



**THE STATE BAR  
OF CALIFORNIA**

180 HOWARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1639

**COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL  
RESPONSIBILITY AND CONDUCT**

TELEPHONE: (415) 538-2161

May 6, 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 6.3

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 6.3 - Legal Services Organizations. COPRAC supports the adoption of proposed Rule 6.3 and the Comments to the Rule.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Carole J. Buckner".

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

<b>Re:</b>	<b>TITLE</b>
<b>RULE</b>	
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*
<b>Rule 6.3</b>	<b>Legal Services Organizations</b>
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): \_\_\_\_\_ Gina Dronet \_\_\_\_\_

Old Rule No./Title: \_\_\_\_\_ None \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed New Rule No./ Title: \_\_\_\_\_ 6.3 Membership in Legal Service Organizations \_\_\_\_\_

**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 [  ]

(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:

Proposed Rule 6.3 deals with a subject not specifically addressed by the existing California Rules of Professional Conduct: a lawyer’s participation in a “legal service organization”.

Unfortunately, the proposed rule does not define “legal service organization(s)”. I could not find a definition of that exact term anywhere in the proposed rules, the State Bar rules, the California Codes, the Federal Statutes, the Code of Federal Regulations, the ABA Rules, or the Model Rules. (In addition, the term is confusingly similar to other terms of art such as “legal service corporations” governed by federal law to provide legal services to the poor, qualified employer

sponsored tax-exempt prepaid group legal plans under Internal Revenue Code sections 120 and 501 (c) 20, and lawyer referral services, which are not intended to be included in the proposed rule.)

Therefore, the proposed rule should be modified to include the intended definition of “legal service organization” by citing to the intended definition if one exists or defining the term in a new subsection (c) as follows:

(c) The term “legal service organization” means those defined in section(s) \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ [and/or the case of \_\_\_\_\_].

OR

(c) The term “legal service organization” means . . .

NOTE: Absent the intended definition, I cannot provide the proposed language for the modification. I believe a starting point is California Business & Professions Code section 6213 – 6215, which describe the organizations entitled to receive IOLTA funds under B&P sections 6210 – 6228, (legal service for the poor paid by interest earned on client trust accounts). For convenience, the relevant sections are set forth in the attachment. However, it is unclear whether the drafters intended to include those organizations that currently fall outside these sections because they are not subject to State Bar regulation but may be in the future. See, e.g., Frye v. Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc., (2006) 38 Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 23,40, which held that nonprofit public benefit corporations providing legal services to the public are not subject to existing regulations governing the practice of law by professional law corporations. The Supreme Court directed the State Bar to investigate such organizations and propose appropriate rules in 2006, which are being considered in the rules revision process.

**CONCLUSIONS (pick one):**

[ ] We approve the new rule in its entirety.

[ **X** ] 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.

Continuation Pages; Dronet Comments  
Proposed Rule 6.3 Membership in Legal Service Organization  
Batch #4, Proposed Amendments to CRPC

Business & Professions Code sections describing intended legal service organizations:

6213. As used in this article:

(a) "Qualified legal services project" means either of the following:

(1) A nonprofit project incorporated and operated exclusively in California which provides as its primary purpose and function legal services without charge to indigent persons and which has quality control procedures approved by the State Bar of California.

(2) A program operated exclusively in California by a nonprofit law school accredited by the State Bar of California which meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(A) The program shall have operated for at least two years at a cost of at least twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) per year as an identifiable law school unit with a primary purpose and function of providing legal services without charge to indigent persons.

(B) The program shall have quality control procedures approved by the State Bar of California.

(b) "Qualified support center" means an incorporated nonprofit legal services center that has as its primary purpose and function the provision of legal training, legal technical assistance, or advocacy support without charge and which actually provides through an office in California a significant level of legal training, legal technical assistance, or advocacy support without charge to qualified legal services projects on a statewide basis in California.

(c) "Recipient" means a qualified legal services project or support center receiving financial assistance under this article.

(d) "Indigent person" means a person whose income is (1) 125 percent or less of the current poverty threshold established by the United States Office of Management and Budget, or (2) who is eligible for Supplemental Security Income or free services under the Older Americans Act or Developmentally Disabled Assistance Act. With regard to a project that provides free services of attorneys in private practice without compensation, "indigent person" also means a person whose income is 75 percent or less of the maximum levels of income for lower income households as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code. For the purpose of this subdivision, the income of a person who is disabled shall be determined after deducting the costs of medical and other disability-related special expenses.

(e) "Fee generating case" means a case or matter that, if undertaken on behalf of an indigent person by an attorney in private practice, reasonably may be expected to result in payment of a fee for legal services from an award to a client, from public funds, or from the opposing party. A case shall not be considered fee generating if adequate representation is unavailable and any of the following circumstances exist:

(1) The recipient has determined that free referral is not possible because of any of the following reasons:

(A) The case has been rejected by the local lawyer referral service, or if there is no such service, by two attorneys in private practice who have experience in the subject matter of the case.

(B) Neither the referral service nor any attorney will consider the case without payment of a consultation fee.

(C) The case is of the type that attorneys in private practice in the area ordinarily do not accept, or do not accept without prepayment of a fee.

(D) Emergency circumstances compel immediate action before referral can be made, but the client is advised that, if appropriate and consistent with professional responsibility, referral will be attempted at a later time.

(2) Recovery of damages is not the principal object of the case and a request for damages is merely ancillary to an action for equitable or other nonpecuniary relief, or inclusion of a counterclaim requesting damages is necessary for effective defense or because of applicable rules governing joinder of counterclaims.

(3) A court has appointed a recipient or an employee of a recipient pursuant to a statute or a court rule or practice of equal applicability to all attorneys in the jurisdiction.

(4) The case involves the rights of a claimant under a publicly supported benefit program for which entitlement to benefit is based on need.

(f) "Legal Services Corporation" means the Legal Services Corporation established under the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-355; 42 U.S.C. Sec. 2996 et seq.).

(g) "Older Americans Act" means the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (P.L. 89-73; 42 U.S.C. Sec. 3001 et seq.).

(h) "Developmentally Disabled Assistance Act" means the Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, as amended (P.L. 94-103; 42 U.S.C. Sec. 6001 et seq.).

(i) "Supplemental security income recipient" means an individual receiving or eligible to receive payments under Title XVI of the federal Social Security Act, or payments under Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 12000) of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

(j) "IOLTA account" means an account or investment product established and maintained pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 6211 that is any of the following:

(1) An interest-bearing checking account.

(2) An investment sweep product that is a daily (overnight) financial institution repurchase agreement or an open-end money-market fund.

(3) An investment product authorized by California Supreme Court rule or order.

A daily financial institution repurchase agreement shall be fully collateralized by United States Government Securities or other comparably conservative debt securities, and may be established only with any eligible institution that is "well-capitalized" or "adequately capitalized" as those terms are defined by applicable federal statutes and regulations. An open-end money-market fund shall be invested solely in United States Government Securities or repurchase agreements fully collateralized by United States Government Securities or other comparably conservative debt securities, shall hold itself out as a "money-market fund" as that term is defined by federal statutes and regulations under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. Sec. 80a-1 et seq.), and, at the time of the investment, shall have total assets of at least two hundred fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000).

(k) "Eligible institution" means a bank or any other type of financial institution authorized by the Supreme Court.

6214. (a) Projects meeting the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 6213 which are funded either in whole or part by the Legal Services Corporation or with Older American Act funds shall be presumed qualified legal services projects for the purpose of this article.

(b) Projects meeting the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 6213 but not qualifying under the presumption specified in subdivision (a) shall qualify for funds under this article if they meet all of the following additional criteria:

(1) They receive cash funds from other sources in the amount of at least twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) per year to support free legal representation to indigent persons.

(2) They have demonstrated community support for the operation of a viable ongoing program.

(3) They provide one or both of the following special services:

(A) The coordination of the recruitment of substantial numbers of attorneys in private practice to provide free legal representation to indigent persons or to qualified legal services projects in California.

(B) The provision of legal representation, training, or technical assistance on matters concerning special client groups, including the elderly, the disabled, juveniles, and non-English-speaking groups, or on matters of specialized substantive law important to the special client groups.

6214.5. A law school program that meets the definition of a "qualified legal services project" as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 6213, and that applied to the State Bar for funding under this article not later than February 17, 1984, shall be deemed eligible for all distributions of funds made under Section 6216.

6215. (a) Support centers satisfying the qualifications specified in subdivision (b) of Section 6213 which were operating an office and providing services in California on December 31, 1980, shall be presumed to be qualified support centers for the purposes of this article.

(b) Support centers not qualifying under the presumption specified in subdivision (a) may qualify as a support center by meeting both of the following additional criteria:

(1) Meeting quality control standards established by the State Bar.

(2) Being deemed to be of special need by a majority of the qualified legal services projects.



**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,<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> OCTC refers the Commission to its previous comments and recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> 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).<sup>3</sup>

## 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.<sup>4</sup>

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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> See proposed rule 1.7. Another rule has 26 comments. (See proposed rule 1.6.)

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> 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 6.3. Membership in Legal Services Organization.**

1. OCTC supports this rule, but the Comments are more appropriate for treatises, law review articles, and ethics opinions.