

Proposed Rule 1.8.2 [RPC 3-100 and 3-310] “Use of Confidential Information”

(Draft #4, 1/24/10)

Summary: This proposed Rule restricts a lawyer’s use of a current client’s information to that client’s disadvantage. It complements other related rules that generally prohibit disclosure of client information and conflicting representations of other clients.

Comparison with ABA Counterpart

Rule	Comment
<input type="checkbox"/> ABA Model Rule substantially adopted	<input type="checkbox"/> ABA Model Rule substantially adopted
<input type="checkbox"/> ABA Model Rule substantially rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> ABA Model Rule substantially rejected
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some material additions to ABA Model Rule	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some material additions to ABA Model Rule
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some material deletions from ABA Model Rule	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some material deletions from ABA Model Rule
<input type="checkbox"/> No ABA Model Rule counterpart	<input type="checkbox"/> No ABA Model Rule counterpart

Primary Factors Considered

- Existing California Law

Rule

RPC 3-100; 3-310

Statute

Bus. & Prof. Code §6068(e)

Case law

- State Rule(s) Variations (In addition, see provided excerpt of selected state variations.)

Massachusetts; Virginia; Oregon; and Illinois

- Other Primary Factor(s)

Rule Revision Commission Action/Vote to Recommend Rule Adoption

(13 Members Total – votes recorded may be less than 13 due to member absences)

Approved on 10-day Ballot, Less than Six Members Opposing Adoption

Vote (see tally below)

Favor Rule as Recommended for Adoption 10
Opposed Rule as Recommended for Adoption 1
Abstain 1

Approved on Consent Calendar

Approved by Consensus

Commission Minority Position, Known Stakeholders and Level of Controversy

Minority Position Included on Model Rule Comparison Chart: Yes No

(See introduction and rule explanation in the Model Rule comparison chart.)

No Known Stakeholders

The Following Stakeholders Are Known:

Very Controversial – Explanation:

Moderately Controversial – Explanation:

See introduction and rule explanation in the Model Rule comparison chart.

Not Controversial – Explanation:

COMMISSION FOR THE REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Proposed Rule 1.8.2* Use of Current Client's Information Relating to the Representation

February 2010

(Draft rule prepared for circulation for public comment)

INTRODUCTION:

Proposed Rule 1.8.2, which governs a lawyer's *use* of a current client's information to the client's disadvantage, complements proposed Rules 1.6 (*disclosure* of a current client's information) and 1.7 (lawyer accepting or continuing *representations* adverse to a current client). Together, these Rules provide critical guidance to lawyers concerning their important duties of loyalty and confidentiality. Proposed Rule 1.8.2 largely tracks the language of Model Rule 1.8(b). The differences between proposed Rule 1.8.2 and the Model Rule relate primarily to California well-settled policy of imposing on lawyers a more uniform and consistent duty of confidentiality. Other changes are intended to clarify the centrality of client loyalty to the Rule's rationale. Finally, there are some housekeeping revisions related to proposed Rule 1.8.2 being a standalone Rule. See Explanation of Rule Changes, ¶. 2.

The Commission's comment modifies the comparable Model Rule language by clarifying that use of a client's information is governed by this Rule whether or not the information is confidential. The comment also tracks the Commission's addition of the requirement for written consent.

Minority. A minority of the Commission believes that this Rule should not require the more stringent "informed *written* consent" standard for obtaining the client's consent to the lawyer's use of information relating to the representation to the client's disadvantage. See Explanation of Changes to the Rule, below.

* Proposed Rule 1.8.2, Draft 4 (1/24/10).

<p align="center"><u>ABA Model Rule</u></p> <p align="center">Rule 1.8(b) Conflict of Interest: Current Clients: Specific Rules</p>	<p align="center"><u>Commission's Proposed Rule*</u></p> <p align="center">Rule 1.8.2 Use of Current Client's Information Relating to the Representation</p>	<p align="center"><u>Explanation of Changes to the ABA Model Rule</u></p>
<p>(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.</p>	<p>(b) A lawyer shall not use information relating to representation of a client to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed <u>written</u> consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules <u>or the State Bar Act</u>.</p>	<p>Rule 1.8.2 is similar to Model Rule 1.8(b) but substantive changes have been made to enhance client protection.</p> <p>The letter designation of the Model Rule paragraph has been deleted because, unlike Model Rule 1.8, which gathers together many divergent concepts in separate paragraphs in a single rule, the Commission has made each paragraph of that Rule a separate, standalone rule.</p> <p>The phrase “information relating to the representation” has been replaced by “information relating to a client.” Because this Rule applies to information of current clients, to which lawyers owe an undivided duty of loyalty, the Commission determined that information protected under this Rule should not be limited to that related only to the client’s representation.</p> <p>The Commission has added the requirement that the client give informed <i>written</i> consent to the lawyer’s use of information relating to the representation to the client’s disadvantage. The Commission determined that mandating informed <i>written</i> consent, which requires that the lawyer’s disclosure of adverse consequences to the client be provided to the client in writing, provides an extra layer of protection by adding the formality of a writing. For example, current California rule 3-310 requires a client’s informed written consent before a client is deemed to have waived a conflict of interest.</p> <p>The phrase, “or required,” has been deleted because there are no provisions in the Rules or the State Bar Act that <i>require</i> a lawyer to violate his or her duty of confidentiality.</p>

* [Proposed Rule 1.8.2, Draft 4 \(1/24/10\)](#). Redline/strikeout showing changes to the ABA Model Rule

<p align="center"><u>ABA Model Rule</u> Rule 1.8(b) Conflict of Interest: Current Clients: Specific Rules</p>	<p align="center"><u>Commission’s Proposed Rule</u> Rule 1.8.2 Use of Current Client’s Information Relating to the Representation</p>	<p align="center"><u>Explanation of Changes to the ABA Model Rule</u></p>
		<p>As the Commission has throughout its proposed rules, a reference to the State Bar Act, which is also part of the regulatory landscape in California, has been added.</p> <p><u>Minority: “Informed <i>Written</i> Consent”.</u> A minority of the Commission notes that current rule 3-100 requires only the client’s informed consent to <i>disclose</i> the client’s confidential information relating to the representation. The minority notes that the heightened written disclosure requirements for waiving conflicts of interest are appropriate in the conflicts context, because the adverse effects of a lawyer’s conflicted representation are not necessarily apparently to a person who is not experienced in the use of legal services. That is not true of the use of the client’s information to the client’s disadvantage, where the potential adverse consequences will be readily apparent to the client.</p> <p><u>Approaches in Other Jurisdictions.</u> There is little divergence from the Model Rule in other jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions, e.g., Massachusetts and Virginia, retain the ABA Model Code’s prohibition on the use of client information to the advantage of the lawyer or a third person. Oregon permits use to the client’s disadvantage only if the client’s informed consent is “confirmed in writing.” The current, pre-Ethics2000 Illinois Rules do not include Model Rule 1.8(b), but the Illinois State Bar has recommended its adoption.</p>

<p align="center">ABA Model Rule</p> <p align="center">Rule 1.8(b) Conflict of Interest: Current Clients: Specific Rules</p> <p align="center">Comment</p>	<p align="center">Commission's Proposed Rule*</p> <p align="center">Rule 1.8.2 Use of Current Client's Information Relating to the Representation</p> <p align="center">Comment</p>	<p align="center"><u>Explanation of Changes to the ABA Model Rule</u></p>
<p>[5] 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 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 use that information to purchase one of the parcels in competition with the client or to recommend that another client make such a purchase. 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 disadvantageous use of client information unless the client gives informed consent, except as permitted or required by these Rules. See Rules 1.2(d), 1.6, 1.9(c), 3.3, 4.1(b), 8.1 and 8.3.</p>	<p>[5] Use of information relating to the representation<u>a client, whether or not confidential,</u> to the disadvantage of the client violates the lawyer's duty of loyalty. Paragraph (b)<u>This Rule</u> applies when the information is used to benefit either the lawyer or a third person, such as another client or business associate of the lawyer, <u>to the disadvantage of the client.</u> For example, if a lawyer learns 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. 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)<u>This Rule</u> prohibits disadvantageous use of client information unless the client gives informed <u>written</u> consent, except as permitted or required<u>by these Rules or the State Bar Act.</u> See Rules 1.2(d), 1.6, 1.9(c), 3.3, and 4.1(b)(2), 8.1 and 8.3.</p>	<p>The Comment to proposed Rule 1.8.2 is substantially similar to Model Rule 1.8(b), comment [5].</p> <p>Aside from necessary housekeeping revisions such as renumbering the comment and substituting "this Rule" for "paragraph (b)," the first sentence has been modified to emphasize that regardless of whether the client information in which a lawyer traffics is confidential, the lawyer will still violate his duty of loyalty and thus this rule if the information is used to the client's disadvantage. The first sentence has also been revised to conform to the change that the Commission recommends to the black letter rule. See Explanation of Changes to the Rule.</p> <p>The clause, "to the disadvantage of the client," has been added in the second sentence to emphasize that the Rule prohibits the disadvantageous use of client information.</p> <p>The more stringent "informed <i>written</i> consent" standard has been added in keeping with California practice. See Explanation of Changes to the Rule.</p> <p>The phrase "or required" has been deleted to conform to the Rule.</p> <p>The comment cross-references the three proposed rules the Commission contemplates will permit use or disclosure client information that might be to the disadvantage a client: Rules 1.6, 1.9(c), and 4.1(a)(2). The other rules referenced in the Model Rule comment do not comport with California policy on confidentiality. The Commission has rejected those rules to the extent they permit a lawyer to violate the duty of confidentiality.</p>

* Redline/strikeout showing changes to the ABA Model Rule

Rule 1.8.2 Use of Current Client's Information Relating to the Representation

(Comparison of the Current Proposed Rule to the initial Public Comment Draft)

A lawyer shall not use information relating to ~~representation of~~ a client to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed written consent, except as permitted by these Rules or the State Bar Act.

Comment

- [1] Use of information relating to ~~the representation~~ a client, whether or not confidential, to the disadvantage of the client violates the lawyer's duty of loyalty. This Rule applies when the information is used to benefit either the lawyer or a third person, such as another client or business associate of the lawyer, to the disadvantage of the client. For example, if a lawyer learns 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. 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. This Rule prohibits disadvantageous use of client information unless the client gives informed written consent, except as permitted by these Rules or the State Bar Act. See Rules ~~{1.6}~~, 1.9(c), ~~and {4.1(ba)}~~ (2), and Business and Professions Code section 6068(e).

Rule 1.8.2 Use of Current Client's Information Relating to the Representation

(Commission's Proposed Rule – Clean Version)

A lawyer shall not use information relating to a client to the disadvantage of the client unless the client gives informed written consent, except as permitted by these Rules or the State Bar Act.

Comment

- [1] Use of information relating to a client, whether or not confidential, to the disadvantage of the client violates the lawyer's duty of loyalty. This Rule applies when the information is used to benefit either the lawyer or a third person, such as another client or business associate of the lawyer, to the disadvantage of the client. For example, if a lawyer learns 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. 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. This Rule prohibits disadvantageous use of client information unless the client gives informed written consent, except as permitted by these Rules or the State Bar Act. See Rules 1.6, 1.9(c), 4.1(a)(2), and Business and Professions Code section 6068(e).

**Rule 1.8.2 Use of Confidential Information [3-100, 3-310].
[Sorted by Commenter]**

TOTAL = 6 **Agree = 3**
Disagree = 0
Modify = 3
NI = 0

No.	Commenter	Position ¹	Comment on Behalf of Group?	Rule Paragraph	Comment	RRC Response
1	California Attorneys for Criminal Justice ("CACJ")	M			Our proposal is to follow precisely the ABA Model Rule 1.8(b).	The Commission disagrees with precisely following Model Rule 1.8(b). First, the phrase, "information relating to a client" has been substitute for "information relating to the representation of a client" to emphasize that the loyalty aspects of this Rule require a broader scope of protection for a client's information. Second, the phrase, "or required," was deleted because there are no provisions in the Rules or the State Bar Act that <i>require</i> a lawyer to violate his or her duty of confidentiality. Third, a reference to the State Bar Act, which is also part of the regulatory landscape in California, has been added to remind lawyers of other obligations they might have. Finally, the Commission has added a "written" consent requirement because it provides an extra layer of protection by adding the formality of a writing, thus impressing upon the client the importance of the matter.
2	COPRAC	M			COPRAC believes that written consent should be required, given the seriousness of the issue addressed by this rule, which involves a lawyer using confidential information of a client to the disadvantage of a client.	The Commission agrees. No response necessary.

¹ A = AGREE with proposed Rule D = DISAGREE with proposed Rule M = AGREE ONLY IF MODIFIED NI = NOT INDICATED

**Rule 1.8.2 Use of Confidential Information [3-100, 3-310].
[Sorted by Commenter]**

TOTAL = 6 **Agree = 3**
Disagree = 0
Modify = 3
NI = 0

No.	Commenter	Position ¹	Comment on Behalf of Group?	Rule Paragraph	Comment	RRC Response
				Comment [1]	<p>We encourage the Commission to address in the rules, perhaps in the definitions, whether informed written consent includes an email from the client. A majority of the members of COPRAC believe that an email should be sufficient.</p> <p>In the third sentence of Comment [1], the phrase "in competition with the client" should be moved to the end of the sentence. Recommending that another client make a purchase would not violate the rule unless such a purchase disadvantaged the client.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees. It has covered this in Rule 1.0.1 (the definitions Rule) by adopting as proposed Rule 1.0.1(n) the Evidence Code section 250 definition of 'writing', which includes, among other things, electronic mail.</p> <p>The Commission disagrees. The syntax is taken verbatim from the Model Rule and is correct. The end of the sentence states: "...or to recommend that another client make such a purchase." The use of the word "such" refers back to a purchase "in competition with the client," which is disadvantageous to the client.</p>
3	Los Angeles County Bar Association, Professional Responsibility and Ethics Committee	A			We support the Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct's Proposed Rule 1.8.2.	No response necessary.
4	Office of Chief Trial Counsel ("OCTC"), State Bar of California				<p>OCTC believes that the phrase "relating to the representation" not be used "because the lawyer may learn client secrets not related to the representation but as a result of the representation or otherwise and the lawyer's duty of loyalty would still suggest that the lawyer should not be able to use it."</p> <p>OCTC also supports the idea of written consent in this Rule because it impresses upon the client the importance of the decision and assists in the enforcement of the Rule.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees and has substituted the phrase "information relating to a client" to broaden the scope of protection afforded to client information under this Rule. See Response to CACJ, above.</p> <p>No response necessary. The Commission agrees with requiring informed consent.</p>

**Rule 1.8.2 Use of Confidential Information [3-100, 3-310].
[Sorted by Commenter]**

**TOTAL = 6 Agree = 3
Disagree = 0
Modify = 3
NI = 0**

No.	Commenter	Position ¹	Comment on Behalf of Group?	Rule Paragraph	Comment	RRC Response
5	Orange County Bar Association	M			<p>The OCBA believes the language “information relating to representation of a client” should be replaced with the language used in proposed Rule 1.6(a), specifically, “information protected from disclosure by Business and Professions Code section 6068(e)(1).” Currently, there is no statement in proposed Rule 1.8.2, as there is in proposed Rule 1.6(a), to explain the correlation between the phrases, nor does proposed Rule 1.8.2 contain the definition included in Comment [3] of proposed Rule 1.6.</p> <p>Adopting the same language as used in proposed Rule 1.6 not only ensures consistency between the two Rules, but also provides lawyers with more definitive guidance on how to comply with the Rule. The OCBA suggests adding to Comment [1] to proposed Rule 1.8.2 a reference to the definition in Comment [3] of proposed Rule 1.6.</p> <p>The OCBA proposes that the Rule be clarified as applying only to a “current” client’s information, as indicated in the Commission’s introductory statement and in the title of the proposed Rule.</p>	<p>The Commission agrees with the commenter’s concern with the phrase, “information relating to the representation of a client,” but has not made the specific change requested. Instead, the Commission has substituted “information relating to a client” to broaden the scope of protection afforded to client information under this Rule. See Response to CACJ, above.</p> <p>The Commission is unsure what OCBA is requesting. The rule applies only to a current client’s information, as reflected in the title. The word “client” is used throughout the Rules to refer only to a current client.</p>

**Rule 1.8.2 Use of Confidential Information [3-100, 3-310].
[Sorted by Commenter]**

**TOTAL = 6 Agree = 3
Disagree = 0
Modify = 3
NI = 0**

No.	Commenter	Position ¹	Comment on Behalf of Group?	Rule Paragraph	Comment	RRC Response
					<p>The OCBA agrees with the Commission's proposed modification to the Model Rule, adopting the "informed written consent" language.</p> <p>The OCBA suggests that proposed Rule 1.8.2 be modified to read as follows:</p> <p>"A lawyer shall not use a current client's information protected from disclosure by Business and Professions Code section 6068(e)(1) to the disadvantage of that client unless the client gives informed written consent, except as otherwise permitted by these Rules or the State Bar Act."</p>	<p>No response necessary.</p> <p>See RRC Response, above.</p>
6	San Diego County Bar Association Legal Ethics Committee	A			We approve of the new rule in its entirety.	No response necessary.
7	Santa Clara County Bar Association	A			Agrees with the proposed rule.	No response necessary.

Rule 1.8.2: Use of Confidential Information

STATE VARIATIONS

(The following is an excerpt from Regulation of Lawyers: Statutes and Standards (2009 Ed.) by Steven Gillers, Roy D. Simon and Andrew M. Perlman. The text relevant to proposed Rule 1.8.2 is highlighted.)

Alabama. In the rules effective June 2008, Alabama's Rule 1.8(e)(3) provides as follows:

(3) a lawyer may advance or guarantee emergency financial assistance to the client, the repayment of which may not be contingent on the outcome of the matter, provided that no promise or assurance of financial assistance was made to the client by the lawyer, or on the lawyer's behalf, prior to the employment of the lawyer.

Alabama also adds Rule 1.8(k), which identifies when a lawyer can represent both parties to an uncontested divorce or domestic relations proceeding. Relating to Rule 1.8(h), the Alabama Legal Services Liability Act, Ala. Code §6-5-570 et seq., provides as follows: "There shall be only one form and cause of action against legal service providers in courts in the State of Alabama and it shall be known as the legal service liability action." Finally, Rules 1.8(l) and (m) describe prohibitions on sexual relations between lawyers and clients. Notably, Rule 1.8(m) states that "except for a spousal relationship or a relationship that existed at the commencement of the lawyer-client relationship, sexual relations between the lawyer and the client shall be presumed to be exploitative [and thus violate Rule 1.8(l)]. This presumption is rebuttable."

Arizona: Rule 1.8(h)(2) adds a clause forbidding a lawyer to "make an agreement prospectively limiting the client's right to report the lawyer to appropriate professional authorities." Rule 1.8(l), which retains the 1983 version of ABA Model Rule 1.8(i), provides: "A lawyer related to another lawyer as parent, child, sibling, spouse or cohabitant shall not represent a client in a representation directly adverse to a person who the lawyer knows is represented by the other lawyer except upon consent by the client after consultation regarding the relationship."

California: California's rules are generally equivalent to Model Rule 1.8, but two exceptions deserve attention. Rule 3-320 provides as follows:

A member shall not represent a client in a matter in which another party's lawyer is a spouse, parent, child, or sibling of the member, lives with the member, is a client of the member, or has an intimate personal relationship with the member, unless the member informs the client in writing of the relationship.

And Rule 4-210 provides in part as follows:

(A) A member shall not directly or indirectly pay or agree to pay, guarantee, represent, or sanction a representation that the member or member's law firm will pay the personal or business expenses of a

prospective or existing client, except that this rule shall not prohibit a member: . . . (2) After employment, from lending money to the client upon the client's promise in writing to repay such loan.

Connecticut adds the following language to Rule 1.8(a), providing that lawyers can enter into business transactions with clients under the following circumstances:

(4) With regard to a business transaction, the lawyer advises the client or former client in writing either (A) that the lawyer will provide legal services to the client or former client concerning the transaction, or (B) that the lawyer will not provide legal services to the client or former client and that the lawyer is involved as a business person only and not as a lawyer representing the client or former client and that the lawyer is not one to whom the client or former client can turn for legal advice concerning the transaction.

(5) With regard to the providing of investment services, the lawyer advises the client or former client in writing (A) whether such services are covered by legal liability insurance or other insurance, and [makes either disclosure set out in paragraph (a)(4)]. Investment services shall only apply where the lawyer has either a direct or indirect control over the invested funds and a direct or indirect interest in the underlying investment.

For purposes of subsection (a)(1) through (a)(5), the phrase "former client" shall mean a client for whom the two year period starting from the conclusion of representation has not expired.

District of Columbia: D.C. Rule 1.8(d) permits lawyers to advance "financial assistance which is reasonably necessary to permit the client to institute or maintain the litigation or administrative proceeding." Rule 1.8(i) provides as follows:

A lawyer may acquire and enforce a lien granted by law to secure the lawyer's fees or expenses, but a lawyer shall not impose a lien upon any part of a client's files, except upon the lawyer's own work product, and then only to the extent that the work product has not been paid for. This work product exception shall not apply when the client has become unable to pay, or when withholding the lawyer's work product would present a significant risk to the client of irreparable harm.

Florida adds Rule 4-8.4(i), which provides that a lawyer shall not engage in sexual conduct with a client "or a representative of a client" that:

exploits or adversely affects the interests of the client or the lawyer-client relationship including, but not limited to:

(1) requiring or demanding sexual relations with a client or a representative of a client incident to or as a condition of a legal representation;

(2) employing coercion, intimidation, or undue influence in entering into sexual relations with a client or a representative of a client; or

(3) continuing to represent a client if the lawyer's sexual relations with the client or a representative of the client cause the lawyer to render incompetent representation.

In 2004, the Florida Supreme Court deleted language from the comment to Rule 8.4, which had stated that lawyer-client sexual relations do not violate the rule if a sexual relationship existed between the lawyer and client before commencement of the lawyer-client relationship.

Georgia: Rule 1.8(a), drawing on DR 5-104 of the ABA Code of Professional Responsibility, applies “if the client expects the lawyer to exercise the lawyer’s professional judgment therein for the protection of the client.” Georgia retains the language of deleted ABA Model Rule 1.8(i) but adds that the disqualification of a lawyer due to a parent, child, sibling, or spousal relationship “is personal and is not imputed to members of firms with whom the lawyers are associated.” Georgia adds that the maximum penalty for violating Rule 1.8(b) (which relates to confidentiality) is disbarment, but the maximum penalty for violating any other provision of Rule 1.8 is only a public reprimand.

Illinois: Rule 1.8(a), which borrows heavily from DR 5-104 of the ABA Model Code of Professional Responsibility, provides that unless the client has consented after disclosure, a lawyer “shall not enter into a business transaction with the client if: (1) the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the lawyer and the client have or may have conflicting interests therein; or (2) the client expects the lawyer to exercise the lawyer’s professional judgment therein for the protection of the client.” Illinois deletes the language of ABA Model Rule 1.8(b), and retains the original 1983 version of ABA Model Rule 1.8(c). Illinois Rule 1.8(e) permits a lawyer to advance or guarantee the expenses of litigation if: “(1) the client remains ultimately liable for such expenses; or (2) the repayment is contingent on the outcome of the matter; or (3) the client is indigent.” Illinois Rule 1.8(h) provides that a lawyer “shall not settle a claim against the lawyer made by an unrepresented client or former client without first advising that person in

writing that independent representation is appropriate in connection therewith.” Illinois adds language to Rule 1.8, providing as follows:

(h) A lawyer shall not enter into an agreement with a client or former client limiting or purporting to limit the right of the client or former client to file or pursue any complaint before the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission.

Illinois has no provision regulating sex with clients, but in *In re Rinella*, 175 Ill. 2d 504, (1997), the court suspended a lawyer for three years for having sexual relations with three different clients (and then lying about it during the Bar’s investigation). The court said that no lawyer could reasonably have considered such conduct acceptable under the existing ethics rules even though the rules do not expressly address sex with clients.

Louisiana: Rule 1.8(g) permits an aggregate settlement if “a court approves the settlement in a certified class action.” Rule 1.8(e) permits a lawyer to “provide financial assistance to a client who is in necessitous circumstances” subject to strict controls, including:

(ii) The advance or loan guarantee, or the offer thereof, shall not be used as an inducement by the lawyer, or anyone acting on the lawyer’s behalf, to secure employment.

(iii) Neither the lawyer nor anyone acting on the lawyer’s behalf may offer to make advances or loan guarantees prior to being hired by a client, and the lawyer shall not publicize nor advertise a willingness to make advances or loan guarantees to clients.

Massachusetts: Rule 1.8(b) forbids a lawyer to use confidential information “for the lawyer’s advantage or the advantage of a third person” without consent.

Michigan: Rules 1.8(a)(2) and 1.8(h)(2) (regarding business transactions with clients and settlement of legal malpractice claims) both require that the client be given a reasonable opportunity to seek the advice of independent counsel but lack the ABA requirement that the client be “advised in writing of the desirability of seeking” independent counsel. Michigan Rule 1.8(g), regarding aggregate settlements, lacks the ABA requirement that the client’s consent be “in a writing signed by the client.” Michigan retains the language of deleted ABA Model Rule 1.8(i) verbatim.

Minnesota: Rule 1.8(e)(3) allows a lawyer to guarantee a loan necessary for a client to withstand litigation delay. Rule 1.8(k)’s provision on sexual relationships with clients prohibits a lawyer from having sexual relations with a client unless a consensual relationship existed between the lawyer and client when the client-lawyer relationship commenced. The rule also defines “sexual relations” and adds the following Rules 1.8(k)(2)-(3) to explain the meaning of sex with a “client” when a lawyer represents an organization:

(2) if the client is an organization, any individual who oversees the representation and gives instructions to the lawyer on behalf of the organization shall be deemed to be the client . . .

(3) this paragraph does not prohibit a lawyer from engaging in sexual relations with a client of the lawyer’s firm provided that the lawyer has no involvement in the performance of the legal work for the client ...

Mississippi: Rule 1.8(e)(2) permits a lawyer to advance medical and living expenses to a client under certain narrowly defined circumstances.

New Hampshire: The New Hampshire rules include a Rule 1.19 (Disclosure of Information to the Client), which requires a lawyer (other than a government or in-house lawyer) to inform a client at the time of engagement if “the lawyer does not maintain professional liability insurance” of at least \$100,000 per occurrence and \$300,000 in the aggregate “or if the lawyer’s professional liability insurance ceases to be in effect.”

New Jersey: Rule 1.8(e)(3) creates an exception allowing financial assistance by a “non-profit organization authorized under [other law]” if the organization is representing the indigent client without a fee. Rule 1.8(h)(1), while forbidding agreements prospectively limiting liability to a client, contains an exception if “the client fails to act in accordance with the lawyer’s advice and the lawyer nevertheless continues to represent the client at the client’s request.” (New Jersey Rule 1.8(k) and (l) provide as follows:

(k) A lawyer employed by a public entity, either as a lawyer or in some other role, shall not undertake the representation of another client if the representation presents a substantial risk that the lawyer’s responsibilities to the public entity would limit the lawyer’s ability to provide independent advice or diligent and competent representation to either the public entity or the client.

(l) A public entity cannot consent to a representation otherwise prohibited by this Rule.

New York: Relating to ABA Model Rule 1.8(a), New York DR 5-104(A) governs business deals between a lawyer and client only if “they have differing interests therein and if the client expects the lawyer to exercise professional judgment therein for the protection of the client.” If so, the lawyer shall not enter into a business transaction unless the lawyer meets conditions identical to Rule 1.8(a)(1), the lawyer advises the client to seek the advice of independent counsel in the transaction, and the client “consents in writing, after full disclosure, to the terms of the transaction and to the lawyer’s inherent conflict of interest in the transaction.” DR 5-104 does not govern acquisition of “an ownership, possessory, security or other pecuniary interest adverse to a client.”

Relating to Rule 1.8(e), New York DR 5-103(B)(1) permits a lawyer representing “an indigent or pro bono client” to pay court costs and reasonable expenses of litigation on behalf of the client. For all clients, DR 5-103(B)(2) tracks ABA Model Rule 1.8(f)(1) verbatim. New York adds DR 5-103(B)(3), which provides:

(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 attorney from the proceeds of the action may include an amount equal to such costs and expenses incurred.

In addition, N.Y. Judiciary Law §488 generally permits a lawyer to advance the costs and expenses of litigation contingent on the outcome of the matter.

Relating to Rule 1.8(j), New York DR 5-111(B) provides that a lawyer shall not “(1) Require or demand sexual relations with a client or third party incident to or as a condition of any

professional representation,” or “(2) Employ coercion, intimidation, or undue influence in entering into sexual relations with a client.” DR 5-111(B)(3) forbids lawyers to begin a sexual relationship with a “domestic relations” client, not with other clients.

New York has no specific counterpart to Rule 1.8(k), and New York’s counterpart to Rule 1.8(c) is found only in EC 5-5, but various Disciplinary Rules in Canons 4 and 5 generally parallel the provisions of Rules 1.8(b), (d), and (f)-(i).

North Dakota: Rule 1.8(g), regarding aggregate settlements, applies “other than in class actions.” North Dakota adds Rule 1.8(k), which restricts the practice of law by a part-time prosecutor or judge in certain circumstances.

Ohio: Rule 1.8(c) forbids a lawyer to solicit “any substantial gift from a client” and forbids a lawyer to “prepare on behalf of the client an instrument giving the lawyer, the lawyer’s partner, associate, paralegal, law clerk or other employee of the lawyer’s firm, a lawyer acting ‘of counsel’ in the lawyer’s firm, or a person related to the lawyer any gift unless the lawyer or other recipient of the gift is related to the client.” “Gift” is defined to include “a testamentary gift.” Ohio Rule 1.8(f)(4) provides a detailed “statement of insured client’s rights” that a lawyer “selected and paid by an insurer to represent an insured” must give to the client.

Oregon: Rule 1.8(b) permits a lawyer to use confidential information to a client’s disadvantage only if the client’s consent is “confirmed in writing” (except as otherwise permitted or required by the Rules). Rule 1.8(e) permits a lawyer to advance litigation expenses only if “the client remains ultimately liable for such expenses to the extent of the client’s ability to pay.” Finally, Oregon’s rule governing sexual relations with clients contains a detailed description of “sexual

relations,” providing that it includes “sexual intercourse or any touching of the sexual or other intimate parts of a person or causing such person to touch the sexual or other intimate parts of the lawyer for the purpose of arousing or gratifying the sexual desire of either party.”

Pennsylvania: Rule 1.8(g) does not require that client consent be “confirmed in writing.”

Texas: Rule 1.08(c) provides that prior to the conclusion of “all aspects of the matter giving rise to the lawyer’s employment,” a lawyer shall not make or negotiate an agreement “with a client, prospective client, or former client” giving the lawyer literary or media rights to a portrayal or account based in substantial part on information relating to the representation. Rule 1.08(d) provides as follows:

(d) A lawyer shall not provide financial assistance to a client in connection with pending or contemplated litigation or administrative proceedings, except that:

(1) a lawyer may advance guarantee court costs, expenses of litigation or administrative proceedings, and reasonably necessary medical and living expenses, the repayment of which may be contingent on the outcome of the matter; and

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

Virginia: Rule 1.8(b) forbids the use of information “for the advantage of the lawyer or of a third person or to the disadvantage of the client.” Rule 1.8(e)(1) requires a client ultimately to be liable for court costs and expenses. Rule 1.8(h) contains an exception where the lawyer is “an employee” of the client “as long as the client is independently

represented in making the agreement” prospectively limiting the lawyer’s liability for malpractice.

Washington: Rule 1.8(e) permits a lawyer to (1) advance or guarantee the expenses of litigation “provided the client remains ultimately liable for such expenses; and (2) in matters maintained as class actions only, repayment of expenses of litigation may be contingent on the outcome of the matter.” Washington deletes ABA Model Rule 1.8(e)(2) (permitting lawyers to pay litigation costs for indigent clients).

Wisconsin: Rule 1.8(c) creates an exception to testamentary gifts where:

(1) the client is related to the donee, (2) the donee is a natural object of the bounty of the client, (3) there is no reasonable ground to anticipate a contest, or a claim of undue influence or for the public to lose confidence in the integrity of the bar, and (4) the amount of the gift or bequest is reasonable and natural under the circumstances.