services when that may not be the case. The risk of confusion is especially acute when the lawyer renders both legal and nonlegal services with respect to the same matter. Under some circumstances, the legal and nonlegal services may be so closely entwined that they cannot be distinguished from each other. In this situation, the recipient is likely to be confused as to whether and when the relationship is protected as a client-lawyer relationship. Therefore, where the legal and nonlegal services are not distinct, paragraph (a)(1) requires that the lawyer providing nonlegal services adhere to all of the requirements of these Rules with respect to the nonlegal services. Paragraph (a)(1) applies to the provision of nonlegal services by a law firm if the person for whom the nonlegal services are being performed is also receiving legal services from the firm that are not distinct from the nonlegal services.

[2] Even when the lawyer believes that the provision of nonlegal services is distinct from any legal services being provided, there is still a risk that the recipient of the nonlegal services might reasonably believe that the recipient is receiving the protection of a client-lawyer relationship. Therefore, paragraph (a)(2) requires that the lawyer providing the nonlegal services adhere to these Rules, unless the person understands that the nonlegal services are not the subject of a client-lawyer relationship. Nonlegal services also may be provided through an entity with which a lawyer is affiliated, for example, as owner, controlling party or agent. In this situation, there is still a risk that the recipient of the nonlegal services might reasonably believe that the recipient is receiving the protection of a client-lawyer relationship. Therefore, paragraph (a)(3) requires that the lawyer involved with the entity providing nonlegal services adhere to all of these Rules with respect to the nonlegal services, unless the person understands that the nonlegal services are not the subject of a client-lawyer relationship.

[3] These Rules will be presumed to apply to a lawyer who directly provides or is otherwise involved in the provision of nonlegal services unless the lawyer complies with paragraph (a)(4) by communicating in writing to the person receiving the nonlegal services that the services are not legal services and that the protection of a client-lawyer relationship does not exist with respect to the nonlegal services. Such a communication should be made before entering into an agreement for the provision of nonlegal services in a manner sufficient to ensure that the person understands the significance of the communication. In certain circumstances, however, additional steps may be required to ensure that the person understands the distinction. For example, while the written disclaimer set forth in paragraph (a)(4) will be adequate for a sophisticated user of legal and nonlegal services, a more detailed explanation may be required for someone unaccustomed to making distinctions between legal services and nonlegal services. Where appropriate and especially where legal services are provided in the same transaction as nonlegal services, the lawyer should counsel the client about the possible effect of the proposed provision of services on the availability of the attorney-client privilege. The lawyer or law firm will not be required to comply with these requirements if its interest in the entity providing the nonlegal services is so small as to be de minimis.

RULE 7.1:
ADVERTISING

(a) A lawyer or law firm shall not use or disseminate or participate in the use or dissemination of any advertisement that:

(1) contains statements or claims that are false, deceptive or misleading; or

(2) violates a Rule.

(b) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (a), an advertisement may include information as to:

(1) legal and nonlegal education; degrees and other scholastic distinctions; dates of admission to any bar; areas of the law in which the lawyer or law firm practices, as authorized by these Rules; public offices and teaching positions held; publications of law-related matters authored by the lawyer; memberships in bar associations or other professional societies or organizations, including offices and committee assignments therein; foreign language fluency; and bona fide professional ratings;

(2) names of clients regularly represented, provided that the client has given prior written consent;

(3) bank references; credit arrangements accepted; prepaid or group legal services programs in which the lawyer or law firm participates; nonlegal services provided by the lawyer or law firm or by an entity owned and controlled by the lawyer or law firm; the existence of contractual relationships between the lawyer or law firm and a nonlegal professional or nonlegal professional service firm, to the extent permitted by Rule 5.8, and the nature and extent of services available through those contractual relationships; and

(4) legal fees for initial consultation; contingent fee rates in civil matters, when accompanied by a statement disclosing the information required by paragraph (p); range of fees for legal and nonlegal services, provided that there be available to the public free of charge a written statement clearly describing the scope of each advertised service, hourly rates, and fixed fees for specified legal and nonlegal services.

(c) An advertisement shall not:

(1) include a paid endorsement of, or testimonial about, a lawyer or law firm without disclosing that the person is being compensated therefor;

(2) include the portrayal of a fictitious law firm, the use of a fictitious name to refer to lawyers not associated together in a law firm, or otherwise imply that lawyers are associated in a law firm if that is not the case;

(3) use actors to portray a judge, the lawyer, members of the law firm, or clients, or utilize depictions of fictionalized events or scenes, without disclosure of same;

(4) be made to resemble legal documents.

(d) An advertisement that complies with paragraph (e) may contain the following:

(1) statements that are reasonably likely to create an expectation about results the lawyer can achieve;

(2) statements that compare the lawyer's services with the services of other lawyers;

(3) testimonials or endorsements of clients, and of former clients; or

(4) statements describing or characterizing the quality of the lawyer's or law firm's services.

(e) It is permissible to provide the information set forth in paragraph (d) provided:

(1) its dissemination does not violate paragraph (a);

(2) it can be factually supported by the lawyer or law firm as of the date on which the advertisement is published or disseminated; and

(3) it is accompanied by the following disclaimer: "Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome"; and

(4) in the case of a testimonial or endorsement from a client with respect to a matter still pending, the client gives informed consent confirmed in writing.

(f) Every advertisement other than those appearing in a radio, television or billboard advertisement, in a directory, newspaper, magazine or other periodical (and any web sites related thereto), or made in person pursuant to Rule 7.3(a)(1), shall be labeled "Attorney Advertising" on the first page, or on the home page in the case of a web site. If the communication is in the form of a self-mailing brochure or postcard, the words "Attorney Advertising" shall appear therein. In the case of electronic mail, the subject line shall contain the notation "ATTORNEY ADVERTISING."

(g) A lawyer or law firm shall not utilize meta-tags or other hidden computer codes that, if displayed, would violate these Rules.

(h) All advertisements shall include the name, principal law office address and telephone number of the lawyer or law firm whose services are being offered.

(i) Any words or statements required by this Rule to appear in an advertisement must be clearly legible and capable of being read by the average person, if written, and intelligible if spoken aloud. In the case of a web site, the required words or statements shall appear on the home page.

(j) A lawyer or law firm advertising any fixed fee for specified legal services shall, at the time of fee publication, have available to the public a written statement clearly describing the scope of each advertised service, which statement shall be available to the client at the time of retainer for any such service. Such legal services shall include all those services that are recognized as reasonable and necessary under local custom in the area of practice in the community where the services are performed.

(k) All advertisements shall be pre-approved by the lawyer or law firm, and a copy shall be retained for a period of not less than three years following its initial dissemination. Any advertisement contained in a computer-accessed communication shall be retained for a period of not less than one year. A copy of the contents of any web site covered by this Rule shall be preserved upon the initial publication of the web site, any major web site redesign, or a meaningful and extensive content change, but in no event less frequently than once every 90 days.

(l) If a lawyer or law firm advertises a range of fees or an hourly rate for services, the lawyer or law firm shall not charge more than the fee advertised for such services. If a lawyer or law firm advertises a fixed fee for specified legal services, or performs services described in a fee schedule, the lawyer or law firm shall not charge more than the fixed fee for such stated legal service as set forth in the advertisement or fee schedule, unless the client agrees in writing that the services performed or to be performed were not legal services referred to or implied in the advertisement or in the fee schedule and, further, that a different fee arrangement shall apply to the transaction.

(m) Unless otherwise specified in the advertisement, if a lawyer publishes any fee information authorized under this Rule in a publication that is published more frequently than once per month, the lawyer shall be bound by any representation made therein for a period of not less than 30 days after such publication. If a lawyer publishes any fee information authorized under this Rule in a publication that is published once per month or less frequently, the lawyer shall be bound by any representation made therein until the publication of the succeeding issue. If a lawyer publishes any fee information authorized under this Rule in a publication that has no fixed date for publication of a succeeding issue, the lawyer shall be bound by any representation made therein for a reasonable period of time after publication, but in no event less than 90 days.

(n) Unless otherwise specified, if a lawyer broadcasts any fee information authorized under this Rule, the lawyer shall be bound by any representation made therein for a period of not less than 30 days after such broadcast.

(o) A lawyer shall not compensate or give anything of value to representatives of the press, radio, television or other communication medium in anticipation of or in return for professional publicity in a news item.

(p) All advertisements that contain information about the fees charged by the lawyer or law firm, including those indicating that in the absence of a recovery no fee will be charged, shall comply with the provisions of Judiciary Law § 488(3).

(q) A lawyer may accept employment that results from participation in activities designed to educate the public to recognize legal problems, to make intelligent selection of counsel or to utilize available legal services.

(r) Without affecting the right to accept employment, a lawyer may speak publicly or write for publication on legal topics so long as the lawyer does not undertake to give individual advice.

Comment

Advertising

[1] The need of members of the public for legal services is met only if they recognize their legal problems, appreciate the importance of seeking assistance, and are able to obtain the services of competent legal counsel. Hence, important functions of the legal profession are to educate people to recognize their problems, to facilitate the process of intelligent selection of lawyers, and to assist in making legal services fully available.

[2] The public's need to know about legal services can be fulfilled in part through advertising. People of limited means who have not made extensive use of legal services in many instances rely on advertising to find appropriate counsel. While a lawyer's reputation may attract some clients, lawyers may also make the public aware of their services by advertising to obtain work.

[3] Advertising by lawyers serves two principal purposes: first, it educates potential clients regarding their need for legal advice and assists them in obtaining a lawyer appropriate for those needs. Second, it enables lawyers to attract clients. To carry out these two purposes and because of the critical importance of legal services, it is of the utmost importance that lawyer advertising not be false, deceptive or misleading. Truthful statements that are misleading are prohibited by this Rule. A truthful statement is misleading if it omits a fact necessary to make the lawyer's communication, considered as a whole, not materially misleading. A truthful statement is also misleading if there is a substantial likelihood that it will lead a reasonable person to formulate a specific conclusion about the lawyer or the lawyer's services, or about the results a lawyer can achieve, for which there is no reasonable factual foundation. For example, a lawyer might truthfully state, "I have never lost a case," but that statement would be misleading if the lawyer settled virtually all cases that the lawyer handled. A communication to anyone that states or implies that the lawyer has the ability to influence improperly a court, court officer, governmental agency or government official is improper under Rule 8.4(e).

[4] To be effective, advertising must attract the attention of viewers, readers or recipients and convey its content in ways that will be understandable and helpful to them. Lawyers may therefore use advertising techniques intended to attract attention, such as music, sound effects, graphics and the like, so long as those techniques do not render the advertisement false, deceptive or misleading. Lawyer advertising may use actors or fictionalized events or

scenes for this purpose, provided appropriate disclosure of their use is made. Some images or techniques, however, are highly likely to be misleading. So, for instance, legal advertising should not be made to resemble legal documents.

[5] The "Attorney Advertising" label serves to dispel any confusion or concern that might be created when nonlawyers receive letters or emails from lawyers. The label is not necessary for advertising in newspapers or on television, or similar communications that are self-evidently advertisements, such as billboards or press releases transmitted to news outlets, and as to which there is no risk of such confusion or concern. The ultimate purpose of the label is to inform readers where they might otherwise be confused.

[6] Not all communications made by lawyers about the lawyer or the law firm's services are advertising. Advertising by lawyers consists of communications made in any form about the lawyer or the law firm's services, the primary purpose of which is retention of the lawyer or law firm for pecuniary gain as a result of the communication. However, non-commercial communications motivated by a not-for-profit organization's interest in political expression and association are generally not considered advertising. Of course, all communications by lawyers, whether subject to the special rules governing lawyer advertising or not, are governed by the general rule that lawyers may not engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation, or knowingly make a material false statement of fact or law. By definition, communications to existing clients are excluded from the Rules governing advertising. A client who is a current client in any matter is an existing client for all purposes of these Rules. (Whether a client is a current client for purposes of conflicts of interest and other issues may depend on other considerations. Generally, the term "current client" for purposes of the advertising exemption should be interpreted more broadly than it is for determining whether a client is a "current client" for purposes of a conflict of interest analysis.)

[7] Communications to former clients that are germane to the earlier representation are not considered to be advertising. Likewise, communications to other lawyers, including those made in bar association publications and other publications targeted primarily at lawyers, are excluded from the special rules governing lawyer advertising even if their purpose is the retention of the lawyer or law firm. Topical newsletters, client alerts, or blogs intended to educate recipients about new developments in the law are generally not considered advertising. However, a newsletter, client alert, or blog that provides information or news primarily about the lawyer or law firm (for example, the lawyer or law firm's cases, personnel, clients or achievements) generally would be considered advertising. Communications, such as proposed retainer agreements or ordinary correspondence with a prospective client who has expressed interest in, and requested information about, a lawyer's services, are not advertising. Accordingly, the special restrictions on advertising and solicitation would not apply to a lawyer's response to a prospective client who has asked the lawyer to outline the lawyer's qualifications to undertake a proposed retention or the terms of a potential retention.

[8] The circulation or distribution to prospective clients by a lawyer of an article or report published about the lawyer by a third party is advertising if the lawyer's primary purpose is to obtain retentions. In circulating or distributing such materials the lawyer should include information or disclaimers as necessary to dispel any misconceptions to which the article may give rise. For example, if a lawyer circulates an article discussing the lawyer's successes that is

reasonably likely to create an expectation about the results the lawyer will achieve in future cases, a disclaimer is required by paragraph (e)(3). If the article contains misinformation about the lawyer's qualifications, any circulation of the article by the lawyer should make any necessary corrections or qualifications. This may be necessary even when the article included misinformation through no fault of the lawyer or because the article is out of date, so that material information that was true at the time is no longer true. Some communications by a law firm that may constitute marketing or branding are not necessarily advertisements. For example, pencils, legal pads, greeting cards, coffee mugs, T-shirts or the like with the law firm name, logo, and contact information printed on them do not constitute "advertisements" within the definition of this Rule if their primary purpose is general awareness and branding, rather than the retention of the law firm for a particular matter.

Recognition of Legal Problems

[9] The legal professional should help the public to recognize legal problems because such problems may not be self-revealing and might not be timely noticed. Therefore, lawyers should encourage and participate in educational and public-relations programs concerning the legal system, with particular reference to legal problems that frequently arise. A lawyer's participation in an educational program is ordinarily not considered to be advertising because its primary purpose is to educate and inform rather than to attract clients. Such a program might be considered to be advertising if, in addition to its educational component, participants or recipients are expressly encouraged to hire the lawyer or law firm. A lawyer who writes or speaks for the purpose of educating members of the public to recognize their legal problems should carefully refrain from giving or appearing to give a general solution applicable to all apparently similar individual problems, because slight changes in fact situations may require a material variance in the applicable advice; otherwise, the public may be misled and misadvised. Talks and writings by lawyers for nonlawyers should caution them not to attempt to solve individual problems on the basis of the information contained therein.

[10] As members of their communities, lawyers may choose to sponsor or contribute to cultural, sporting, charitable or other events organized by not-for-profit organizations. If information about the lawyer or law firm disseminated in connection with such an event is limited to the identification of the lawyer or law firm, the lawyer's or law firm's contact information, a brief description of areas of practice, and the fact of sponsorship or contribution, the communication is not considered advertising.

Statements Creating Expectations, Characterizations of Quality, and Comparisons

[11] Lawyer advertising may include statements that are reasonably likely to create an expectation about results the lawyer can achieve, statements that compare the lawyer's services with the services of other lawyers, or statements describing or characterizing the quality of the lawyer's or law firm's services, only if they can be factually supported by the lawyer or law firm as of the date on which the advertisement is published or disseminated and are accompanied by the following disclaimer: "Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome." Accordingly, if true and accompanied by the disclaimer, a lawyer or law firm could advertise "Our firm won 10 jury verdicts over $1,000,000 in the last five years," "We have more Patent Lawyers than any other firm in X County," or "I have been practicing in the area of divorce law for more than 10

years." Even true factual statements may be misleading if presented out of the context of additional information needed to properly understand and evaluate the statements. For example, a truthful statement by a lawyer that the lawyer's average jury verdict for a given year was $100,000 may be misleading if that average was based on a large number of very small verdicts and one $10,000,000 verdict. Likewise, advertising that truthfully recites judgment amounts would be misleading if the lawyer failed to disclose that the judgments described were overturned on appeal or were obtained by default.

[12] Descriptions of characteristics of the lawyer or law firm that are not comparative and do not involve results obtained are permissible even though they cannot be factually supported. Such statements are understood to be general descriptions and not claims about quality, and would not be likely to mislead potential clients. Accordingly, a law firm could advertise that it is "Hard-Working," "Dedicated," or "Compassionate" without the necessity to provide factual support for such subjective claims. On the other hand, descriptions of characteristics of the law firm that compare its services with those of other law firms and that are not susceptible of being factually supported could be misleading to potential clients. Accordingly, a lawyer may not advertise that the lawyer is the "Best," "Most Experienced," or "Hardest Working." Similarly, some claims that involve results obtained are not susceptible of being factually supported and could be misleading to potential clients. Accordingly, a law firm may not advertise that it will obtain "Big $$$," "Most Money," or "We Win Big."

Bona Fide Professional Ratings

[13] An advertisement may include information regarding bona fide professional ratings by referring to the rating service and how it has rated the lawyer, provided that the advertisement contains the "past results" disclaimer as required under paragraphs (d) and (e). However, a rating is not "bona fide" unless it is unbiased and nondiscriminatory. Thus, it must evaluate lawyers based on objective criteria or legitimate peer review in a manner unbiased by the rating service's economic interests (such as payment to the rating service by the rated lawyer) and not subject to improper influence by lawyers who are being evaluated. Further, the rating service must fairly consider all lawyers within the pool of those who are purported to be covered. For example, a rating service that purports to evaluate all lawyers practicing in a particular geographic area or in a particular area of practice or of a particular age must apply its criteria to all lawyers within that geographic area, practice area, or age group.

Meta-Tags

[14] Meta-tags are hidden computer software codes that direct certain Internet search engines to the web site of a lawyer or law firm. For example, if a lawyer places the meta-tag "NY personal injury specialist" on the lawyer's web site, then a person who enters the search term "personal injury specialist" into a search engine will be directed to that lawyer's web page. That particular meta-tag is prohibited because Rule 7.4(a) generally prohibits the use of the word "specialist." However, a lawyer may use an advertisement employing meta-tags or other hidden computer codes that, if displayed, would not violate a Rule.

Advertisements Referring to Fees and Advances

[15] All advertisements that contain information about the fees or expenses charged by the lawyer or law firm, including advertisements indicating that in the absence of a recovery no fee will be charged, must comply with the provisions of section 488(3) of the Judiciary Law. However, a lawyer or law firm that offers any of the fee and expense arrangements permitted by section 488(3) must not, either directly or in any advertisement, state or imply that the lawyer's or law firm's ability to advance or pay costs and expenses of litigation is unique or extraordinary when that is not the case. For example, if an advertisement promises that the lawyer or law firm will advance the costs and expenses of litigation contingent on the outcome of the matter, or promises that the lawyer or law firm will pay the costs and expenses of litigation for indigent clients, then the advertisement must not say that such arrangements are "unique in the area," "unlike other firms," available "only at our firm," "extraordinary," or words to that effect, unless that is actually the case. However, if the lawyer or law firm can objectively demonstrate that this arrangement is unique or extraordinary, then the lawyer or law firm may make such a claim in the advertisement.

Retention of Copies; Filing of Copies; Designation of Principal Office

[16] Where these Rules require that a lawyer retain a copy of an advertisement or file a copy of a solicitation or other information, that obligation may be satisfied by any of the following: original records, photocopies, microfilm, optical imaging, and any other medium that preserves an image of the document that cannot be altered without detection.

[17] A law firm that has no office it considers its principal office may comply with paragraph (h) by listing one or more offices where a substantial amount of the law firm's work is performed.

[4] Although a lawyer may be exempt from the application of these Rules with respect to nonlegal services on the face of paragraph (a), the scope of the exemption is not absolute. A lawyer who provides or who is involved in the provision of nonlegal services may be excused from compliance with only those Rules that are dependent upon the existence of a representation or client-lawyer relationship. Other Rules, such as those prohibiting lawyers from misusing the confidences or secrets of a former client (see Rule 1.9), requiring lawyers to report certain lawyer misconduct (see Rule 8.3), and prohibiting lawyers from engaging in illegal, dishonest, fraudulent or deceptive conduct (see Rule 8.4), apply to a lawyer irrespective of the existence of a representation, and thus govern a lawyer not covered by paragraph (a). A lawyer or law firm rendering legal services is always subject to these Rules.

Provision of Legal and Nonlegal Services in the Same Transaction

[5] In some situations it may be beneficial to a client to purchase both legal and nonlegal services from a lawyer, law firm or affiliated entity in the same matter or in two or more substantially related matters. Examples include: (i) a law firm that represents corporations and also provides public lobbying, public relations, investment banking and business relocation services, (ii) a law firm that represents clients in environmental matters and also provides engineering consulting services to those clients, and (iii) a law firm that represents clients in litigation and also provides consulting services relating to electronic document discovery. In these situations, the lawyer may have a financial interest in the nonlegal services that would constitute a conflict of interest under Rule 1.7(a)(2), which governs conflicts between a client and a lawyer's personal interests.

[5A] Under Rule 1.7(a)(2), a concurrent conflict of interest exists when a reasonable lawyer would conclude that there is a significant risk that the lawyer's professional judgment on behalf of a client will be adversely affected by the lawyer's own financial, business, property or personal interests. When a lawyer or law firm provides both legal and nonlegal services in the same matter (or in substantially related matters), a conflict with the lawyer's own interests will nearly always arise. For example, if the legal representation involves exercising judgment about whether to recommend nonlegal services and which provider to recommend, or if it involves overseeing the provision of the nonlegal services, then a conflict with the lawyer's own interests under Rule 1.7(a)(2) is likely to arise. However, when seeking the consent of a client to such a conflict, the lawyer should comply with both Rule 1.7(b) regarding the conflict affecting the legal representation of the client and Rule 1.8(a) regarding the business transaction with the client.

[5B] Thus, the client may consent if: (i) the lawyer complies with Rule 1.8(a) with respect to the transaction in which the lawyer agrees to provide the nonlegal services, including obtaining the client's informed consent in a writing signed by the client, (ii) the lawyer reasonably believes that the lawyer can provide competent and diligent legal representation despite the conflict within the meaning of Rule 1.7(b), and (iii) the client gives informed consent pursuant to Rule 1.7(b), confirmed in writing. In certain cases, it will not be possible to provide both legal and nonlegal services because the lawyer could not reasonably believe that he or she can represent the client competently and diligently while providing both legal and nonlegal services in the same or substantially related matters. Whether providing dual services gives rise to an impermissible conflict must be determined on a case-by-case basis, taking into account all

of the facts and circumstances, including factors such as: (i) the experience and sophistication of the client in obtaining legal and nonlegal services of the kind being provided in the matter, (ii) the relative size of the anticipated fees for the legal and nonlegal services, (iii) the closeness of the relationship between the legal and nonlegal services, and (iv) the degree of discretion the lawyer has in providing the legal and nonlegal services.

[6] In the context of providing legal and nonlegal services in the same transaction, Rule 1.8(a) first requires that: (i) the nonlegal services be provided on terms that are fair and reasonable to the client, (ii) full disclosure of the terms on which the nonlegal services will be provided be made in writing to the client in a manner understandable by the client, (iii) the client is advised to seek the advice of independent counsel about the provision of the nonlegal services by the lawyer, and (iv) the client gives informed consent, as set forth in Rule 1.8(a)(3), in a writing signed by the client, to the terms of the transaction in which the nonlegal services are provided and to the lawyer's inherent conflict of interest.

[7] In addition, in the context of providing legal and nonlegal services in the same transaction, Rule 1.8(a) requires a full disclosure of the nature and extent of the lawyer's financial interest or stake in the provision of the nonlegal services. By its terms, Rule 1.8(a) requires that the nonlegal services be provided on terms that are fair and reasonable to the client. (Where the nonlegal services are provided on terms generally available to the public in the marketplace, that requirement is ordinarily met.) Consequently, as a further safeguard against conflicts that may arise when the same lawyer provides both legal and nonlegal services in the same or substantially related matters, a lawyer may do so only if the lawyer not only complies with Rule 1.8(a) with respect to the nonlegal services, but also obtains the client's informed consent, pursuant to Rule 1.7(b), confirmed in writing, after fully disclosing the advantages and risks of obtaining legal and nonlegal services from the same or affiliated providers in a single matter (or in substantially related matters), including the lawyer's conflict of interest arising from the lawyer's financial interest in the provision of the nonlegal services.

[8] [Reserved.]

[9] [Reserved.]

[10] [Reserved.]

[11] [Reserved.]

RULE 7.2:
PAYMENT FOR REFERRALS

(a) A lawyer shall not compensate or give anything of value to a person or organization to recommend or obtain employment by a client, or as a reward for having made a recommendation resulting in employment by a client, except that:

(1) a lawyer or law firm may refer clients to a nonlegal professional or nonlegal professional service firm pursuant to a contractual relationship with such nonlegal professional or nonlegal professional service firm to provide legal and other professional services on a systematic and continuing basis as permitted by Rule 5.8, provided however that such referral shall not otherwise include any monetary or other tangible consideration or reward for such, or the sharing of legal fees; and

(2) a lawyer may pay the usual and reasonable fees or dues charged by a qualified legal assistance organization or referral fees to another lawyer as permitted by Rule 1.5(g).

(b) A lawyer or the lawyer's partner or associate or any other affiliated lawyer may be recommended, employed or paid by, or may cooperate with one of the following offices or organizations that promote the use of the lawyer's services or those of a partner or associate or any other affiliated lawyer, or request one of the following offices or organizations to recommend or promote the use of the lawyer's services or those of the lawyer's partner or associate, or any other affiliated lawyer as a private practitioner, if there is no interference with the exercise of independent professional judgment on behalf of the client:

(1) a legal aid office or public defender office:

(i) operated or sponsored by a duly accredited law school;

(ii) operated or sponsored by a bona fide, non-profit community organization;

(iii) operated or sponsored by a governmental agency; or

(iv) operated, sponsored, or approved by a bar association;

(2) a military legal assistance office;

(3) a lawyer referral service operated, sponsored or approved by a bar association or authorized by law or court rule; or

(4) any bona fide organization that recommends, furnishes or pays for legal services to its members or beneficiaries provided the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) Neither the lawyer, nor the lawyer's partner, nor associate, nor any other affiliated lawyer nor any nonlawyer, shall have initiated or promoted such organization for the primary purpose of providing financial or other benefit to such lawyer, partner, associate or affiliated lawyer;

(ii) Such organization is not operated for the purpose of procuring legal work or financial benefit for any lawyer as a private practitioner outside of the legal services program of the organization;

(iii) The member or beneficiary to whom the legal services are furnished, and not such organization, is recognized as the client of the lawyer in the matter;

(iv) The legal service plan of such organization provides appropriate relief for any member or beneficiary who asserts a claim that representation by counsel furnished, selected or approved by the organization for the particular matter involved would be unethical, improper or inadequate under the circumstances of the matter involved; and the plan provides an appropriate procedure for seeking such relief;

(v) The lawyer does not know or have cause to know that such organization is in violation of applicable laws, rules of court or other legal requirements that govern its legal service operations; and

(vi) Such organization has filed with the appropriate disciplinary authority, to the extent required by such authority, at least annually a report with respect to its legal service plan, if any, showing its terms, its schedule of benefits, its subscription charges, agreements with counsel and financial results of its legal service activities or, if it has failed to do so, the lawyer does not know or have cause to know of such failure.

Comment

Paying Others to Recommend a Lawyer

[1] Except as permitted under paragraphs (a)(1)-(a)(2) of this Rule or under Rule 1.17, lawyers are not permitted to pay others for recommending the lawyer's services or for channeling professional work in a manner that would violate Rule 7.3 if engaged in by a lawyer. *See* Rule 8.4(a) (lawyer may not violate or attempt to violate a Rule, knowingly assist another to do so, or do so through the acts of another). A communication contains a recommendation of it endorses or vouches for a lawyer's credentials, abilities, competence, character, or other professional qualities. Paragraph (a), however, does not prohibit a lawyer from paying for advertising and communications permitted by these Rules, including the costs of print directory listings, online directory listings, newspaper ads, television and radio airtime, domain name registrations, sponsorship fees, Internet-based advertisements, search engine optimization, and group advertising. A lawyer may also compensate employees, agents and vendors who are

engaged to provide marketing or client development services, such as publicists, public-relations personnel, marketing personnel, business development staff, and web site designers. Moreover, a lawyer may pay others for generating clients leads, such as Internet-based client leads, as long as (i) the lead generator does not recommend the lawyers, (ii) any payment to the lead generator is consistent with Rules 1.5(g) (division of fees) and 5.4 (professional independence of the lawyer), (iii) the lawyer complies with Rule 1.8(f) (prohibiting interference with a lawyer's indepdendent professional judgment by a person who recommends the lawyer's services), and (iv) the lead generator's communications are consistent with Rules 7.1 (Advertising) and 7.3 (Solicitation and Recommendation of Professional Employment). To comply with Rule 7.1, a lawyer must not pay a lead generator that states, implies, or creates a reasonable impression that it is recommending the lawyer, id making the referral without payment from the lawyer, or has analyzed a person's legal problems when determining which lawyer should receive the referral. *See also* Rule 5.3 (Lawyer's Responsibility for Conduct of Nonlawyers).

[2] A lawyer may pay the usual charges of a qualified legal assistance organization. A lawyer so participating should make certain that the relationship with a qualified legal assistance organization in no way interferes with independent professional representation of the interests of the individual client. A lawyer should avoid situations in which officials of the organization who are not lawyers attempt to direct lawyers concerning the manner in which legal services are performed for individual members and should also avoid situations in which considerations of economy are given undue weight in determining the lawyers employed by an organization or the legal services to be performed for the member or beneficiary, rather than competence and quality of service.

[3] A lawyer who accepts assignments or referrals from a qualified legal assistance organization must act reasonably to ensure that the activities of the plan or service are compatible with the lawyer's professional obligations. *See* Rule 5.3. The lawyer must ensure that the organization's communications with potential clients are in conformity with these Rules. Thus, advertising must not be false or misleading, as would be the case if the organization's communications falsely suggested that it was a lawyer referral service sponsored by a state agency or bar association. Nor could the lawyer allow in-person, telephonic or real-time interactive electronic contacts that would violate this Rule.

[4] A lawyer also may agree to refer clients to another lawyer or a nonlawyer in return for the undertaking of that person to refer clients or customers to the lawyer. Such reciprocal referral arrangements must not interfere with the lawyer's professional judgment as to making referrals or as to providing substantive legal services. *See* Rules 2.1, 5.4(c). Except as provided in Rule 1.5(e), a lawyer who receives referrals from a lawyer or nonlawyer must not pay anything solely for the referral, but the lawyer does not violate paragraph (a) by agreeing to refer clients to the other lawyer or nonlawyer so long as the reciprocal referral agreement is not exclusive and the client is informed of the referral agreement. A lawyer may enter into such an arrangement only if it is nonexclusive on both sides, so that both the lawyer and the nonlawyer are free to refer clients to others if that is in the best interest of those clients. Conflicts of interest created by such arrangements are governed by Rule 1.7. A lawyer's interest in receiving a steady stream of referrals from a particular source must not undermine the lawyer's professional judgment on behalf of clients. Reciprocal referral agreements should not be of indefinite duration and should be reviewed periodically to determine whether they comply with these

Rules. This Rule does not restrict referrals or divisions of revenues or net income among lawyers within firms comprising multiple entities.

[5] Campaign contributions by lawyers to government officials or candidates for public office who are, or may be, in a position to influence the award of a legal engagement may threaten governmental integrity by subjecting the recipient to a conflict of interest. Correspondingly, when a lawyer makes a significant contribution to a public official or an election campaign for a candidate for public office and is later engaged by the official to perform legal services for the official's agency, it may appear that the official has been improperly influenced in selecting the lawyer, whether or not this is so. This appearance of influence reflects poorly on the integrity of the legal profession and government as a whole. For these reasons, just as the Code prohibits a lawyer from compensating or giving anything of value to a person or organization to recommend or obtain employment by a client, the Code prohibits a lawyer from making or soliciting a political contribution to any candidate for government office, government official, political campaign committee or political party, if a disinterested person would conclude that the contribution is being made or solicited for the purpose of obtaining or being considered eligible to obtain a government legal engagement. This would be true even in the absence of an understanding between the lawyer and any government official or candidate that special consideration will be given in return for the political contribution or solicitation.

[6] In determining whether a disinterested person would conclude that a contribution to a candidate for government office, government official, political campaign committee or political party is or has been made for the purpose of obtaining or being considered eligible to obtain a government legal engagement, the factors to be considered include (a) whether legal work awarded to the contributor or solicitor, if any, was awarded pursuant to a process that was insulated from political influence, such as a "Request for Proposal" process, (b) the amount of the contribution or the contributions resulting from a solicitation, (c) whether the contributor or any law firm with which the lawyer is associated has sought or plans to seek government legal work from the official or candidate, (d) whether the contribution or solicitation was made because of an existing personal, family or non-client professional relationship with the government official or candidate, (e) whether prior to the contribution or solicitation in question, the contributor or solicitor had made comparable contributions or had engaged in comparable solicitations on behalf of governmental officials or candidates for public office for which the lawyer or any law firm with which the lawyer is associated did not perform or seek to perform legal work, (f) whether the contributor has made a contribution to the government official's or candidate's opponent(s) during the same campaign period and, if so, the amounts thereof, and (g) whether the contributor is eligible to vote in the jurisdiction of the governmental official or candidate, and if not, whether other factors indicate that the contribution or solicitation was nonetheless made to further a genuinely held political, social or economic belief or interest rather than to obtain a legal engagement.

RULE 7.3:
SOLICITATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

(a) A lawyer shall not engage in solicitation:

(1) by in-person or telephone contact, or by real-time or interactive computer-accessed communication unless the recipient is a close friend, relative, former client or existing client; or

(2) by any form of communication if:

(i) the communication or contact violates Rule 4.5, Rule 7.1(a), or paragraph (e) of this Rule;

(ii) the recipient has made known to the lawyer a desire not to be solicited by the lawyer;

(iii) the solicitation involves coercion, duress or harassment;

(iv) the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the age or the physical, emotional or mental state of the recipient makes it unlikely that the recipient will be able to exercise reasonable judgment in retaining a lawyer; or

(v) the lawyer intends or expects, but does not disclose, that the legal services necessary to handle the matter competently will be performed primarily by another lawyer who is not affiliated with the soliciting lawyer as a partner, associate or of counsel.

(b) For purposes of this Rule, "solicitation" means any advertisement initiated by or on behalf of a lawyer or law firm that is directed to, or targeted at, a specific recipient or group of recipients, or their family members or legal representatives, the primary purpose of which is the retention of the lawyer or law firm, and a significant motive for which is pecuniary gain. It does not include a proposal or other writing prepared and delivered in response to a specific request of a prospective client.

(c) A solicitation directed to a recipient in this State shall be subject to the following provisions:

(1) A copy of the solicitation shall at the time of its dissemination be filed with the attorney disciplinary committee of the judicial district or judicial department wherein the lawyer or law firm maintains its principal office. Where no such office is maintained, the filing shall be made in the judicial department where the solicitation is targeted. A filing shall consist of:

(i) a copy of the solicitation;

(ii) a transcript of the audio portion of any radio or television solicitation; and

(iii) if the solicitation is in a language other than English, an accurate English-language translation.

(2) Such solicitation shall contain no reference to the fact of filing.

(3) If a solicitation is directed to a predetermined recipient, a list containing the names and addresses of all recipients shall be retained by the lawyer or law firm for a period of not less than three years following the last date of its dissemination.

(4) Solicitations filed pursuant to this subdivision shall be open to public inspection.

(5) The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to:

(i) a solicitation directed or disseminated to a close friend, relative, or former or existing client;

(ii) a web site maintained by the lawyer or law firm, unless the web site is designed for and directed to or targeted at a prospective client affected by an identifiable actual event or occurrence or by an identifiable prospective defendant; or

(iii) professional cards or other announcements the distribution of which is authorized by Rule 7.5(a).

(d) A written solicitation shall not be sent by a method that requires the recipient to travel to a location other than that at which the recipient ordinarily receives business or personal mail or that requires a signature on the part of the recipient.

(e) No solicitation relating to a specific incident involving potential claims for personal injury or wrongful death shall be disseminated before the 30th day after the date of the incident, unless a filing must be made within 30 days of the incident as a legal prerequisite to the particular claim, in which case no unsolicited communication shall be made before the 15th day after the date of the incident.

(f) Any solicitation made in writing or by computer-accessed communication and directed to a pre-determined recipient, if prompted by a specific occurrence involving or affecting a recipient, shall disclose how the lawyer obtained the identity of the recipient and learned of the recipient's potential legal need.

(g) If a retainer agreement is provided with any solicitation, the top of each page shall be marked "SAMPLE" in red ink in a type size equal to the largest type size used in

the agreement and the words "DO NOT SIGN" shall appear on the client signature line.

(h) Any solicitation covered by this section shall include the name, principal law office address and telephone number of the lawyer or law firm whose services are being offered.

(i) The provisions of this Rule shall apply to a lawyer or members of a law firm not admitted to practice in this State who shall solicit retention by residents of this State.

Comment

Solicitation

[1] In addition to seeking clients through general advertising (either by public communications in the media or by private communications to potential clients who are neither current clients nor other lawyers), many lawyers attempt to attract clients through a specialized category of advertising called "solicitation." Not all advertisements are solicitations within the meaning of this Rule. All solicitations, however, are advertisements with certain additional characteristics. By definition, a communication that is not an advertisement is not a solicitation. Solicitations are subject to all of the Rules governing advertising and are also subject to additional Rules, including filing a copy of the solicitation with the appropriate attorney disciplinary authority (including a transcript of the audio portion of any radio or television solicitation and, if the solicitation is in a language other than English, an accurate English language translation). These and other additional requirements will facilitate oversight by disciplinary authorities.

[2] A "solicitation" means any advertisement: (i) that is initiated by a lawyer or law firm (as opposed to a communication made in response to an inquiry initiated by a potential client), (ii) with a primary purpose of persuading recipients to retain the lawyer or law firm (as opposed to providing educational information about the law, *see* Rule 7.1, Comment [7]), (iii) that has as a significant motive for the lawyer to make money (as opposed to a public-interest lawyer offering pro bono services), and (iv) that is directed to or targeted at a specific recipient or group of recipients, or their family members or legal representatives. Any advertisement that meets all four of these criteria is a solicitation, and is governed not only by the Rules that govern all advertisements but also by special Rules governing solicitation.

Directed or Targeted

[3] An advertisement may be considered to be directed to or targeted at a specific recipient or recipients in two different ways. First, an advertisement is considered "directed to or targeted at" a specific recipient or recipients if it is made by in-person or telephone contact or by real-time or interactive computer-accessed communication or if it is addressed so that it will be delivered to the specific recipient or recipients or their families or agents (as with letters, emails, express packages). Advertisements made by in-person or telephone contact or by real-time or interactive computer-accessed communication are prohibited unless the recipient is a close friend, relative, former client or current client. Advertisements addressed so that they will be delivered to the specific recipient or recipients or their families or agents (as with letters, emails,

express packages) are subject to various additional rules governing solicitation (including filing and public inspection) because otherwise they would not be readily subject to disciplinary oversight and review. Second, an advertisement in public media such as newspapers, television, billboards, web sites or the like is a solicitation if it makes reference to a specific person or group of people whose legal needs arise out of a specific incident to which the advertisement explicitly refers. The term "specific incident" is explained in Comment [5].

[4] Unless it falls within Comment [3], an advertisement in public media such as newspapers, television, billboards, web sites or the like is presumed not to be directed to or targeted at a specific recipient or recipients. For example, an advertisement in a public medium is not directed to or targeted at "a specific recipient or group of recipients" simply because it is intended to attract potential clients with needs in a specified area of law. Thus, a lawyer could advertise in the local newspaper that the lawyer is available to assist homeowners in reducing property tax assessments. Likewise, an advertisement by a patent lawyer is not directed or targeted within the meaning of the definition solely because the magazine is geared toward inventors. Similarly, a lawyer could advertise on television or in a newspaper or web site to the general public that the lawyer practices in the area of personal injury or Workers' Compensation law. The fact that some recipients of such advertisements might actually be in need of specific legal services at the time of the communication does not transform such advertisements into solicitations.

Solicitations Relating To a Specific Incident Involving Potential Claims for Personal Injury or Wrongful Death

[5] Solicitations relating to a specific incident involving potential claims for personal injury or wrongful death are subject to a further restriction, in that they may not be disseminated until 30 days (or in some cases 15 days) after the date of the incident. This restriction applies even where the recipient is a close friend, relative, or former client, but not where the recipient is a current client. A "specific incident" is a particular identifiable event (or a sequence of related events occurring at approximately the same time and place) that causes harm to one or more people. Specific incidents include such events as traffic accidents, plane or train crashes, explosions, building collapses, and the like.

[6] A solicitation that is intended to attract potential claims for personal injury or wrongful death arising from a common cause but at disparate times and places, does not relate to a specific incident and is not subject to the special 30-day (or 15-day) rule, even though it is addressed so that it will be delivered to specific recipients or their families or agents (as with letters, emails, express packages), or is made in a public medium such as newspapers, television, billboards, web sites or the like and makes reference to a specific person or group of people, *see* Comments [3]-[4]. For example, solicitations intended to be of interest only to potential claimants injured over a period of years by a defective medical device or medication do not relate to a specific incident and are not subject to the special 30-day (or 15-day) rule.

[7] An advertisement in the public media that makes no express reference to a specific incident does not become a solicitation subject to the 30-day (or 15-day) rule solely because a specific incident has occurred within the last 30 (or 15) days. Thus, a law firm that advertises on television or in newspapers that it can "help injured people explore their legal

rights" is not violating the 30-day (or 15-day) rule by running or continuing to run its advertisements even though a mass disaster injured many people within hours or days before the advertisement appeared. Unless an advertisement in the public media explicitly refers to a specific incident, it is not a solicitation subject to the 30-day (or 15-day) blackout period. However, if a lawyer causes an advertisement to be delivered (whether by mail, email, express service, courier, or any other form of direct delivery) to a specific recipient (i) with knowledge that the addressee is either a person killed or injured in a specific incident or that person's family member or agent, and (ii) with the intent to communicate with that person because of that knowledge, then the advertisement is a solicitation subject to the 30-day (or 15-day) rule even if it makes no reference to a specific incident and even if it is part of a mass mailing.

Extraterritorial Application of Solicitation Rules

[8] All of the special solicitation rules, including the special 30-day (or 15-day) rule, apply to solicitations directed to recipients in New York State, whether made by a lawyer admitted in New York State or a lawyer admitted in any another jurisdiction. Solicitations by a lawyer admitted in New York State directed to or targeted at a recipient or recipients outside of New York State are not subject to the filing and related requirements set out in Rule 7.3(c). Whether such solicitations are subject to the special 30-day (or 15-day) rule depends on the application of Rule 8.5.

In-Person, Telephone and Real-Time or Interactive Computer-Accessed Communication

[9] Paragraph (a) generally prohibits in-person solicitation, which has historically been disfavored by the bar because it poses serious dangers to potential clients. For example, in-person solicitation poses the risk that a lawyer, who is trained in the arts of advocacy and persuasion, may pressure a potential client to hire the lawyer without adequate consideration. These same risks are present in telephone contact or in real-time or interactive computer-accessed communication. These same risks are also present in all other real-time or interactive electronic communications, whether by computer, phone or related electronic means – *see* Rule 1.0(c) (defining "computer-accessed communication") – and are regulated in the same manner. The prohibitions on in-person or telephone contact and the prohibitions on contact by real-time or interactive computer-accessed communication do not apply if the recipient is a close friend, relative, former or current client. Communications with these individuals do not pose the same dangers as solicitations to others. However, when the special 30-day (or 15-day) rule applies, it does so even where the recipient is a close friend, relative, or former client. Ordinarily, email communications and web sites are not considered to be real-time or interactive communication. Similarly, automated pop-up advertisements on a web site that are not a live response are not considered to be real-time or interactive communication. However, instant messaging ("IM"), chat rooms, and other similar types of conversational computer-accessed communications – whether sent or received via a desktop computer, a portable computer, a cell phone, or any similar electronic or wireless device, and whether sent directly or via social media – are considered to be real-time or interactive communication.

RULE 8.4:
MISCONDUCT

A lawyer or law firm shall not:

(a) violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another;

(b) engage in illegal conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer;

(c) engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;

(d) engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;

(e) state or imply an ability:

(1) to influence improperly or upon irrelevant grounds any tribunal, legislative body or public official; or

(2) to achieve results using means that violate these Rules or other law;

(f) knowingly assist a judge or judicial officer in conduct that is a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law;

(g) unlawfully discriminate in the practice of law, including in hiring, promoting or otherwise determining conditions of employment on the basis of age, race, creed, color, national origin, sex, disability, marital status or sexual orientation. Where there is a tribunal with jurisdiction to hear a complaint, if timely brought, other than a Departmental Disciplinary Committee, a complaint based on unlawful discrimination shall be brought before such tribunal in the first instance. A certified copy of a determination by such a tribunal, which has become final and enforceable and as to which the right to judicial or appellate review has been exhausted, finding that the lawyer has engaged in an unlawful discriminatory practice shall constitute prima facie evidence of professional misconduct in a disciplinary proceeding; or

(h) engage in any other conduct that adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness as a lawyer.

Comment

[1] Lawyers are subject to discipline when they violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another, as when they request or instruct an agent to do so on their behalf. Paragraph (a), however, does not prohibit a lawyer from advising a client concerning action the client is legally entitled to take.

[2] Many kinds of illegal conduct reflect adversely on fitness to practice law. Illegal conduct involving violence, dishonesty, fraud, breach of trust, or serious interference with the administration of justice is illustrative of conduct that reflects adversely on fitness to practice law. A pattern of repeated offenses, even ones of minor significance when considered separately, can indicate indifference to legal obligation.

[3] The prohibition on conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice is generally invoked to punish conduct, whether or not it violates another ethics rule, that results in substantial harm to the justice system comparable to those caused by obstruction of justice, such as advising a client to testify falsely, paying a witness to be unavailable, altering documents, repeatedly disrupting a proceeding, or failing to cooperate in an attorney disciplinary investigation or proceeding. The assertion of the lawyer's constitutional rights consistent with Rule 8.1, Comment [2] does not constitute failure to cooperate. The conduct must be seriously inconsistent with a lawyer's responsibility as an officer of the court.

[4] A lawyer may refuse to comply with an obligation imposed by law if such refusal is based upon a reasonable good-faith belief that no valid obligation exists because, for example, the law is unconstitutional, conflicts with other legal or professional obligations, or is otherwise invalid. As set forth in Rule 3.4(c), a lawyer may not disregard a specific ruling or standing rule of a tribunal, but can take appropriate steps to test the validity of such a rule or ruling.

[4A] A lawyer harms the integrity of the law and the legal profession when the lawyer states or implies an ability to influence improperly any officer or agency of the executive, legislative or judicial branches of government.

[5] Lawyers holding public office assume legal responsibilities going beyond those of other citizens. A lawyer's abuse of public office can suggest an inability to fulfill the professional role of lawyers. The same is true of abuse of positions of private trust such as trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, agent and officer, director or manager of a corporation or other organization.

[5A] Unlawful discrimination in the practice of law on the basis of age, race, creed, color, national origin, sex, disability, marital status, or sexual orientation is governed by paragraph (g).