

**Rule 1.7 [3-310] Conflict of Interest: Current Clients**  
**(Commission's Proposed Rule Adopted on March 31 – April 1, 2016**  
**– Clean Version)**

- (a) A lawyer shall not, without informed written consent\* from each client, represent a client if the representation is directly adverse to another client in the same or a separate matter.
- (b) A lawyer shall not, without informed written consent\* from each affected client, represent a client if there is a significant risk the lawyer's representation of the client will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to or relationships with another client, a former client or a third person,\* or the lawyer's own interests, including when:
  - (1) the lawyer has, or knows\* that another lawyer in the lawyer's firm\* has, a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with or responsibility to a party or witness in the same matter; or
  - (2) the lawyer:
    - (i) knows\* the lawyer previously had a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with a party or witness in the same matter; and
    - (ii) knows\* or reasonably should know\* the previous relationship will materially limit the lawyer's representation; or
  - (3) the lawyer has or had a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with another person\* or entity the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* will be affected substantially by resolution of the matter; or
  - (4) the lawyer has or had, or knows\* that another lawyer in the lawyer's firm\* has or had, a legal, business, financial, or personal interest in the subject matter of the representation that the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* will materially limit the lawyer's representation; or
  - (5) the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* that there is a reasonable\* likelihood that the interests of clients being represented by the lawyer in the same matter will conflict.
- (c) A lawyer shall not represent a client in a matter in which another party's lawyer is a spouse, parent, child, or sibling of the lawyer, lives with the lawyer, is a client of the lawyer, or has an intimate personal relationship with the lawyer, unless the lawyer informs the client in writing\* of the relationship.
- (d) Representation is permitted under this Rule only if:

- (1) the lawyer reasonably believes\* that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each affected client;
- (2) the representation is not prohibited by law; and
- (3) the representation does not involve the assertion of a claim by one client against another client represented by the lawyer in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal.

## Comment

[1] Loyalty and independent judgment are essential elements in the lawyer's relationship to a client. The duty of undivided loyalty to a current client prohibits undertaking representation directly adverse to that client without that client's informed written consent.\* Thus, absent consent, a lawyer may not act as an advocate in one matter against a person\* the lawyer represents in some other matter, even when the matters are wholly unrelated. See *Flatt v. Superior Court* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 275 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 537]. A directly adverse conflict under paragraph (a) occurs when: (i) a lawyer accepts representation of more than one client in a matter in which the interests of the clients actually conflict; or (ii) a lawyer, while representing a client, accepts in another matter the representation of a person\* or organization who, in the first matter, is directly adverse to the lawyer's client. Similarly, direct adversity can arise when a lawyer cross-examines a non-party witness who is the lawyer's client in another matter, if the examination is likely to harm or embarrass the witness. On the other hand, simultaneous representation in unrelated matters of clients whose interests are only economically adverse, such as representation of competing economic enterprises in unrelated litigation, does not ordinarily constitute a conflict of interest and thus may not require informed written consent\* of the respective clients.

[2] Paragraph (a) does not prohibit a lawyer from representing multiple clients having antagonistic positions on the same legal question that has arisen in different cases, unless the interests of any of the clients would be adversely affected by the resolution of the legal question. Factors relevant in determining whether the interests of one or more of the clients would be adversely affected, thus requiring that the clients provide informed written consent\* under paragraph (a), include: the courts and jurisdictions where the different cases are pending, whether a ruling in one case would have a precedential effect on the other case, whether the legal question is substantive or procedural, the temporal relationship between the matters, the significance of the legal question to the immediate and long-term interests of the clients involved, and the clients' reasonable\* expectations in retaining the lawyer.

[3] Paragraphs (a) and (b) apply to all types of legal representations, including the concurrent representation of multiple parties in litigation or in a single transaction or in some other common enterprise or legal relationship. Examples of the latter include the formation of a partnership for several partners\* or a corporation for several shareholders, the preparation of a pre-nuptial agreement, or joint or reciprocal wills for a husband and wife, or the resolution of an "uncontested" marital dissolution. If a lawyer

initially represents multiple clients with the informed written consent\* as required under paragraph (b), and circumstances later develop indicating that direct adversity exists between the clients, the lawyer must obtain further informed written consent\* of the clients under paragraph (a).

[4] In *State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Federal Insurance Company* (1999) 72 Cal.App. 4th 1422 [86 Cal.Rptr.2d 20], the court held that subparagraph (C)(3) of predecessor rule 3-310 was violated when a lawyer, retained by an insurer to defend one suit, and while that suit was still pending, filed a direct action against the same insurer in an unrelated action without securing the insurer's consent. Notwithstanding *State Farm*, paragraph (a) does not apply with respect to the relationship between an insurer and a lawyer when, in each matter, the insurer's interest is only as an indemnity provider and not as a direct party to the action.

[5] Even where there is no direct adversity, a conflict of interest requiring informed written consent\* under paragraph (b) exists if there is a significant risk that a lawyer's ability to consider, recommend or carry out an appropriate course of action for the client will be materially limited as a result of the lawyer's other responsibilities or interests. For example, a lawyer's obligations to two or more clients in the same matter, such as several individuals seeking to form a joint venture, may materially limit the lawyer's ability to recommend or advocate all possible positions that each might take because of the lawyer's duty of loyalty to the other clients. The risk is that the lawyer may not be able to offer alternatives that would otherwise be available to each of the clients. The mere possibility of subsequent harm does not itself require disclosure and informed written consent.\* The critical questions are the likelihood that a difference in interests exists or will eventuate and, if it does, whether it will materially interfere with the lawyer's independent professional judgment in considering alternatives or foreclose courses of action that reasonably\* should be pursued on behalf of each client.

[6] Other rules and laws may preclude the disclosures necessary to obtain the informed written consent\* or provide the information required to permit representation under this Rule. (See, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(e)(1) and Rule 1.6.) If such disclosure is precluded, representation subject to paragraph (a), (b), or (c) of this Rule is likewise precluded.

[7] Paragraph (d) imposes conditions that must be satisfied even if informed written consent\* is obtained as required by paragraphs (a) or (b) or the lawyer has informed the client in writing\* as required by paragraph (c). There are some matters in which the conflicts are such that even informed written consent\* may not suffice to permit representation. (See *Woods v. Superior Court* (1983) 149 Cal.App.3d 931 [197 Cal.Rptr. 185]; *Klemm v. Superior Court* (1977) 75 Cal.App.3d 893 [142 Cal.Rptr. 509]; *Ishmael v. Millington* (1966) 241 Cal.App.2d 520 [50 Cal.Rptr. 592].)

[8] This Rule does not preclude an informed written consent\* to a future conflict in compliance with applicable case law. The effectiveness of an advance consent is generally determined by the extent to which the client reasonably\* understands the material risks that the consent entails. The more comprehensive the explanation of the

types of future representations that might arise and the actual and reasonably\* foreseeable adverse consequences to the client of those representations, the greater the likelihood that the client will have the requisite understanding. An advance consent cannot be effective if the circumstances that materialize in the future make the conflict nonconsentable under paragraph (d). A lawyer who obtains from a client an advance consent that complies with this Rule will have all the duties of a lawyer to that client except as expressly limited by the consent. A lawyer cannot obtain an advance consent to incompetent representation. See Rule 1.8.8.

[9] A material change in circumstances relevant to application of this Rule may trigger a requirement to make new disclosures and, where applicable, obtain new informed written consents.\* In the absence of such consents, depending on the circumstances, the lawyer may have the option to withdraw from one or more of the representations in order to avoid the conflict. The lawyer must seek court approval where necessary and take steps to minimize harm to the clients. See Rule 1.16. The lawyer must continue to protect the confidences of the clients from whose representation the lawyer has withdrawn. See Rule 1.9(c).

[10] For special rules governing membership in a legal service organization, see Rule 6.3; and for work in conjunction with certain limited legal services programs, see Rule 6.5.

**PROPOSED RULE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT 1.7**  
**(Current Rule 3-310(B), (C))**  
**Conflict of Interest: Current Client**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct (“Commission”) has evaluated current rule 3-310 (Avoiding the Representation of Adverse Interests) in accordance with the Commission Charter, with a focus on the function of the rule as a disciplinary standard, and with the understanding that the rule comments should be included only when necessary to explain a rule and not for providing aspirational guidance. In addition, the Commission considered the national standard of the American Bar Association (“ABA”) counterparts, a series of rules that address conflicts of interest as they might arise in a number of different situations: Model Rules 1.7 (Current Client Conflicts); 1.8(f) (third party payments); 1.8(g) (aggregate settlements); and 1.9 (Duties To Former Clients).

The result of the Commission’s evaluation is a two-fold recommendation for implementing:

- (1) the Model Rules’ framework of having separate rules that regulate different conflicts interest situations: proposed rules 1.7 (current clients), 1.8.6 (payments from one other than client), 1.8.7 (aggregate settlements) and 1.9 (former clients); and
- (2) proposed Rule 1.7 (conflicts of interest: current clients), which regulates conflicts situations that are currently regulated under rule 3-310(B) and (C). Proposed rule 1.7 represents an approach that is a “hybrid” of the California and ABA approaches to current client conflicts.

Proposed rule 1.7 has been adopted by the Commission for submission to the Board of Trustees for public comment authorization. A final recommended rule will follow the public comment process.

1. **Recommendation of the ABA Model Rule Conflicts Framework**. The rationale underlying the Commission’s recommendation of the ABA’s multiple-rule approach is its conclusion that such an approach should facilitate compliance with and enforcement of conflicts of interest principles. Among other things, separate rules should reduce confusion and provide out-of-state lawyers, who often practice in California under one of the multijurisdictional practice rules (9.45 to 9.48) with quick access to the rules governing their specific conflicts problem. At the same time, this approach will promote a national standard in how the different conflicts of interest principles are organized within the Rules.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Every other jurisdiction in the country has adopted the ABA conflicts rules framework. In addition to the identified provisions, the Model Rules also include Model Rule 1.8, which includes eight provisions in addition to paragraphs (d) and (f) that cover conflicts situations addressed by standalone California Rules (e.g., MR 1.8(a) is covered by California Rule 3-300 [Avoiding Interests Adverse To A Client] and MR 1.8(e) is covered by California Rule 4-210 [Payment of Personal or Business Expenses By Or For A Client].)

Further, the Model Rules also deal with concepts that are addressed by case law in California: Model Rules 1.10 (Imputation of Conflicts and Ethical Screening); 1.11 (Conflicts Involving Government Officers and Employees); and 1.12 (Conflicts Involving Former Judges and Judicial Employees). The Commission is currently studying those rules.

2. **Recommendation of the “hybrid” approach of proposed Rule 1.7.** The recommended “hybrid” approach involves merging the “checklist approach”<sup>2</sup> of regulating conflicts involving current clients in current rule 3-310(B) and (C) with the ABA Model Rule’s approach, which generally describes two kinds of conflict situations relating to current clients: (1) those involving direct adversity, (MR 1.7(a)(1)), and (2) those involving a significant risk that a lawyer’s representation of current clients will be materially limited by the lawyer’s responsibilities to another client or third person, or by the lawyer’s personal interests. (MR 1.7(a)(2)).

There are a number of reasons for the Commission’s recommendation. *First*, a hybrid rule will facilitate compliance with enforcement of the current client conflicts rule provisions by incorporating more clearly-stated general conflicts principles, (see paragraph (a) and introductory clause to paragraph (b)), while providing specific examples (“checklist items”) within the latter category that carry forward the current California Rule requirements. These listed requirements in turn clarify how situations that violate those principles might be recognized in practice. *Second*, the hybrid approach will also increase client protection by including the generally-stated conflicts principles that are subject to regulation under the rule, rather than limiting the rule’s application to several discrete situations as in current rule 3-310(B) and (C). *Third*, by incorporating the generally-stated principles in Model Rule 1.7(a)(1) and (2) into paragraphs (a) and (b), the proposed rule will help promote a national standard in conflicts of interest. *Fourth*, by incorporating the provisions in Model Rule 1.7(b)(1) – (3) concerning unconsentable conflicts into proposed paragraph (d), the proposed rule will move this important concept into the black letter rather than relegate it to two separate Discussion paragraphs in the current rule (see rule 3-310, Discussion paragraphs 2 and 10).

**Informed written consent.** In addition to the foregoing considerations, the Commission recommends carrying forward California’s more client-protective requirement that a lawyer obtain the client’s “informed written consent,” which requires written disclosure of the potential adverse consequences of the client consenting to a conflicted representation. The Model Rules, on the other hand, employ a less-strict requirement of requiring only “informed consent, confirmed in writing.” That standard permits a lawyer to confirm by email or even text message that the client has consented to a conflict.

Paragraph (a) of proposed Rule 1.7 incorporates the concept of direct adversity of interests of two current clients. This carries forward the concept in current rule 3-310(C)(2) and (3), and Model Rule 1.7(a)(1).

Paragraph (b) incorporates the concept of material limitations on a lawyer’s representation of a client because of duties owed another current or former client, or because a relationship with a client or other person. The paragraph borrows the language of Model Rule 1.7(a)(2) in carrying forward the concepts found in current rule 3-310(B) and (C)(1). Subparagraphs (b)(1) through (b)(5) are the provisions that warrant the characterization of the proposed rule as a “hybrid” as these are derived from current rule 3-310 “checklist” of specified conflicts that trigger the current rule. In the proposed rule, these are nonexclusive examples of interests and relationships that result in a material limitation and require that the lawyer obtain informed written consent.

Paragraph (c) carries forward the concept in current rule 3-320. Similar to paragraph (b), this paragraph is concerned with limitations on the lawyer’s ability to represent a client because of

---

<sup>2</sup> The “checklist” approach in current rule 3-310(B) and (C) involves the identification of discrete categories of current conflict situations. Unless an alleged conflict fits within one of these discrete categories, the lawyers involved will not be subject to discipline.

the lawyer's relationships with an opposing party's lawyer. The situation is not included in paragraph (b) because the Commission believes that the standard in current rule 3-320 – the lawyer must only “inform” the client of the relationship – should be carried forward, rather than applying paragraph (b)'s “informed written consent” standard.

Paragraph (d) incorporates the provisions in Model Rule 1.7(b)(1) – (3) concerning unconsentable conflicts. The concept is currently found in two separate Discussion paragraphs of current rule 3-310 (paragraphs 2 and 10).

Unlike the Model Rule with 35 comments, there are only 10 comments to proposed Rule 1.7, all of which provide interpretative guidance or clarify how the proposed rule, which is intended to govern a broad array of complex conflicts situations, should be applied. Comment [1] explains “direct adversity” of legal interests and importantly distinguishes clients with economically adverse interests. Comment [2] explains when adverse positions clients have taken on a legal issue may require a lawyer to obtain the clients' informed written consent. Comment [2] carries forward the concept in current rule 3-310, Discussion ¶.7, and explains the rule's application to joint client representations. Comment [4] carries forward current Discussion ¶.9, which the Supreme Court approved in 2002 after extensive debate among various stakeholders in the insurance industry. Comment [5] explains how paragraph (b) should be applied by providing several discrete examples. Comment [6] crucially explains that a lawyer's duty of confidentiality may preclude the lawyer from providing a disclosure sufficient to ensure the client's consent is informed. Comment [7] carries forward the substance of current Discussion ¶¶.2 and 10 concerning unconsentable conflicts and provides citations to several cases that have addressed the issue. Comment [8] is new and provides interpretative guidance regarding paragraphs (a) and (b) regarding the extent to which they might apply to advance consents to future conflicts of interest. Comment [9] notes that a second consent may be required should the circumstances under which a consent was originally obtained change. Comment [10] provides cross-references to proposed Rules 6.3 and 6.5, both of which permit otherwise conflicted representations or provide exceptions for imputation under certain conditions.

**Rule 1.7 [3-310] ~~Avoiding the Representation of Adverse Interests~~  
Conflict of Interest: Current Clients  
(Redline Comparison of the Proposed Rule to Current California Rule**

~~(A) For purposes of this rule:~~

~~(1) “Disclosure” means informing the client or former client of the relevant circumstances and of the actual and reasonably foreseeable adverse consequences to the client or former client;~~

~~(2) “Informed written consent” means the client’s or former client’s written agreement to the representation following written disclosure;~~

~~(3) “Written” means any writing as defined in Evidence Code section 250.~~

(a) A lawyer shall not, without informed written consent\* from each client, represent a client if the representation is directly adverse to another client in the same or a separate matter.

(b) A lawyer shall not, without informed written consent\* from each affected client, represent a client if there is a significant risk the lawyer’s representation of the client will be materially limited by the lawyer’s responsibilities to or relationships with another client, a former client or a third person,\* or the lawyer’s own interests, including when:

~~(B) A member shall not accept or continue representation of a client without providing written disclosure to the client where:~~

~~(1) The member has~~ the lawyer has, or knows\* that another lawyer in the lawyer’s firm\* has, a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with or responsibility to a party or witness in the same matter; or

~~(2) the lawyer:~~ The member knows or reasonably should know that:

~~(a)(i)~~ knows\* the ~~member~~ lawyer previously had a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with a party or witness in the same matter; and

~~(b)(ii)~~ knows\* or reasonably should know\* the previous relationship ~~would substantially affect the member’s~~ will materially limit the lawyer’s representation; or

~~(3) The member~~ the lawyer has or had a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with another person\* or entity the ~~member~~ lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* ~~would~~ will be affected substantially by resolution of the matter; or

- (4) ~~The member~~the lawyer has or had, or knows\* that another lawyer in the lawyer's firm\* has or had, a legal, business, financial, or ~~professional~~personal interest in the subject matter of the representation, ~~that the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* will materially limit the lawyer's representation; or~~
- (5) the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* that there is a reasonable\* likelihood that the interests of clients being represented by the lawyer in the same matter will conflict.

~~(C) — A member shall not, without the informed written consent of each client:~~

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

(d) Representation is permitted under this Rule only if:

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

(2) the representation is not prohibited by law; and

~~(1)~~(3) the representation does not involve the assertion of a claim by one client against another client represented by the lawyer in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal.~~Accept representation of more than one client in a matter in which the interests of the clients potentially conflict; or~~

~~(2) — Accept or continue representation of more than one client in a matter in which the interests of the clients actually conflict; or~~

~~(3) — Represent a client in a matter and at the same time in a separate matter accept as a client a person or entity whose interest in the first matter is adverse to the client in the first matter.~~

~~(D) — 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.~~

~~(E) — A member shall not, without the informed written consent of the client or former client, accept employment adverse to the client or former client where, by reason of the representation of the client or former client, the member has obtained confidential information material to the employment.~~

~~(F) — A member shall not accept compensation for representing a client from one other than the client unless:~~

- ~~(1) — There is no interference with the member's independence of professional judgment or with the client-lawyer relationship; and~~
- ~~(2) — Information relating to representation of the client is protected as required by Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivision (e); and~~
- ~~(3) — The member obtains the client's informed written consent, provided that no disclosure or consent is required if:
  - ~~(a) — such nondisclosure is otherwise authorized by law; or~~
  - ~~(b) — the member is rendering legal services on behalf of any public agency which provides legal services to other public agencies or the public.~~~~

### **Discussion**Comment

[1] Loyalty and independent judgment are essential elements in the lawyer's relationship to a client. The duty of undivided loyalty to a current client prohibits undertaking representation directly adverse to that client without that client's informed written consent.\* Thus, absent consent, a lawyer may not act as an advocate in one matter against a person\* the lawyer represents in some other matter, even when the matters are wholly unrelated. See *Flatt v. Superior Court* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 275 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 537]. A directly adverse conflict under paragraph (a) occurs when: (i) a lawyer accepts representation of more than one client in a matter in which the interests of the clients actually conflict; or (ii) a lawyer, while representing a client, accepts in another matter the representation of a person\* or organization who, in the first matter, is directly adverse to the lawyer's client. Similarly, direct adversity can arise when a lawyer cross-examines a non-party witness who is the lawyer's client in another matter, if the examination is likely to harm or embarrass the witness. On the other hand, simultaneous representation in unrelated matters of clients whose interests are only economically adverse, such as representation of competing economic enterprises in unrelated litigation, does not ordinarily constitute a conflict of interest and thus may not require informed written consent\* of the respective clients.

~~Rule 3-310 is not intended to prohibit a member from representing parties having antagonistic positions on the same legal question that has arisen in different cases, unless representation of either client would be adversely affected.~~

[2] Paragraph (a) does not prohibit a lawyer from representing multiple clients having antagonistic positions on the same legal question that has arisen in different cases, unless the interests of any of the clients would be adversely affected by the resolution of the legal question. Factors relevant in determining whether the interests of one or more of the clients would be adversely affected, thus requiring that the clients provide informed written consent\* under paragraph (a), include: the courts and jurisdictions where the different cases are pending, whether a ruling in one case would have a precedential effect on the other case, whether the legal question is substantive or procedural, the temporal relationship between the matters, the significance of the

legal question to the immediate and long-term interests of the clients involved, and the clients' reasonable\* expectations in retaining the lawyer.

~~Other rules and laws may preclude making adequate disclosure under this rule. If such disclosure is precluded, informed written consent is likewise precluded. (See, e.g., Business and Professions Code section 6068, subdivision (e).)~~

~~Paragraph (B) is not intended to apply to the relationship of a member to another party's lawyer. Such relationships are governed by rule 3-320.~~

~~Paragraph (B) is not intended to require either the disclosure of the new engagement to a former client or the consent of the former client to the new engagement. However, both disclosure and consent are required if paragraph (E) applies.~~

~~While paragraph (B) deals with the issues of adequate disclosure to the present client or clients of the member's present or past relationships to other parties or witnesses or present interest in the subject matter of the representation, paragraph (E) is intended to protect the confidences of another present or former client. These two paragraphs are to apply as complementary provisions.~~

~~Paragraph (B) is intended to apply only to a member's own relationships or interests, unless the member knows that a partner or associate in the same firm as the member has or had a relationship with another party or witness or has or had an interest in the subject matter of the representation.~~

~~Subparagraphs (C)(1) [3] Paragraphs (a) and (C)(2) are intended to b apply to all types of legal employment representations, including the concurrent representation of multiple parties in litigation or in a single transaction or in some other common enterprise or legal relationship. Examples of the latter include the formation of a partnership for several partners\* or a corporation for several shareholders, the preparation of ~~an ante-nuptial~~ a pre-nuptial agreement, or joint or reciprocal wills for a husband and wife, or the resolution of an "uncontested" marital dissolution. ~~In such situations, for the sake of convenience or economy, the parties may well prefer to employ a single counsel, but a member must disclose the potential adverse aspects of such multiple representation (e.g., Evid. Code, §962) and must obtain~~ if a lawyer initially represents multiple clients with the informed written consent\* of as required under paragraph (b), and circumstances later develop indicating that direct adversity exists between the clients ~~thereto pursuant to subparagraph (C)(1). Moreover, if the potential adversity should become actual, the member, the lawyer~~ must obtain ~~the~~ further informed written consent\* of the clients pursuant to subparagraph under paragraph (C)(2a).~~

~~Subparagraph (C)(3) is intended to apply to representations of clients in both litigation and transactional matters.—~~

[4] In *State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Federal Insurance Company* (1999) 72 Cal.App. 4th 1422 [86 Cal.Rptr.2d 20], the court held that subparagraph (C)(3) of predecessor rule 3-310 was violated when a member lawyer, retained by an insurer to defend one suit, and while that suit was still pending, filed a

direct action against the same insurer in an unrelated action without securing the insurer's consent. Notwithstanding *State Farm*, ~~subparagraph (C)(3) is not intended to~~ paragraph (a) does not apply with respect to the relationship between an insurer and a ~~member~~ lawyer when, in each matter, the insurer's interest is only as an indemnity provider and not as a direct party to the action.

[5] Even where there is no direct adversity, a conflict of interest requiring informed written consent\* under paragraph (b) exists if there is a significant risk that a lawyer's ability to consider, recommend or carry out an appropriate course of action for the client will be materially limited as a result of the lawyer's other responsibilities or interests. For example, a lawyer's obligations to two or more clients in the same matter, such as several individuals seeking to form a joint venture, may materially limit the lawyer's ability to recommend or advocate all possible positions that each might take because of the lawyer's duty of loyalty to the other clients. The risk is that the lawyer may not be able to offer alternatives that would otherwise be available to each of the clients. The mere possibility of subsequent harm does not itself require disclosure and informed written consent.\* The critical questions are the likelihood that a difference in interests exists or will eventuate and, if it does, whether it will materially interfere with the lawyer's independent professional judgment in considering alternatives or foreclose courses of action that reasonably\* should be pursued on behalf of each client.

[6] Other rules and laws may preclude the disclosures necessary to obtain the informed written consent\* or provide the information required to permit representation under this Rule. (See, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(e)(1) and Rule 1.6.) If such disclosure is precluded, representation subject to paragraph (a), (b), or (c) of this Rule is likewise precluded.

[7] Paragraph (d) imposes conditions that must be satisfied even if informed written consent\* is obtained as required by paragraphs (a) or (b) or the lawyer has informed the client in writing\* as required by paragraph (c). There are some matters in which the conflicts are such that even informed written consent\* may not suffice ~~for non-disciplinary purposes~~ to permit representation. (See *Woods v. Superior Court* (1983) 149 Cal.App.3d 931 [197 Cal.Rptr. 185]; *Klemm v. Superior Court* (1977) 75 Cal.App.3d 893 [142 Cal.Rptr. 509]; *Ishmael v. Millington* (1966) 241 Cal.App.2d 520 [50 Cal.Rptr. 592].)

[8] This Rule does not preclude an informed written consent\* to a future conflict in compliance with applicable case law. The effectiveness of an advance consent is generally determined by the extent to which the client reasonably\* understands the material risks that the consent entails. The more comprehensive the explanation of the types of future representations that might arise and the actual and reasonably\* foreseeable adverse consequences to the client of those representations, the greater the likelihood that the client will have the requisite understanding. An advance consent cannot be effective if the circumstances that materialize in the future make the conflict nonconsentable under paragraph (d). A lawyer who obtains from a client an advance consent that complies with this Rule will have all the duties of a lawyer to that client

except as expressly limited by the consent. A lawyer cannot obtain an advance consent to incompetent representation. See Rule 1.8.8.

[9] A material change in circumstances relevant to application of this Rule may trigger a requirement to make new disclosures and, where applicable, obtain new informed written consents.\* In the absence of such consents, depending on the circumstances, the lawyer may have the option to withdraw from one or more of the representations in order to avoid the conflict. The lawyer must seek court approval where necessary and take steps to minimize harm to the clients. See Rule 1.16. The lawyer must continue to protect the confidences of the clients from whose representation the lawyer has withdrawn. See Rule 1.9(c).

[10] For special rules governing membership in a legal service organization, see Rule 6.3; and for work in conjunction with certain limited legal services programs, see Rule 6.5.

~~Paragraph (D) is not intended to apply to class action settlements subject to court approval.~~

~~Paragraph (F) is not intended to abrogate existing relationships between insurers and insureds whereby the insurer has the contractual right to unilaterally select counsel for the insured, where there is no conflict of interest. (See *San Diego Navy Federal Credit Union v. Cumis Insurance Society* (1984) 162 Cal.App.3d 358 [208 Cal.Rptr. 494].) (Amended by order of Supreme Court, operative September 14, 1992; operative March 3, 2003.)~~

**Rule 1.7 [3-310] Conflict of Interest: Current Clients  
(Redline Comparison of the Proposed Rule to ABA Model Rule)**

- (a) A lawyer shall not, without informed written consent\* from each client, represent a client if the representation is directly adverse to another client in the same or a separate matter.
- ~~(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest. A concurrent conflict of interest exists if:~~
- ~~(1) the representation of one client will be directly adverse to another client;  
or~~
- (2b) A lawyer shall not, without informed written consent\* from each affected client, represent a client if there is a significant risk that the lawyer's representation of ~~one or more clients~~the client will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to or relationships with another client, a former client or a third person,\* or ~~by a personal interest of the lawyer.~~the lawyer's own interests, including when:
- (1) the lawyer has, or knows\* that another lawyer in the lawyer's firm\* has, a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with or responsibility to a party or witness in the same matter; or
- (2) the lawyer:
- ~~(b) Notwithstanding the existence of a concurrent conflict of interest under paragraph (a), a lawyer may represent a client if:~~
- (i) knows\* the lawyer previously had a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with a party or witness in the same matter; and
- (ii) knows\* or reasonably should know\* the previous relationship will materially limit the lawyer's representation; or
- (3) the lawyer has or had a legal, business, financial, professional, or personal relationship with another person\* or entity the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* will be affected substantially by resolution of the matter; or
- (4) the lawyer has or had, or knows\* that another lawyer in the lawyer's firm\* has or had, a legal, business, financial, or personal interest in the subject matter of the representation that the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* will materially limit the lawyer's representation; or

(5) the lawyer knows\* or reasonably should know\* that there is a reasonable\* likelihood that the interests of clients being represented by the lawyer in the same matter will conflict.

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

(d) Representation is permitted under this Rule only if:

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

(2) the representation is not prohibited by law; and

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

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

## Comment

### *General Principles*

~~[1] Loyalty and independent judgment are essential elements in the lawyer's relationship to a client. Concurrent conflicts of interest can arise from the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or from the lawyer's own interests. For specific Rules regarding certain concurrent conflicts of interest, see Rule 1.8. For former client conflicts of interest, see Rule 1.9. For conflicts of interest involving prospective clients, see Rule 1.18. For definitions of "informed consent" and "confirmed in writing," see Rule 1.0(e) and (b).~~

~~[2] Resolution of a conflict of interest problem under this Rule requires the lawyer to: 1) clearly identify the client or clients; 2) determine whether a conflict of interest exists; 3) decide whether the representation may be undertaken despite the existence of a conflict, i.e., whether the conflict is consentable; and 4) if so, consult with the clients affected under paragraph (a) and obtain their informed consent, confirmed in writing. The clients affected under paragraph (a) include both of the clients referred to in paragraph (a)(1) and the one or more clients whose representation might be materially limited under paragraph (a)(2).~~

~~[3] A conflict of interest may exist before representation is undertaken, in which event the representation must be declined, unless the lawyer obtains the informed consent of each client under the conditions of paragraph (b). To determine whether a conflict of interest exists, a lawyer should adopt reasonable procedures, appropriate for the size and type of firm and practice, to determine in both litigation and non-~~

~~litigation matters the persons and issues involved. See also Comment to Rule 5.1. Ignorance caused by a failure to institute such procedures will not excuse a lawyer's violation of this Rule. As to whether a client-lawyer relationship exists or, having once been established, is continuing, see Comment to Rule 1.3 and Scope.~~

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

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

#### ~~*Identifying Conflicts of Interest: Directly Adverse*~~

~~[61] Loyalty and independent judgment are essential elements in the lawyer's relationship to a client. The duty of undivided loyalty to a current client prohibits undertaking representation directly adverse to that client without that client's informed written consent.\* Thus, absent consent, a lawyer may not act as an advocate in one matter against a person the lawyer represents in some other matter, even when the matters are wholly unrelated. The client as to whom See *Flatt v. Superior Court* (1994) 9 Cal.4th 275 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 537]. A directly adverse conflict under paragraph (a) occurs when: (i) a lawyer accepts representation of more than one client in a matter in which the interests of the clients actually conflict; or (ii) a lawyer, while representing a client, accepts in another matter the representation of a person\* or organization who, in the first matter, is directly adverse ~~is likely to feel betrayed, and the resulting damage to the client-lawyer relationship is likely to impair the lawyer's ability to represent the client effectively.~~ In addition, the client on whose behalf the adverse representation is undertaken reasonably may fear that the lawyer will pursue that client's case less effectively out of deference to the other client, i.e., that the representation may be materially limited by the lawyer's interest in retaining the current to the lawyer's client. Similarly, a directly adverse conflict may direct adversity can arise when a lawyer is required to cross-examine a client who appears as a witness in a lawsuit involving another client, as when the testimony will be damaging to the client who is represented in the lawsuit cross-examines a non-party witness who is the lawyer's client in another matter, if the examination is likely to harm or embarrass the witness. On the~~

other hand, simultaneous representation in unrelated matters of clients whose interests are only economically adverse, such as representation of competing economic enterprises in unrelated litigation, does not ordinarily constitute a conflict of interest and thus may not require informed written consent\* of the respective clients.

[2] Paragraph (a) does not prohibit a lawyer from representing multiple clients having antagonistic positions on the same legal question that has arisen in different cases, unless the interests of any of the clients would be adversely affected by the resolution of the legal question. Factors relevant in determining whether the interests of one or more of the clients would be adversely affected, thus requiring that the clients provide informed written consent\* under paragraph (a), include: the courts and jurisdictions where the different cases are pending, whether a ruling in one case would have a precedential effect on the other case, whether the legal question is substantive or procedural, the temporal relationship between the matters, the significance of the legal question to the immediate and long-term interests of the clients involved, and the clients' reasonable expectations in retaining the lawyer.

[3] Paragraphs (a) and (b) apply to all types of legal representations, including the concurrent representation of multiple parties in litigation or in a single transaction or in some other common enterprise or legal relationship. Examples of the latter include the formation of a partnership for several partners\* or a corporation for several shareholders, the preparation of a pre-nuptial agreement, or joint or reciprocal wills for a husband and wife, or the resolution of an “uncontested” marital dissolution. If a lawyer initially represents multiple clients with the informed written consent\* as required under paragraph (b), and circumstances later develop indicating that direct adversity exists between the clients, the lawyer must obtain further informed written consent\* of the clients under paragraph (a).

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

[4] In *State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Federal Insurance Company* (1999) 72 Cal.App. 4th 1422 [86 Cal.Rptr.2d 20], the court held that subparagraph (C)(3) of predecessor rule 3-310 was violated when a lawyer, retained by an insurer to defend one suit, and while that suit was still pending, filed a direct action against the same insurer in an unrelated action without securing the insurer's consent. Notwithstanding *State Farm*, paragraph (a) does not apply with respect to the relationship between an insurer and a lawyer when, in each matter, the insurer's interest is only as an indemnity provider and not as a direct party to the action.

#### *Identifying Conflicts of Interest: Material Limitation*

[85] Even where there is no direct ~~adverseness~~adversity, a conflict of interest requiring informed written consent\* under paragraph (b) exists if there is a significant

risk that a lawyer's ability to consider, recommend or carry out an appropriate course of action for the client will be materially limited as a result of the lawyer's other responsibilities or interests. For example, a ~~lawyer asked to represent~~ lawyer's obligations to two or more clients in the same matter, such as several individuals seeking to form a joint venture ~~is likely to be,~~ may materially ~~limited in~~ limit the ~~lawyer's~~ lawyer's ability to recommend or advocate all possible positions that each might take because of the ~~lawyer's~~ lawyer's duty of loyalty to the ~~others.~~ ~~The conflict in effect forecloses~~ other clients. The risk is that the lawyer may not be able to offer alternatives that would otherwise be available to each of the ~~client~~ clients. The mere possibility of subsequent harm does not itself require disclosure and informed written consent.\* The critical questions are the likelihood that a difference in interests exists or will eventuate and, if it does, whether it will materially interfere with the ~~lawyer's~~ lawyer's independent professional judgment in considering alternatives or foreclose courses of action that reasonably\* should be pursued on behalf of ~~the~~ each client.

[6] Other rules and laws may preclude the disclosures necessary to obtain the informed written consent\* or provide the information required to permit representation under this Rule. (See, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(e)(1) and Rule 1.6.) If such disclosure is precluded, representation subject to paragraph (a), (b), or (c) of this Rule is likewise precluded.

#### *Lawyer's Responsibilities to Former Clients and Other Third Persons*

[7] Paragraph (d) imposes conditions that must be satisfied even if informed written consent\* is obtained as required by paragraphs (a) or (b) or the lawyer has informed the client in writing\* as required by paragraph (c). There are some matters in which the conflicts are such that even informed written consent\* may not suffice to permit representation. (See *Woods v. Superior Court* (1983) 149 Cal.App.3d 931 [197 Cal.Rptr. 185]; *Klemm v. Superior Court* (1977) 75 Cal.App.3d 893 [142 Cal.Rptr. 509]; *Ishmael v. Millington* (1966) 241 Cal.App.2d 520 [50 Cal.Rptr. 592].)

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

#### *Personal Interest Conflicts*

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

~~pertaining to a number of personal interest conflicts, including business transactions with clients. See also Rule 1.10 (personal interest conflicts under Rule 1.7 ordinarily are not imputed to other lawyers in a law firm).~~

~~[11] When lawyers representing different clients in the same matter or in substantially related matters are closely related by blood or marriage, there may be a significant risk that client confidences will be revealed and that the lawyer's family relationship will interfere with both loyalty and independent professional judgment. As a result, each client is entitled to know of the existence and implications of the relationship between the lawyers before the lawyer agrees to undertake the representation. Thus, a lawyer related to another lawyer, e.g., as parent, child, sibling or spouse, ordinarily may **not represent a client in a matter** where that lawyer is representing another party, unless each client gives informed consent. The disqualification arising from a close family relationship is personal and ordinarily is not imputed to members of firms with whom the lawyers are associated. See Rule 1.10.~~

~~[12] A lawyer is prohibited from engaging in sexual relationships with a client unless the sexual relationship predates the formation of the client-lawyer relationship. See Rule 1.8(j).~~

#### ~~*Interest of Person Paying for a Lawyer's Service*~~

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

#### ~~*Prohibited Representations*~~

~~[14] Ordinarily, clients may consent to representation notwithstanding a conflict. However, as indicated in paragraph (b), some conflicts are nonconsentable, meaning that the lawyer involved cannot properly ask for such agreement or provide representation on the basis of the client's consent. When the lawyer is representing more than one client, the question of consentability must be resolved as to each client.~~

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

~~[16] Paragraph (b)(2) describes conflicts that are nonconsentable because the representation is prohibited by applicable law. For example, in some states substantive law provides that the same lawyer may not represent more than one defendant in a capital case, even with the consent of the clients, and under federal criminal statutes certain representations by a former government lawyer are prohibited, despite the informed consent of the former client. In addition, decisional law in some states limits the ability of a governmental client, such as a municipality, to consent to a conflict of interest.~~

~~[17] Paragraph (b)(3) describes conflicts that are nonconsentable because of the institutional interest in vigorous development of each client's position when the clients are aligned directly against each other in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal. Whether clients are aligned directly against each other within the meaning of this paragraph requires examination of the context of the proceeding. Although this paragraph does not preclude a lawyer's multiple representation of adverse parties to a mediation (because mediation is not a proceeding before a "tribunal" under Rule 1.0(m)), such representation may be precluded by paragraph (b)(1).~~

#### *~~Informed Consent~~*

~~[18] Informed consent requires that each affected client be aware of the relevant circumstances and of the material and reasonably foreseeable ways that the conflict could have adverse effects on the interests of that client. See Rule 1.0(e) (informed consent). The information required depends on the nature of the conflict and the nature of the risks involved. When representation of multiple clients in a single matter is undertaken, the information must include the implications of the common representation, including possible effects on loyalty, confidentiality and the attorney-client privilege and the advantages and risks involved. See Comments [30] and [31] (effect of common representation on confidentiality).~~

~~[19] Under some circumstances it may be impossible to make the disclosure necessary to obtain consent. For example, when the lawyer represents different clients in related matters and one of the clients refuses to consent to the disclosure necessary to permit the other client to make an informed decision, the lawyer cannot properly ask the latter to consent. In some cases the alternative to common representation can be that each party may have to obtain separate representation with the possibility of incurring additional costs. These costs, along with the benefits of securing separate representation, are factors that may be considered by the affected client in determining whether common representation is in the client's interests.~~

#### *~~Consent Confirmed in Writing~~*

~~[20] Paragraph (b) requires the lawyer to obtain the informed consent of the client, confirmed in writing. Such a writing may consist of a document executed by the client or one that the lawyer promptly records and transmits to the client following an oral consent. See Rule 1.0(b). See also Rule 1.0(n) (writing includes electronic~~

transmission). If it is not feasible to obtain or transmit the writing at the time the client gives informed consent, then the lawyer must obtain or transmit it within a reasonable time thereafter. See Rule 1.0(b). The requirement of a writing does not supplant the need in most cases for the lawyer to talk with the client, to explain the risks and advantages, if any, of representation burdened with a conflict of interest, as well as reasonably available alternatives, and to afford the client a reasonable opportunity to consider the risks and alternatives and to raise questions and concerns. Rather, the writing is required in order to impress upon clients the seriousness of the decision the client is being asked to make and to avoid disputes or ambiguities that might later occur in the absence of a writing.

### *Revoking Consent*

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

### *Consent to Future Conflict*

[228] Whether a lawyer may properly request a client to waive conflicts that might arise in the future is subject to the test of paragraph (b). This Rule does not preclude an informed written consent\* to a future conflict in compliance with applicable case law. The effectiveness of ~~such waivers~~an advance consent is generally determined by the extent to which the client reasonably understands the material risks that the ~~waiver~~consent entails. The more comprehensive the explanation of the types of future representations that might arise and the actual and reasonably\* foreseeable adverse consequences to the client of those representations, the greater the likelihood that the client will have the requisite understanding. ~~Thus, if the client agrees to consent to a particular type of conflict with which the client is already familiar, then the consent ordinarily will be effective with regard to that type of conflict. If the consent is general and open-ended, then the consent ordinarily will be ineffective, because it is not reasonably likely that the client will have understood the material risks involved. On the other hand, if the client is an experienced user of the legal services involved and is reasonably informed regarding the risk that a conflict may arise, such consent is more likely to be effective, particularly if, e.g., the client is independently represented by other counsel in giving consent and the consent is limited to future conflicts unrelated to the subject of the representation. In any case, An advance consent cannot be effective if the circumstances that materialize in the future are such as would make the conflict nonconsentable under paragraph (b).d). A lawyer who obtains from a client an advance consent that complies with this Rule will have all the duties of a lawyer to that client except as expressly limited by the consent. A lawyer cannot obtain an advance consent to incompetent representation. See Rule 1.8.8.~~

### *Conflicts in Litigation*

~~[23] Paragraph (b)(3) prohibits representation of opposing parties in the same litigation, regardless of the clients' consent. On the other hand, simultaneous representation of parties whose interests in litigation may conflict, such as coplaintiffs or codefendants, is governed by paragraph (a)(2). A conflict may exist by reason of substantial discrepancy in the parties' testimony, incompatibility in positions in relation to an opposing party or the fact that there are substantially different possibilities of settlement of the claims or liabilities in question. Such conflicts can arise in criminal cases as well as civil. The potential for conflict of interest in representing multiple defendants in a criminal case is so grave that ordinarily a lawyer should decline to represent more than one codefendant. On the other hand, common representation of persons having similar interests in civil litigation is proper if the requirements of paragraph (b) are met.~~

~~[24] Ordinarily a lawyer may take inconsistent legal positions in different tribunals at different times on behalf of different clients. The mere fact that advocating a legal position on behalf of one client might create precedent adverse to the interests of a client represented by the lawyer in an unrelated matter does not create a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest exists, however, if there is a significant risk that a lawyer's action on behalf of one client will materially limit the lawyer's effectiveness in representing another client in a different case; for example, when a decision favoring one client will create a precedent likely to seriously weaken the position taken on behalf of the other client. **Factors relevant in determining whether the clients need to be advised of the risk include: where the cases are pending, whether the issue is substantive or procedural, the temporal relationship between the matters, the significance of the issue to the immediate and long-term interests of the clients involved and the clients' reasonable expectations in retaining the lawyer.** If there is significant risk of material limitation, then absent informed consent of the affected clients, the lawyer must refuse one of the representations or withdraw from one or both matters.~~

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

### *Nonlitigation Conflicts*

~~[26] Conflicts of interest under paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) arise in contexts other than litigation. For a discussion of directly adverse conflicts in transactional matters, see Comment [7]. Relevant factors in determining whether there is significant potential for material limitation include the duration and intimacy of the lawyer's relationship with~~

~~the client or clients involved, the functions being performed by the lawyer, the likelihood that disagreements will arise and the likely prejudice to the client from the conflict. The question is often one of proximity and degree. See Comment [8].~~

~~[27] For example, conflict questions may arise in estate planning and estate administration. A lawyer may be called upon to prepare wills for several family members, such as husband and wife, and, depending upon the circumstances, a conflict of interest may be present. In estate administration the identity of the client may be unclear under the law of a particular jurisdiction. Under one view, the client is the fiduciary; under another view the client is the estate or trust, including its beneficiaries. In order to comply with conflict of interest rules, the lawyer should make clear the lawyer's relationship to the parties involved.~~

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

### *Special Considerations in Common Representation*

~~[29] In considering whether to represent multiple **clients in the same matter**, a lawyer should be mindful that if the common representation fails because the potentially adverse interests cannot be reconciled, the result can be additional cost, embarrassment and recrimination. Ordinarily, the lawyer will be forced to withdraw from representing all of the clients if the common representation fails. In some situations, the risk of failure is so great that multiple representation is plainly impossible. For example, a lawyer cannot undertake common representation of clients where contentious litigation or negotiations between them are imminent or contemplated. Moreover, because the lawyer is required to be impartial between commonly represented clients, representation of multiple clients is improper when it is unlikely that impartiality can be maintained. Generally, if the relationship between the parties has already assumed antagonism, the possibility that the clients' interests can be adequately served by common representation is not very good. Other relevant factors are whether the lawyer subsequently will represent both parties on a continuing basis and whether the situation involves creating or terminating a relationship between the parties.~~

~~[309] A particularly important factor in determining the appropriateness of common representation is the effect on client-lawyer confidentiality and the attorney-client privilege. With regard to the attorney-client privilege, the prevailing rule is that, as between commonly represented clients, the privilege does not attach. Hence, it must be assumed that if litigation eventuates between the clients, the privilege will not protect any such communications, and the clients should be so advised. material change in circumstances relevant to application of this Rule may trigger a requirement to make new disclosures and, where applicable, obtain new informed written consents.\* In the absence of such consents, depending on the circumstances, the lawyer may have the option to withdraw from one or more of the representations in order to avoid the conflict. The lawyer must seek court approval where necessary and take steps to minimize harm to the clients. See Rule 1.16. The lawyer must continue to protect the confidences of the clients from whose representation the lawyer has withdrawn. See Rule 1.9(c).~~

~~[10] For special rules governing membership in a legal service organization, see Rule 6.3; and for work in conjunction with certain limited legal services programs, see Rule 6.5.~~

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

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

~~[33] Subject to the above limitations, each client in the common representation has the right to loyal and diligent representation and the protection of Rule 1.9 concerning~~

~~the obligations to a former client. The client also has the right to discharge the lawyer as stated in Rule 1.16.~~

### *Organizational Clients*

~~[34] A lawyer who represents a corporation or other organization does not, by virtue of that representation, necessarily represent any constituent or affiliated organization, such as a parent or subsidiary. See Rule 1.13(a). Thus, the lawyer for an organization is not barred from accepting representation adverse to an affiliate in an unrelated matter, unless the circumstances are such that the affiliate should also be considered a client of the lawyer, there is an understanding between the lawyer and the organizational client that the lawyer will avoid representation adverse to the client's affiliates, or the lawyer's obligations to either the organizational client or the new client are likely to limit materially the lawyer's representation of the other client.~~

~~[35] A lawyer for a corporation or other organization who is also a member of its board of directors should determine whether the responsibilities of the two roles may conflict. The lawyer may be called on to advise the corporation in matters involving actions of the directors. Consideration should be given to the frequency with which such situations may arise, the potential intensity of the conflict, the effect of the lawyer's resignation from the board and the possibility of the corporation's obtaining legal advice from another lawyer in such situations. If there is material risk that the dual role will compromise the lawyer's independence of professional judgment, the lawyer should not serve as a director or should cease to act as the corporation's lawyer when conflicts of interest arise. The lawyer should advise the other members of the board that in some circumstances matters discussed at board meetings while the lawyer is present in the capacity of director might not be protected by the attorney-client privilege and that conflict of interest considerations might require the lawyer's recusal as a director or might require the lawyer and the lawyer's firm to decline representation of the corporation in a matter.~~