

**Rule 1.11 Special Conflicts of Interest for Former and Current Government
Officials and Employees
(Commission’s Proposed Rule Adopted on June 2 – 3, 2016 – Clean Version)**

- (a) Except as law may otherwise expressly permit, a lawyer who has formerly served as a public official or employee of the government:
 - (1) is subject to Rule 1.9(c); and
 - (2) shall not otherwise represent a client in connection with a matter in which the lawyer participated substantially as a public official or employee, unless the appropriate government agency gives its informed written consent* to the representation. This paragraph shall not apply to matters governed by Rule 1.12(a).
- (b) When a lawyer is prohibited from representation under paragraph (a), no lawyer in a firm* with which that lawyer is associated may knowingly* undertake or continue representation in such a matter unless:
 - (1) the personally prohibited lawyer is timely screened* [in accordance with Rule 1.0.1(k)] from any participation in the matter and is apportioned no part of the fee therefrom; and
 - (2) written* notice is promptly given to the appropriate government agency to enable it to ascertain compliance with the provisions of this Rule
- (c) Except as law may otherwise expressly permit, a lawyer who was a public official or employee and, during that employment, acquired information that the lawyer knows* is confidential government information about a person,* may not represent a private client whose interests are adverse to that person* in a matter in which the information could be used to the material disadvantage of that person.* As used in this Rule, the term “confidential government information” means information that has been obtained under governmental authority, that, at the time this Rule is applied, the government is prohibited by law from disclosing to the public, or has a legal privilege not to disclose, and that is not otherwise available to the public. A firm with which that lawyer is associated may undertake or continue representation in the matter only if the personally prohibited lawyer is timely screened* [in accordance with Rule 1.0.1(k)] from any participation in the matter and is apportioned no part of the fee therefrom.
- (d) Except as law may otherwise expressly permit, a lawyer currently serving as a public official or employee:
 - (1) is subject to Rules 1.7 and 1.9; and
 - (2) shall not:
 - (i) participate in a matter in which the lawyer participated substantially

while in private practice or nongovernmental employment, unless the appropriate government agency gives its informed written consent;* or

- (ii) negotiate for private employment with any person* who is involved as a party, or as a lawyer for a party, or with a law firm* for a party, in a matter in which the lawyer is participating substantially, except that a lawyer serving as a law clerk to a judge, other adjudicative officer or arbitrator may negotiate for private employment as permitted by Rule 1.12(b) and subject to the conditions stated in Rule 1.12(b).

(e) As used in this Rule, the term “matter” includes:

- (1) any judicial or other proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, investigation, charge, accusation, arrest or other particular matter involving a specific party or parties, and
- (2) any other matter covered by the conflict of interest rules of the appropriate government agency.

Comment

[1] Rule 1.10 is not applicable to the conflicts of interest addressed by this Rule.

[2] Paragraphs (a)(2) and (d)(2) apply regardless of whether a lawyer is adverse to a former client.

[3] By requiring a former government lawyer to comply with Rule 1.9(c), paragraph (a)(1) protects information obtained while working for the government to the same extent as information learned while representing a private client. This provision applies regardless of whether the lawyer was working in a “legal” capacity. Thus, information learned by the lawyer while in public service in an administrative, policy or advisory position also is covered by paragraph (a)(1).

[4] Paragraph (c) operates only when the lawyer in question has actual knowledge of the information; it does not operate with respect to information that merely could be imputed to the lawyer.

[5] When a lawyer has been employed by one government agency and then moves to a second government agency, it may be appropriate to treat that second agency as another client for purposes of this Rule, as when a lawyer is employed by a city and subsequently is employed by a federal agency. Because conflicts of interest are governed by paragraphs (a) and (b), the latter agency is required to screen the lawyer. Whether two government agencies should be regarded as the same or different clients for conflict of interest purposes is beyond the scope of these Rules. See Rule 1.13, Comment [6]. See also *Civil Service Commission v. Superior Court* (1984) 163 Cal.App.3d 70, 76-78 [209 Cal.Rptr. 159].

[6] Paragraphs (b) and (c) do not prohibit a lawyer from receiving a salary or partnership share established by prior independent agreement, but that lawyer may not receive compensation directly relating the lawyer's compensation to the fee in the matter in which the lawyer is disqualified.

[7] Paragraphs (a) and (d) do not prohibit a lawyer from jointly representing a private party and a government agency when doing so is permitted by Rule 1.7 and is not otherwise prohibited by law.

[8] A lawyer serving as a public official or employee of the government may participate in a matter in which the lawyer participated substantially while in private practice or non-governmental employment only if: (i) the government agency gives its informed written consent* as required by subparagraph (d)(2)(i); and (ii) the former client gives its informed written consent* as required by Rule 1.9, to which the lawyer is subject by subparagraph (d)(1).

[9] This Rule is not intended to address whether in a particular matter: (i) a lawyer's conflict under paragraph (d) will be imputed to other lawyers serving in the same governmental agency or (ii) the use of a timely screen will avoid that imputation. The imputation and screening rules for lawyers moving from private practice into government service under paragraph (d) are left to be addressed by case law and its development. See *City & County of San Francisco v. Cobra Solutions, Inc.*, 38 Cal. 4th at 847, 851-54 and *City of Santa Barbara v. Superior Court* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 17, 26-27 [18 Cal.Rptr.3d 403]. Regarding the standards for recusals of prosecutors in criminal matters, see Penal Code § 1424; *Haraguchi v. Superior Court* (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 706, 711-20 [76 Cal.Rptr.3d 250]; and *Hollywood v. Superior Court* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 721, 727-35 [76 Cal.Rptr.3d 264]. Concerning prohibitions against former prosecutors participating in matters in which they served or participated in as prosecutor, see, e.g., Business and Professions Code § 6131 and 18 U.S.C. § 207(a).