



**THE STATE BAR
OF CALIFORNIA**

180 HOWARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1639

**COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL
RESPONSIBILITY AND CONDUCT**

TELEPHONE: (415) 538-2161

June 14, 2010

Harry B. Sondheim, Chair
Commission for the Revision of the
Rules of Professional Conduct
State Bar of California
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

RE: Proposed Rule 1.8.7

Dear Mr. Sondheim:

The State Bar of California's Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct (COPRAC) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments to the Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of California, pursuant to the request of the Board Committee on Regulation, Admissions & Discipline Oversight (RAD) for public comment.

COPRAC has reviewed the provisions of proposed Rule 1.8.7 and supports its adoption with the following suggested clarifications.

The last sentence of Comment [4] contains certain awkward language that may be corrected by replacing "...this Rule does not prevent the lawyer from assisting the jointly-represented clients *from agreeing* at any time *to* a procedure" with "...this Rule does not prevent the lawyer from assisting the jointly-represented clients *in reaching an agreement* at any time *on* a procedure...."

In addition, Comment [5] states: "A lawyer's obligation to make a written disclosure and obtain written consent *is satisfied* when the lawyer makes the required disclosure, and the clients give consent, on the record in court before a licensed court reporter that transcribes the disclosure and consent." COPRAC believes it would be more accurate to change "is satisfied" to "may be satisfied." This is because, read in isolation, the Comment as currently phrased would improperly suggest that disclosure and consent in court before a licensed court reporter on the record is the *only* way to satisfy the disclosure and consent requirements of this proposed Rule.

We also recommend deleting the portion of the Comment that states: "before a licensed court reporter that transcribes the disclosure and consent" as unnecessary and inconsistent with practices in some courts which use audio tapes instead of court reporters for the record.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Very truly yours,

Carole Buckner, Chair
Committee on Professional
Responsibility and Conduct

cc: Members, COPRAC

May 6, 2010

Ms. Audrey Hollins
Office of Professional Competence, Planning and Development
The State Bar of California
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Re:	TITLE
RULE	
Rule 1.0	Purpose and Scope of the Rules of Professional Conduct
Rule 1.0.1	Terminology *BATCH 6*
Rule 1.1	Competence
Rule 1.2	Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer
Rule 1.4	Communication
Rule 1.4.1	Disclosure of Professional Liability Insurance *BATCH 6*
Rule 1.5	Fee for Legal Services
Rule 1.5.1	Financial Arrangements Among Lawyers
Rule 1.6	Confidential Information of a Client
Rule 1.7	Conflict of Interests: Current Clients
Rule 1.8.1	Business Transactions with a Client and Acquiring Interests Adverse to the Client
Rule 1.8.2	Use of a Current Client's Confidential Information
Rule 1.8.3	Gifts from Client
Rule 1.8.5	Payment of Personal or Business Expenses Incurred by or for a Client
Rule 1.8.6	Payments Not From Client
Rule 1.8.7	Aggregate Settlements
Rule 1.8.8	Limiting Liability to Client
Rule 1.8.9	Purchasing Property at a Foreclosure Sale or a Sale Subject to Judicial Review
Rule 1.8.10	Sexual Relations with Client
Rule 1.8.11	Imputation of Personal Conflicts (Rules 1.8.1 to 1.8.9)
Rule 1.9	Duties to Former Clients
Rule 1.11	Special Conflicts for Former and Current Government Officers and Employees *BATCH 6*
Rule 1.12	Former Judge, Arbitrator, Mediator or Other Third-Party Neutral
Rule 1.13	Organization as Client
Rule 1.14	Client with Diminished Capacity
Rule 1.15	Handling Funds and Property of Clients and Other Persons
Rule 1.16	Declining or Terminating Representation
Rule 1.17	Purchase and Sale of a Law Practice *BATCH 6*
Rule 1.18	Duties to Prospective Clients *BATCH 6*
Rule 2.1	Advisor
Rule 2.4	Lawyer as a Third-Party Neutral
Rule 2.4.1	Lawyer as a Temporary Judge
Rule 3.1	Meritorious Claims
Rule 3.3	Candor Toward the Tribunal
Rule 3.4	Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel
Rule 3.5	Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal
Rule 3.6	Trial Publicity
Rule 3.7	Lawyer As A Witness

2010 Board of Directors

President

Patrick L. Hosey

President-Elect

Dan F. Link

Vice-Presidents

Elizabeth S. Balfour
Thomas M. Buchenau
John H. Gomez
Marvin E. Mizell
Timothy J. Richardson

Secretary

Marcella O. McLaughlin

Treasurer

Duane S. Horning

Directors

Christopher M. Alexander
Tina M. Fryar
Jeffrey A. Joseph
Margo I. Lewis
James E. Lund
Nory R. Pascua
Gita M. Varughese
Jon R. Williams

**Young/New Lawyer
Representative**

Kristin E. Rizzo

Immediate Past President

Jerrilyn T. Malana

Executive Director

Ellen Miller-Sharp

**ABA House of Delegates
Representatives**

William E. Grauer
Monty A. McIntyre

**State Bar Board of Governors
District Nine Representative**

Wells B. Lyman

**Conference of California
Bar Associations
District Nine Representative**

James W. Talley

Rule 3.8	Special Responsibilities of a Prosecutor
Rule 3.9	Advocate in Non-adjudicative Proceedings *BATCH 6*
Rule 3.10	Threatening Criminal, Administrative, or Disciplinary Charges
Rule 4.1	Truthfulness in Statements to Others *BATCH 6*
Rule 4.2	Communication with a Person Represented by Counsel
Rule 4.3	Dealing with Unrepresented Person
Rule 4.4	Respect for Rights of Third Persons *BATCH 6*
Rule 5.1	Responsibilities of Partners, Managers, and Supervisory Lawyers
Rule 5.2	Responsibilities of a Subordinate Lawyer
Rule 5.3	Responsibilities Regarding Nonlawyer Assistants
Rule 5.3.1	Employment of Disbarred, Suspended, Resigned, or Involuntarily Inactive Member
Rule 5.4	Duty to Avoid Interference with a Lawyer's Professional Independence
Rule 5.5	Unauthorized Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice
Rule 5.6	Restrictions on Right to Practice
Rule 6.1	Voluntary Pro Bono Publico Service *BATCH 6*
Rule 6.2	Accepting Appointments *BATCH 6*
Rule 6.3	Legal Services Organizations
Rule 6.4	Law Reform Activities
Rule 6.5	Limited Legal Services Programs *BATCH 6*
Rule 7.1	Communications Concerning the Availability of Legal Services
Rule 7.2	Advertising
Rule 7.3	Direct Contact with Prospective Clients
Rule 7.4	Communication of Fields of Practice and Specialization
Rule 7.5	Firm Names and Letterheads
Rule 8.1	False Statement Regarding Application for Admission to Practice
Rule 8.1.1	Compliance with Conditions of Discipline and Agreements in Lieu of Discipline
Rule 8.2	Judicial and Legal Officials; Lawyer as a Candidate or Applicant for Judicial Office *BATCH 6*
Rule 8.3	Reporting Professional Misconduct
Rule 8.4	Misconduct
Rule 8.4.1	Prohibited Discrimination in Law Practice Management and Operation
Rule 8.5	Disciplinary Authority; Choice of Law

Dear Ms. Hollins:

This letter constitutes the San Diego County Bar Association's response to The State Bar of California's Request for Public Comment on the foregoing proposed rules of Professional Conduct.

The SDCBA reconfirms previous responses to each of the foregoing proposed rules.

Very truly yours,



Patrick L. Hosey, President
San Diego County Bar Association

SDCBA Legal Ethics Committee
Comments to Revisions to Rules of Professional Conduct (RPC)
BATCH #4, Comment Deadline October 23, 2009
SDCBA Legal Ethics Committee Deadline September 22, 2009
Subcommittee Deadline August 31, 2009

LEC Rule Volunteer Name(s): Frank L. Tobin

Old Rule No./Title: 3-310(D)/Avoiding the Representation of Adverse Interests

Proposed New Rule No./ Title: 1.8.7/Aggregate Settlements

QUESTIONS (please use separate sheets of paper as necessary):

(1) Is the **policy** behind the new rule correct? If “yes,” please proceed to the next question. If “no,” please elaborate, and proceed to Question #4.
Yes No

(2) Is the new rule **practical** for attorneys to follow? If “yes,” please proceed to the next question. If “no,” please elaborate, and then proceed to the Conclusions section.
Yes No

(3) Is the new rule **worded correctly and clearly**? If “yes, please proceed to the Conclusions section. If “no,” please elaborate, and then proceed to the Conclusions section.
Yes No The second sentence of the new rule is not clear. The second sentence reads:

The lawyer’s disclosure shall include, among other things, the existence and nature of all the claims or pleas involved and of the participation of each person in the settlement.

By using the language “among other things”, the second sentence is vague and not inclusive of all of the items that must be in the disclosure. The second sentence does not specifically define what exactly must be covered when disclosing the existence and nature of all of the claims and pleas. This could lead to confusion as to the extent of what should be disclosed. One of the committee members, specifically in comments contained in February 25 and 27, 2009 emails from Melchior, expressed concerns that this sentence may create the requirement of drafting a treatise with regard to explaining “the nature of the claims involved.” I have attached these emails. I tend to agree that in cases where a large number of claims and defenses are included, this language is confusing as to what is actually required when providing a written disclosure as to each claim and defense involved. Because of the lack of clarity and because the sentence does not otherwise list all of the items that must be included in the disclosure,¹ I recommend taking the second sentence out as unnecessary and likely to cause confusion. Once taken out, the proposed rule becomes very similar to existing Rule 3-310(D). In addition, if the second sentence of the new rule is taken out, then the sentence in Comment [3] that refers to the requirement in the second sentence should be revised as follows: “In making written disclosure to each client of the existence and nature of ~~all~~ the claims or defenses involved and of the participation of each person in the settlement, as is required by this Rule in obtaining

¹ By using the language “among other things”, there are presumably items that must be in the written disclosure that are not expressly set forth in the body of the new rule.

informed written consent, the lawyer ordinarily must include the material terms of the settlement, what each of the lawyer's clients would receive or pay if the settlement were accepted, and the method by which expenses (including any expenses already paid by the lawyer and any expenses to be paid out of the settlement proceeds) would be apportioned among them." This change which omits the word "all" addresses the concern about being required to write a treatise and allows more flexibility when disclosing the nature and existence of the claims or defenses.

(4) Is the policy behind the existing rule correct? If "yes," please proceed to the Conclusions section. If "no," please elaborate, and then proceed to the Conclusions section.

Yes No

(5) Do you have any other comments about the proposed rule? If so, please elaborate here: See above.

The first sentence of the new rule and Rule 3-310(D) are very similar. Rule 3-310(D) provides: "A member who represents two or more clients shall not enter into an aggregate settlement of the claims of or against the clients without the informed written consent of each client." The first sentence of the new rule provides:

A lawyer who represents two or more clients shall not participate in making an aggregate settlement of the claims of or against the clients, or in a criminal case an aggregate agreement as to guilty or nolo contendere pleas, unless each client gives informed written consent.

Unlike Rule 3-310(D), the first sentence of the new rule clarifies that it applies to aggregate agreements as to guilty or nolo contendere pleas in criminal matters. Otherwise, the new rule and Rule 3-310(D) are consistent. I recommend approving the new rule modified by omission of the second sentence and revision of the sentence in Comment [3] as explained above.

CONCLUSIONS (pick one):

We approve the new rule in its entirety.

We approve the new rule with modifications.*

We disapprove the new rule and support keeping the old rule.

We disapprove the new rule and recommend a rule entirely different from either the old or new rule.*

We abstain from voting on the new rule but submit comments for your consideration.*

* If you select one of the * options, please make sure your concerns are included in your comments above in response to Questions 1-5, or set the forth on a separate sheet of paper.



**THE STATE BAR OF
CALIFORNIA**

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL
ENFORCEMENT
Russell G. Weiner, Interim Chief Trial Counsel

180 HOWARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-1639

TELEPHONE: (415) 538-2000

TDD: (415) 538-2231

FACSIMILE: (415) 538-2220

<http://www.calbar.ca.gov>

DIRECT DIAL: (415) 538-2063

June 15, 2010

Audrey Hollins, Director
Office of Professional Competence, Planning &
Development
State Bar of California
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, California 94105

re: Comments of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel to Proposed
Amendments to the Rules of Professional Conduct

Dear Ms. Hollins:

Preliminarily, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel (OCTC) would like to thank Harry B. Sondheim, Chair, Mark L. Tuft and Paul W. Vapnek, Co-Vice-Chairs, and the members of the Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct, for the opportunity to submit comments to the proposed amendments to the Rules of Professional Conduct, as released for public comment by the Board of Governors. We appreciate the Commission's considerable efforts in crafting rules of conduct for California attorneys relevant to our contemporary legal environment. While we concur with many of the Commission's recommendations, we raise some points of disagreement. Our disagreement is offered in the spirit of aiding in the adoption of rules which can be practically and fairly understood by the attorneys in this state and applied in a uniform fashion by both this Office and the State Bar Court. While OCTC has submitted comments in the past to some of these rules as they were initially submitted,¹ we welcome this opportunity to comment on the entire set of rules and in context. Further, there have been changes to the proposed rules since our original comments.² We hope you find our thoughts helpful.

SUMMARY

We summarize our main concerns as follows:

- Some of the rules are becoming too complicated and long, making them difficult to understand and enforce;
- There are way too many Comments to the Rules, making the rules unwieldy, confusing, and

¹ OCTC refers the Commission to its previous comments and recommendations.

² We are not commenting on the rules that were not recommended or tentatively adopted by the Board of Governors (BOG).

difficult to read, understand, and enforce. Many of the Comments are more appropriate for treatises, law review articles, and ethics opinions. The Comments clutter and overwhelm the rules. We recommend that most of the Comments be stricken or that the Rules be adopted without the Comments;

- Many of the Comments are too large and thus bury the information sought to be presented;
- Several of the Comments are in our opinion legally incorrect (i.e. Comment 9 of Rule 1.8.1 and Comment 5 of rule 1.9);
- One of the Comments invades OCTC's prosecutory discretion (i.e. Comment 6 of Rule 8.4);
- Some of the rules are confusing and inconsistent with the State Bar Act (i.e. that an attorney's misrepresentation to a court cannot be based on gross negligence);
- Some of the rules attempt to define and limit provisions adopted by the Legislature in the State Bar Act (i.e. Rule 1.6's defining the scope of confidentiality in Business & Professions Code section 6068(e)); and
- Some of the proposed rules deviate unnecessarily from the ABA Model Rules (i.e. proposed rules 3.9, 4.4 and 8.4).³

GENERAL COMMENTS

OCTC finds many of the proposed rules too lengthy and complicated, often making them difficult to understand and enforce. There are way too many Comments to the Rules, making the rules unwieldy, confusing, and difficult to read, understand, and enforce. We would strongly suggest that the rules be simplified and the Comments either be significantly reduced or entirely eliminated. Otherwise, it is hard to imagine the attorneys of this state reading and understanding the entirety of the rules and official Comments. Further, we believe that some of the Comments are legally incorrect.

The Rules and Comments are not meant to be annotated rules, a treatise on the rules, a series of ethics opinions, a law review article, or musings and discussions about the rules and best practices. There are other more appropriate vehicles for such discussions and expositions.

Every attorney is required to know and understand the Rules of Professional Conduct. This is why ignorance of a rule is no defense in a State Bar proceeding. (See *Zitny v. State Bar* (1966) 64 Cal.2d 787, 793.) Yet, the proposed rules (including Comments) are 99 pages; contain 68 rules; and almost 500 Comments. One rule alone has 38 Comments.⁴

In contrast, the current rules are 30 pages; contain 46 rules; and 94 comments.⁵ The 1974 rules were 13 pages; contained 25 rules; and 6 comments.⁶ The original 1928 rules were 4 pages long; contained 17 rules; and had no comments.

³ Unless stated otherwise, all future references to section are to a section of the Business & Professions Code; all references to rule are to the current Rules of Professional Conduct; all references to proposed rule is to the Commission's proposed Rule of Professional Conduct; and all references to the Model Rules are to the ABA's current Model Rules of Professional Conduct.

⁴ See proposed rule 1.7. Another rule has 26 comments. (See proposed rule 1.6.)

⁵ The current rules list them as Discussion paragraphs; most are unnumbered, but OCTC estimates there are 94 paragraphs of discussion and will refer to them as comments so that there is a standard reference.

⁶ The 1974 rules had 6 footnotes (*), four simply reference another rule and two contain a short substantive discussion.

Letter from OCTC
To Randall Difuntorum
June 15, 2010

Many of the proposed Comments appear to be nothing more than a rephrasing of the rule or an annotated version of the rule. If the rule is ambiguous or not clear enough, the solution should not be a Comment rephrasing the rule, but a redrafting of the rule so it is clear and understandable. Likewise, discussing the purpose of the rule, best practices, or the limits of the rule are not proper Comments to the rules. There are other better vehicles for such discussions. Lawyers can read and conduct legal research when needed.

In addition, the rules and Comments make too much use of references to other rules and Comments, making it hard to understand the rules. Some of the Comments are too long and, thus, bury information in a very long Comment. Other Comments appear to be legally incorrect. We would recommend that most of the Comments be stricken or that the Rules be adopted without the Comments. It is our understanding that about seven states have not adopted the ABA's Comments, although two of those still provide the ABA's comments as guidance.

We are also concerned that there are too many separate conflicts rules (see rules 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13(g), and 1.18) and they often incorporate each other, making it difficult to comprehend, understand, and enforce them.⁷

⁷ There is actually no Rule 1.8, but several separate rules, going from 1.8.1 through 1.8.11.

Letter from OCTC
To Randall Difuntorum
June 15, 2010

Rule 1.8.7. Aggregate Settlements.

1. OCTC supports the proposal to use the term “informed written consent” as that term is used in other California rules. However, OCTC finds the rule as written and the Commission’s Comments somewhat confusing, especially Comment 4, which is not in the ABA Model Rules. If the Commission is seeking to allow clients to agree that a neutral third-party may determine the allocation of the aggregate settlement that should be stated in the rule, not a comment.
2. OCTC thanks the commission for defining aggregate package deals in criminal cases in comment 1. Again, there are too many comments and they are too long. The ABA has only one comment on this subject, while these proposed rules have five comments. Comment 2 seems unnecessary in light of proposed rule 1.4. Comment 3 is too long and could be tightened.