April 20, 2026

BY EMAIL

The Honorable Justices of the Tennessee Supreme Court
c/o Hon. James Hivner
Clerk, Tennessee Supreme Court
100 Supreme Court Building
401 7th Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37219-1307

In Re: Public Comments on Potential Regulatory Reforms to Increase Access to Quality Legal Representation, No. ADM2025-01403

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE LAWYER MOBILITY BY AMENDING TENNESSEE RULE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT 5.5

To the Honorable Justices of the Tennessee Supreme Court:

In response to the Court's Order dated September 16, 2025, soliciting public input on potential regulatory reforms to increase access to quality legal representation, we submit this proposal to revise Tennessee Rule of Professional Conduct 5.5 in order to increase lawyer mobility into Tennessee and increase the availability of legal services and lawyers to Tennesseans.

Specifically, we address Question 5 in the Court's Order:

> (5) Whether the Court should consider modifying requirements for admission to the Tennessee Bar for those licensed in other States to promote interstate practice and mobility;

The authors of this comment are part of a group of Tennessee lawyers that began studying and considering legal innovation efforts three years ago, before the Court issued its request for comments. The group consisted of academics and law firm, legal services, and bar association leaders from across Tennessee. Our group reviewed materials and held meetings with people who have led reform efforts in Utah, Arizona, North Carolina, and

elsewhere, as well as academics and public interest organizations that have studied and evaluated legal innovation models across the U.S. Although we were not formally constituted or affiliated, we shared a common interest in exploring opportunities to reform the structure of the legal market to remedy the unavailability of legal services for too many Tennesseans.

When the Court issued its request for comments, our group had a firm foundation to address several aspects of the Court's request. We began further research and drafting to respond to the Court's proposed areas for reform that aligned with our group's prior work. We submit this comment to assist the Court by drawing on the study and conclusions that have been the fruit of our group's work. We hope our work and this comment will help inform the Court's understanding, both now and as the Court proceeds with reform efforts.

We submit as **Exhibit A** to this comment a proposed revision to Rule 5.5. By its adoption in Tennessee, the Court would increase the availability of legal services and lawyers in Tennessee to provide quality legal services to Tennesseans. This proposal is based on two different proposals—one from the national organization of legal ethics lawyers, the Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers (APRL)[1] and one from The Federalist Society's Regulatory Transparency Project[2]—and has been adapted to accomplish the purposes of both groups and fit within Tennessee's existing lawyer regulatory structure.

We strongly support such reform and urge the Court to adopt a revised version of Tennessee Supreme Court Rule 8, RPC 5.5 governing multijurisdictional practice, as outlined in the attached proposal. Our recommendation is grounded in the dual goals of increasing access to legal services for Tennesseans—particularly in underserved and rural areas—and expanding economic opportunity for attorneys.

---

[1] Letter from APRL President Brian S. Faughnan to ABA President Reginald M. Turner, *Proposal for a Revised Model Rule 5.5* (April 18, 2022) (copy attached as **Exhibit E**), https://faughnanonethics.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Letter-regarding-our-proposal-to-ABA-President.pdf.

[2] Shoshana Weissmann, Daniel Greenberg, Luke Wake, Braden Boucek, and Jonathan Riches, "The World Needs More Lawyers," The Federalist Society Regulatory Transparency Project (Sept. 28, 2023) (copy attached as **Exhibit F**), https://rtp.fedsoc.org/paper/the-world-needs-more-lawyers/.

The current rule, which ties the unauthorized practice of law to physical presence, is increasingly out of step with the realities of modern legal practice. Remote work, virtual court appearances, and multistate client needs have rendered geographic boundaries largely irrelevant.

With the Court's adoption of Rule 5.5 in nearly its present form more than a decade ago, Tennessee took a large step to move lawyer regulation of lawyer mobility closer to the needs of clients large and small.

More recently, with the effects of further economic changes, both in the needs of clients and the lives of lawyers, and the effects of the pandemic, greater flexibility was introduced by the informal adoption in Tennessee of the concept of "remote practice" consistent with ABA Formal Opinion 495, *Lawyers Working Remotely* (Dec. 16, 2020). Thanks to informal guidance from the Court's Board of Professional Responsibility endorsing this approach, today lawyers properly licensed and in good standing in other states can reside in Tennessee, without an office, without Tennessee clients, and work only on non-Tennessee matters for non-Tennessee clients, with little risk of UPL prosecution or discipline. But, of course, this informal accommodation while helpful to lawyers licensed in other jurisdictions serves not a single Tennessee client.

We submit that it is time for the Court to take the next step.

Our proposed revision would allow attorneys in good standing from other U.S. jurisdictions to practice in Tennessee, provided they:

- Disclose their licensure status;
- Comply with Tennessee's Rules of Professional Conduct;
- Submit to the jurisdiction of Tennessee's disciplinary authorities; and
- Disclose that they are not licensed in Tennessee.

All out-of-state lawyers practicing under this proposed rule would be subject to the disciplinary authority of this Court and its Board of Professional Responsibility, and Tennessee ethics rules would govern their conduct in Tennessee.[3] Both of these things have been true for years of all out-of-state

[3] Rule 8.5(a) has provided for years and today provides that "[a] lawyer not admitted in this jurisdiction is also subject to the disciplinary authority of this jurisdiction if the lawyer provides or offers to provide any legal services in this jurisdiction." Tenn. Sup. Ct. R.

lawyers practicing in Tennessee pursuant to the authority of current Tennessee Rule 5.5.

Because of the acknowledged difference between practice in Tennessee courtrooms and other kinds of law practice, any out-of-state lawyer practicing in Tennessee under the authority of our proposed amended Rule 5.5 would still be required to obtain *pro hac vice* admission under Tennessee Supreme Court Rule 19.

This approach would reduce unnecessary barriers to entry, attract qualified attorneys to Tennessee, and expand the pool of legal professionals available to serve Tennesseans—without compromising consumer protection. We believe this reform aligns with the Court's stated goals of lowering barriers to entry into the legal profession, ensuring the availability of affordable legal services, and safeguarding the public.

I. The Need for Proposed RPC 5.5

Unquestionably, the Court has identified a real problem with a shortage of lawyers in Tennessee.

Studies from Legal Services Corporation show that ***almost 92% of the serious legal needs of the poor and near-poor are unmet***.[4] This deficiency is at

8, RPC 8.5(a). Rule 8.5(b) supplies the choice of law rule for any such disciplinary proceedings. See Rule 8.5(b)(1) (for litigation, the rules adopted by the tribunal govern—*i.e.*, the Tennessee Rules for conduct in litigation in Tennessee courts), (b)(2) (for all other conduct, the rules of the jurisdiction where the lawyer's conduct occurred apply, or the jurisdiction of the predominant effect of the jurisdiction). Out-of-state lawyers have been investigated and disciplined by this Court's Board of Professional Responsibility.

[4] Legal Servs. Corp., *The Justice Gap: The Unmet Civil Legal Needs of Low-Income Americans* (2022), https://justicegap.lsc.gov/.

an all-time high, when compared against earlier studies by LSC and others.[5] These serious legal needs extend far beyond the courthouse.[6]

For example, as the Court's Order notes, these studies address only those Tennesseans who earn up to 125% of the poverty level—for 2025 that amounted to $15,650 for an individual and $32,150 for a family of four.[7] As this Court if aware, this means that these measures of the "justice gap" seriously understate the problem. No doubt, millions more individual Tennesseans who are not poor by this definition face serious difficulty in accessing quality legal representation. There is also every reason to believe that Tennessee small businesses, a vital segment of our economy, face the same challenges in access to affordable, quality legal representation.

Tennessee also has a particularly acute problem with "legal deserts" in the rural parts of our state. The Court eloquently notes the "growing concern regarding the lack of access to legal services in rural areas, or so-called 'legal deserts.'"[8] The Court notes, for example, that only two percent of small law practices are located in rural areas and that a recent survey showed Tennessee had twenty counties with fewer than ten lawyers each.[9]

While these figures are troubling, the true problem in Tennessee is almost certainly worse. As noted in the NCSC's 2025 Clear Report cited in the Court's Order, the accepted benchmark for a "legal desert" is 1 lawyer per

---

[5] Legal Servs. Corp., *Documenting the Justice Gap in America: The Current Unmet Civil Legal Needs of Low-Income Americans* (2005); Legal Servs. Corp., *Documenting the Justice Gap in America: An Update* (2007); Legal Servs. Corp., *Documenting the Justice Gap in America: The Current Unmet Civil Legal Needs of Low-Income Americans—An Updated Report of the Legal Services Corporation* (2009); Legal Servs. Corp., *The Justice Gap: Measuring the Unmet Civil Legal Needs of Low-Income Americans* (2017).

[6] The Tennessee Alliance for Legal Services (TALS) is currently preparing for publication very soon a further study of unmet legal needs of Tennesseans. We expect that TALS will provide this information to the Court.

[7] Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines, 89 Fed. Reg. 2962 (Jan. 17, 2024), https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2024-01-17/pdf/2024-00796.pdf; U.S. Dep't of Health & Human Servs., Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning & Evaluation, Poverty Guidelines (Dec. 20, 2025), https://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty-guidelines.

[8] Order, at 3, *In Re: Public Comments on Potential Regulatory Reforms to Increase Access to Quality Legal Representation*, No. ADM2025-01403 (Sept. 16, 2025)

[9] *Id.*

1,000 population.[10] A rough comparison of the Board of Professional Responsibility's roster of the locations of licensed lawyers and Tennessee data on county population suggests that ***more than half of Tennessee's counties, where more than a million Tennesseans live, may be legal deserts***.[11]

Thus, as the Court's Order suggests, the current supply of legal services in Tennessee is insufficient to meet the needs of those who live and work here. And while rules governing the practice of law are important to protect the public and ensure competent legal representation, they also necessarily limit the supply of legal services and drive up costs.

One such restriction pertains to the multijurisdictional practice of lawyers. Of course, thousands of skilled and experienced lawyers are just sitting right outside our borders, unable to offer their services. They are experienced and have demonstrated competence and can provide services right now to Tennesseans. But they are only licensed in states other than Tennessee and, therefore, unable to practice in Tennessee owing to the requirement that, with few exceptions, require licensure in Tennessee to practice "in" Tennessee. The relevant rule is RPC 5.5, which allows for only a limited amount of multijurisdictional practice. An update to RPC 5.5 is the quickest way to add meaningfully to the supply of lawyers available to offer their services.

II. The History of Current Tennessee Rule 5.5

Before going further, however, it may be useful to explain how the current version of RPC 5.5 came to be.

In 2002, the American Bar Association adopted Model Rule of Professional Conduct 5.5 in response to the landmark California Supreme Court *Birbrower* decision.[12] That case sent shockwaves through the legal profession by holding that New York lawyers had engaged in the

[10] Committee on Legal Education and Admissions Reform (CLEAR) Report and Recommendations 12 (Nat'l Ctr. for St. Cts. July 27, 2025), https://perma.cc/SW8E-FTX4 (cited in Order at 3).

[11] *See* **Exhibit D** for data supporting this analysis. Of course, this calculation is simply a rough approximation.

[12] *Birbrower, Montalbano, Condon & Frank v. Superior Ct.*, 17 Cal. 4th 119, 949 P.2d 1 (1998).

unauthorized practice of law in California simply by advising a California client on a California matter involving potential arbitration. *Birbrower* exposed the legal and ethical risks faced by competent attorneys who, in good faith, served clients across state lines. The ABA's Model Rule 5.5 sought to address this problem by recognizing that lawyers licensed in one U.S. jurisdiction are presumptively competent to provide legal services in another, at least on a temporary basis.

Tennessee followed suit in 2009, adopting a version of Rule 5.5 that largely mirrored the ABA's model.[13] It currently permits limited multijurisdictional practice by attorneys licensed in other U.S. jurisdictions, but only under narrow conditions. These include temporary legal services tied to specific proceedings (*e.g.*, litigation, arbitration), or when working in association with a Tennessee-licensed attorney who actively participates in the matter. The rule also allows in-house counsel to serve their employer from within Tennessee, provided they register and comply with certain requirements.

III. The problems with the current rule

The 2009 changes to RPC 5.5 were a significant step forward at the time, acknowledging the growing need for multijurisdictional practice. However, its permission structure for multijurisdictional process is narrow.

It is constrained by primarily allowing "temporary" practice but prohibiting conduct if it ends up being deemed to be "continuous and systematic." The rule's focus on physical presence and office location fails to reflect the realities of contemporary legal practice, where geographic boundaries are increasingly irrelevant. The Rule has remained largely unchanged since 2009, despite dramatic shifts in how legal services are delivered. The rise of remote work, virtual court appearances, and increasingly mobile clients has rendered the original framework outdated. What was once a progressive reform is now a barrier to both lawyer mobility and client access to competent counsel.

The basic structure of the Rule reveals what today is its fundamental structural weakness: the Rule turns on whether a lawyer is providing legal services "in" Tennessee. The Rule and its Comment provide very little

[13] *See In re: Petition for the Adoption of Rules Governing the Multijurisdictional Practice of Law*, Order, No. M2008-01404-SC-RL1-RL (Tenn.; Oct. 23, 2009).

meaningful guidance as to how a lawyer may determine in good faith whether she is practicing "in" Tennessee beyond discouraging them from being physically present in the state. In what jurisdiction is a lawyer licensed outside Tennessee practicing when she:

- Negotiates a lease for an out-of-state client of a property located in Tennessee? What if she represents the Tennessee owner of the property?
- Advises an out-of-state employer on their rights concerning the conduct of a Tennessee-based employee? What if she represents the Tennessee employee in evaluating a claim against an out-of-state employee?
- Advises an out-of-state parent concerning their child custody rights when their ex-spouse has moved to Tennessee with the child?
- Drafts an out-of-state testator's estate plan that includes real and personal property in Tennessee and several other states

In answering these questions, the Court should consider this further question: What policy reason, grounded in client, consumer, and public protection, mandates that a lawyer performing these legal services must be (1) physically present in Tennessee or (2) licensed in Tennessee, as opposed to in another jurisdiction? We submit that the answer is simple: None.

Bear in mind, too, that in the seminal 1998 *Birbrower* decision from the California Supreme Court, which launched the effort that led to the adoption of ABA Model Rule of Professional Conduct 5.5, on which Tennessee Rule 5.5 is based, that court went out of its way in sweeping dicta to say that "one may practice law in the state in violation of [California's UPL law] although not physically present here by advising a California client on California law in connection with a California legal dispute by telephone, fax, computer, or other modern technological means."[14] Any thoughtful lawyer assessing Tennessee's Rule 5.5 in good faith against the increasingly multi-state interests and legal needs of ordinary clients often simply cannot reach a definitive conclusion as to whether her conduct is lawful. Our proposed rule would bring *clarity* and do so in a way that *increases* the choice of lawyers available to Tennessee residents.

---

[14] *Birbrower, Montalbano, Condon & Frank v. Superior Ct.*, 17 Cal. 4th 119, 128–29, 949 P.2d 1, 5–6 (1998), *as modified* (Feb. 25, 1998).

COVID didn't create remote legal practice—it revealed how technology can permit lawyers to practice remotely without jeopardizing legal consumers and why rules prohibiting that from happening should be reexamined. Practicing law no longer requires a physical office or in-person meetings; attorneys now routinely work from home, appear in court virtually, and collaborate with clients and colleagues across jurisdictions using cloud-based tools. These innovations have made legal services more efficient and accessible, especially for clients who prefer or require remote options. Yet Tennessee's current RPC 5.5 still regulates based on physical presence, exposing competent attorneys to unauthorized practice penalties simply for residing in the state while serving their clients. This geographic tethering is not only impractical—it actively undermines access to justice and the economic viability of modern legal practice. As unpleasant as COVID was, it did demonstrate how outdated our thinking was about regulating the practice of law based on geographical location.

Tennessee Rules' current structure has real-world consequences. An attorney may relocate to Tennessee for family or lifestyle reasons but continue to serve clients exclusively in jurisdictions where they are licensed. Even this can be the unauthorized practice of law.

The Court has also raised the issue in its Order of whether it should adopt amendments to rules to make it easier for lawyers licensed in other jurisdictions to become licensed in Tennessee. We very much believe that the Court should do so, and do so urgently. The current restrictions on Tennessee bar admission on motion (or comity admission) are too strict.[15]

We understand that others will offer the Court their comments favoring reform of these restrictions, and we expect to heartily endorse them. To be clear, however, more than rule reform is needed concerning admission on

[15] Doing so would also directly address the inadequacies in Tennessee bar admissions rules revealed by the case of Violaine Panasci. After graduating from a Canadian law school and obtaining an L.L.M. from Pace University in New York where she graduated *summa cum laude*, she passed the notoriously difficult New York Bar Exam with a 90th percentile on the Uniform Bar Exam (UBE). She relocated to Nashville from New York during the pandemic. Although she (unsurprisingly) had no difficulty getting a job, the Tennessee Board of Law Examiners told her she was not fit to practice here because her "academic path [was] not equivalent" to an American educated attorney. This Court righted this wrong. *See* Order, *Panasci v. Tenn. Bd. of Law Examiners*, No. M2002-00609-SC-WR-CV (Tenn. Sept. 16, 2022). But reform along the lines proposed in this comment, plus meaningful reform of comity admission, would avoid such future controversies, and open Tennessee to other undoubtedly competent practitioners like Ms. Panasci.

motion; procedural reform and increased staffing is needed at the Tennessee Board of Law Examiners, as comity applicants now wait as long as three years—which could well be longer than in any other jurisdiction—to have their applications addressed. The rules' substance and the way they are implemented are both serious impediments to Tennesseans receiving needed legal services.

Regardless of whether the Court adopts reforms of comity admission, there will still be lawyers who may not wish to become licensed in another jurisdiction. The common-sense reform we propose to RPC 5.5 will itself increase the talent pool of lawyers available to be hired by the people and businesses of our state.

A small business with suppliers across state lines, a divorcing couple with assets in multiple jurisdictions, or a family navigating estate planning with out-of-state property may all require multistate legal expertise. Yet under the current rule, if a lawyer not licensed in Tennessee is willing to represent them, the client must either hire multiple attorneys (one of whom has a Tennessee license) or forego representation altogether. The result is higher costs, reduced access, and increased dissatisfaction among the public regarding the usefulness of our profession. By regulating based on physical presence rather than competence and transparency, Tennessee's rule discourages talented lawyers from living or working in the state and deprives Tennesseans of the full range of legal services they increasingly need.

IV. Proposed Rule

We urge the Court to consider modifying requirements for practicing in Tennessee by amending RPC 5.5 governing multijurisdictional practice. The proposed revision to Tennessee Supreme Court Rule 8, RPC 5.5 (as outlined in **Exhibit A**) modernizes the regulation of multijurisdictional practice by allowing attorneys licensed and in good standing in any U.S. jurisdiction to provide legal services in Tennessee—without requiring full bar admission—so long as they meet specific consumer protection requirements. This reform eliminates the current rule's outdated focus on physical presence (which matters little to many clients) and instead emphasizes transparency, accountability, and competence (which matters to all clients).

Under the proposed rule, out-of-state attorneys may practice in Tennessee if they:

- Disclose where they are licensed;

- Comply with Tennessee's Rules of Professional Conduct, including competency standards;
- Submit to Tennessee's disciplinary authority and choice-of-law rules; and
- Refrain from misrepresenting their admission status or assisting in unauthorized practice

This revised rule would make Tennessee a leader in legal innovation. But for all its ingenuity, the basic approach of acknowledging that lawyers licensed in other jurisdictions can provide competent representation to clients who choose them as their lawyer is not novel. Many federal courts—including those in Tennessee—allow attorneys in good standing from other jurisdictions to appear and practice under local rules without requiring separate licensure.[16]

By adopting this rule, Tennessee would position itself as a national leader in legal innovation—expanding access to justice, supporting a modern legal workforce, and maintaining strong ethical safeguards.

V. Benefits of the Proposed Rule

In brief, the revised rule would yield the following advantages.

A. Benefits to the Public

Expanding multijurisdictional practice is one of the surest and quickest ways to increase access to legal services, particularly in underserved and rural areas, because it increases the pool of attorneys dramatically. This is a tried and true market-based approach that addresses the deficiencies of a captured market with a supply side solution. Clients will gain access to a broader pool of attorneys, including subject-matter experts who may not be locally licensed but are fully competent to handle their legal needs. This reform promotes affordability, convenience, and choice for legal consumers across Tennessee.

---

[16] *See* LR 83.4(b) (W.D. Tenn.) (allowing eligibility for membership to attorneys in good standing in other states or District of Columbia so long as they are a member in good standing of another United States District Court, subject to procedure); LR 83.5(a) (E.D. Tenn.) (attorneys in good standing and admitted to practice in any state, territory, or District of Columbia are qualified for admission upon standards set under Tennessee's RPC).

B. Benefits to the Legal Profession

The proposed rule lowers unnecessary barriers to entry, enabling qualified attorneys to practice in Tennessee without the expense (and delay) of duplicative licensure. It supports modern, flexible work arrangements, allowing lawyers to serve clients remotely without fear of violating outdated geographic restrictions. This is good for young lawyers because it prohibits job lock. It is good for working parents who might otherwise fall out of the job market when life takes them across a state border. And it is good for older attorneys who are ready to slow down but not retire because it gives them the flexibility to work in Tennessee remotely. By embracing mobility, Tennessee can attract and retain talented attorneys who might otherwise be excluded due to rigid licensure rules.

C. Safeguards for Consumer Protection

The proposed rule preserves essential safeguards by requiring attorneys to disclose their licensure status, comply with Tennessee's ethical rules, and submit to the state's disciplinary authority. These measures ensure accountability and transparency, protecting clients from deception or incompetence without relying on artificial geographic constraints.

The proposed rule also reinforces, rather than diminishes, Tennessee's authority to regulate the practice of law within its borders. Far from ceding control to other jurisdictions, the rule ensures that any lawyer—regardless of where they are licensed—who provides legal services in Tennessee is subject to Tennessee's Rules of Professional Conduct and disciplinary authority. This approach preserves the state's sovereign interest in protecting legal consumers while recognizing the competence of attorneys licensed elsewhere. It does not alter substantive law or ethical standards; it simply removes artificial geographic barriers that prevent qualified lawyers from serving Tennesseans, all while keeping them accountable to Tennessee's regulatory framework.

* * *

We appreciate the Court's thoughtful consideration of the important issue of access to justice and welcome the opportunity to provide further information or participate in any future proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian S. Faughnan
Faughnan Law, PLLC
5865 Ridgeway Center Parkway NW
Suite 300
Memphis TN 38120
(901) 820-4556
brian@faughnanonethics.com

Lucian T. Pera
Adams & Reese, LLP
Crescent Center
6075 Poplar Ave., Suite 700
Memphis, TN 38119
901-524-5278
Lucian.Pera@arlaw.com

EXHIBIT A

PROPOSED REVISED TENNESSEE SUPREME COURT RULE 8, RPC 5.5

(proposed additions; ~~proposed deletions~~)

Rule 5.5. Unauthorized Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law

(a) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, or assist another in doing so.

(b) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction, subject to the other provisions of this Rule.

(c) Only a lawyer who is admitted in this jurisdiction may hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.

(d) A lawyer who provides legal services in this jurisdiction shall:

(1) If not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction, disclose where the lawyer is admitted to practice law;

(2) Comply with this jurisdiction's rules of professional conduct, including but not limited to Rule 1.1 (Competence) and with the admission requirements of the courts of this jurisdiction;

(3) Be subject to Rule 8.5 regarding the disciplinary authority and choice of law rules of this jurisdiction; and

(4) Not assist another person in the unauthorized practice of law in this or any other jurisdiction.

(e) A lawyer admitted to practice law in a foreign jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction or the equivalent thereof, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction that:

(1) are provided to the lawyer's employer or its organizational affiliates;

(2) are not services for which the forum requires *pro hac vice* admission; and

(3) do not arise under the law of any U.S. jurisdiction, unless the services are provided after consultation with a lawyer authorized to practice law in this jurisdiction.

~~(b) A lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction shall not:~~

~~(1) except as authorized by these Rules or other law, establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law; or~~

~~(2) hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.~~

~~(c) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction that:~~

~~(1) are undertaken in association with a lawyer who is admitted to practice in this jurisdiction and who actively participates in the matter;~~

~~(2) are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential proceeding before a tribunal in this or another jurisdiction, if the lawyer, or a person the lawyer is assisting, is authorized by law or order to appear in such proceeding or reasonably expects to be so authorized;~~

~~(3) are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential arbitration, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution proceeding in this or another jurisdiction, if the services arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice and are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; or~~

~~(4) are not within paragraphs (c)(2) or (c)(3) and arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice.~~

~~(d) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services through an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction that:~~

~~(1) are provided to the lawyer's employer or its organizational affiliates and are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; or~~

~~(2) are services that the lawyer is authorized to provide by federal law or other law or rule of this jurisdiction.~~

~~(3) A lawyer providing legal services pursuant to paragraph (d)(1) is subject to registration pursuant to Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 7, § 10.01, and~~

~~may be subject to other requirements, including assessments for client protection funds and mandatory continuing legal education. Failure to register in a timely manner may preclude the lawyer from later seeking admission in this jurisdiction.~~

~~(e) A lawyer authorized to provide legal services in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraph (d)(1) of this Rule may also provide pro bono legal services in this jurisdiction, provided that these services are offered through an established not-for-profit bar association, pro bono program or legal services program or through such organization(s) specifically authorized in this jurisdiction and provided that these are services for which the forum does not require pro hac vice admission.~~

~~(f) A lawyer providing legal services in Tennessee pursuant to paragraph (c) or (d) shall advise the lawyer's client that the lawyer is not admitted to practice in Tennessee and shall obtain the client's informed consent to such representation.~~

(f) A lawyer providing legal services in Tennessee pursuant to paragraphs (b) ~~(c) or (d)~~ or (e) shall be deemed to have submitted himself or herself to personal jurisdiction in Tennessee for claims arising out of the lawyer's actions in providing such services in this state.

(g) A lawyer or law firm shall not employ or continue the employment of a disbarred or suspended lawyer as an attorney, legal consultant, law clerk, paralegal or in any other position of a quasi-legal nature.

COMMENT

[1] This Rule acknowledges that the practice of law now routinely transcends geographic jurisdictional boundaries. The question of what it means for a lawyer to practice law "in" a jurisdiction has been clouded by advances in technology that facilitate lawyers' ability to communicate, work, and appear in other jurisdictions. For example, historically a lawyer's physical presence in a jurisdiction was the predominant factor in determining where the lawyer practiced law. In modern law practices, lawyers routinely send emails, place phone calls, and participate in video calls with clients and other parties in other jurisdictions, rendering the lawyer's physical location irrelevant to the lawyer's capacity to provide legal services. Similarly, the advent of online research, including access to local rules and ordinances, has enhanced lawyers' ability to master competency without regard to artificial

geographic limitations. Hence, this Rule recognizes the realities of current law practice and expands access to lawyers while still being mindful of the need for public protection.

[2] The definition of the practice of law is established by statute (*see* Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 23-3-101 to -108) and common law. Limiting the practice of law to individuals admitted and authorized to practice law in at least one United States jurisdiction protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified and unaccountable persons. Under the circumstances specified in section (d) of this Rule, lawyers licensed in a foreign jurisdiction may also practice law in limited circumstances without undue risk of harm to the public.

[3] A lawyer is admitted in a jurisdiction when they have been formally licensed to appear in the courts of that jurisdiction without limitation.

[4] The distinction of being admitted in a particular jurisdiction relates to the privilege of regularly appearing in the courts of this jurisdiction and communicating that privilege to the public. Thus, while lawyers admitted in other jurisdictions may practice in this jurisdiction as provided in this Rule, only lawyers admitted in this jurisdiction may represent that they are fully authorized to appear regularly in the courts of this jurisdiction.

[5] Paragraph (d)(1) requires that all lawyers, including lawyers admitted in this jurisdiction, disclose the jurisdictions in which they are admitted. Such disclosure is necessary to inform consumers of legal services and other parties where the lawyer's license originates and to facilitate disciplinary enforcement. This Rule anticipates that the primary form of disclosure will be in written communications, such as lawyers' signature blocks on correspondence and in lawyer advertising, including websites. A lawyer who communicates orally with another person and knows, or reasonably should know, that the other person has a misunderstanding about the lawyer's licensure, has an affirmative duty to correct the person's impression. *See* Rule 4.3.

[6] A lawyer may establish an office for the practice of law in this jurisdiction with proper disclosure of the jurisdictions in which the lawyer is admitted.

[7] Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services in this jurisdiction is governed by Rules 7.1 – 7.3.

[8] All lawyers are required to be competent in the practice of law. *See* Rule 1.1. The lawyer's duty of competence applies regardless of practice area or the jurisdiction in which a matter is located.

[9] All lawyers are subject to the disciplinary authority of the jurisdictions in which they practice. *See* Rule 8.5(a). The frequency with which disciplinary authorities have exercised their authority to prosecute and discipline lawyers not licensed in their jurisdiction has increased in the past decade, suggesting that geographic boundaries are not an impediment to holding lawyers accountable for ethical misconduct. Hence, allowing lawyers to practice in multiple jurisdictions does not undermine public protection.

[10] A lawyer does not engage in the unauthorized practice of law by employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. *See* Rule 5.3. A lawyer may provide professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of the law; for example, claims adjusters, employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants, and persons employed in government agencies. Lawyers also may assist independent nonlawyers, such as paraprofessionals, who are authorized by the law of a jurisdiction to provide particular law-related services. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed *pro se*.

[11] To the extent that a court rule or other law of this jurisdiction requires a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction to obtain admission *pro hac vice* before appearing before a tribunal or administrative agency, this Rule requires the lawyer to obtain that authority. In the absence of such requirements, this Rule permits lawyers to appear before administrative agencies in jurisdictions in which they are not admitted, subject to the other provisions of this Rule.

[12] In situations in which *pro hac vice* admission is required, this Rule permits a lawyer to engage in conduct in anticipation of a proceeding or hearing in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice law under this Rule but for which *pro hac vice* admission has not yet been obtained. Examples of such conduct include meetings with the client, interviews of potential witnesses, and the review of documents.

[13] Paragraph (e) applies to a foreign lawyer who is employed by a client to provide legal services to the client or its organizational affiliates, i.e., entities that control, are controlled by, or are under common control with the employer. This paragraph does not authorize the foreign lawyer to provide personal legal services to the employer's officers or employees or legal services to the general public. The paragraph applies to in-house corporate lawyers, government lawyers and others who are employed to render legal services to the employer. The lawyer's ability to represent the employer outside the foreign jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed generally serves the interests of the employer and does not create an unreasonable risk to the client and others because the employer is well situated to assess the lawyer's qualifications and the quality of the lawyer's work. To further decrease any risk to the client, when advising on the domestic law of a United States jurisdiction or on the law of the United States, the foreign lawyer authorized to practice under this Rule needs to first consult with a lawyer admitted and authorized to practice in at least one U.S. jurisdiction.

~~[1] A lawyer may practice law only in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice. A lawyer may be admitted to practice law in a jurisdiction on a regular basis or may be authorized by court rule or order or by law to practice for a limited purpose or on a restricted basis. Paragraph (a) applies to unauthorized practice of law by a lawyer, whether through the lawyer's direct action or by the lawyer assisting another person. For example, a lawyer may not assist a person in practicing law in violation of the rules governing professional conduct in that person's jurisdiction.~~

~~[2] The definition of the practice of law is established by law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to members of the bar protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified persons. This Rule does not prohibit a lawyer from employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. See RPC 5.3.~~

~~[3] A lawyer may provide professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of the law, for example, claims adjusters, employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants and persons employed in government agencies. Lawyers also may assist independent nonlawyers, such as paraprofessionals, who are authorized by the law of a jurisdiction to provide particular law-~~

~~related services. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed pro se.~~

~~[4] Other than as authorized by law or this Rule, a lawyer who is not admitted to practice generally in this jurisdiction violates paragraph (b)(1) if the lawyer establishes an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law. Presence may be systematic and continuous even if the lawyer is not physically present here. Such a lawyer must not hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction. See also RPCs 7.1(a).~~

~~[5] There are occasions in which a lawyer admitted to practice in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction under circumstances that do not create an unreasonable risk to the interests of their clients, the public or the courts. Paragraph (c) identifies four such circumstances. The fact that conduct is not so identified does not imply that the conduct is or is not authorized. With the exception of paragraphs (d)(1) and (d)(2), this Rule does not authorize a lawyer to establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction without being admitted to practice generally here.~~

~~[6] There is no single test to determine whether a lawyer's services are provided on a "temporary basis" in this jurisdiction, and may therefore be permissible under paragraph (c). Services may be "temporary" even though the lawyer provides services in this jurisdiction on a recurring basis, or for an extended period of time, as when the lawyer is representing a client in a single lengthy negotiation or litigation.~~

~~[7] Paragraphs (c) and (d) apply to lawyers who are admitted to practice law in any United States jurisdiction, which includes the District of Columbia and any state, territory or commonwealth of the United States. The word "admitted" in paragraph (c) contemplates that the lawyer is authorized to practice in the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted and excludes a lawyer who while technically admitted is not authorized to practice, because, for example, the lawyer is on inactive status.~~

~~[8] Paragraph (c)(1) recognizes that the interests of clients and the public are protected if a lawyer admitted only in another jurisdiction associates with a lawyer licensed to practice in this jurisdiction. For this paragraph to apply, however, the lawyer admitted to practice in this~~

~~jurisdiction must actively participate in and share responsibility for the representation of the client.~~

~~[9] Lawyers not admitted to practice generally in a jurisdiction may be authorized by law or order of a tribunal or an administrative agency to appear before the tribunal or agency. This authority may be granted pursuant to formal rules governing admission pro hac vice or pursuant to informal practice of the tribunal or agency. Under paragraph (c)(2), a lawyer does not violate this Rule when the lawyer appears before a tribunal or agency pursuant to such authority. To the extent that a court rule or other law of this jurisdiction requires a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction to obtain admission pro hac vice before appearing before a tribunal or administrative agency, this Rule requires the lawyer to obtain that authority.~~

~~[10] Paragraph (c)(2) also provides that a lawyer rendering services in this jurisdiction on a temporary basis does not violate this Rule when the lawyer engages in conduct in anticipation of a proceeding or hearing in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice law or in which the lawyer reasonably expects to be admitted pro hac vice. Examples of such conduct include meetings with the client, interviews of potential witnesses, and the review of documents. Similarly, a lawyer admitted only in another jurisdiction may engage in conduct temporarily in this jurisdiction in connection with pending litigation in another jurisdiction in which the lawyer is or reasonably expects to be authorized to appear, including taking depositions in this jurisdiction.~~

~~[11] When a lawyer has been or reasonably expects to be admitted to appear before a court or administrative agency, paragraph (c)(2) also permits conduct by lawyers who are associated with that lawyer in the matter, but who do not expect to appear before the court or administrative agency. For example, subordinate lawyers may conduct research, review documents, and attend meetings with witnesses in support of the lawyer responsible for the litigation.~~

~~[12] Paragraph (c)(3) permits a lawyer admitted to practice law in another jurisdiction to perform services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction if those services are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential arbitration, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution proceeding in this or another jurisdiction, if the services arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a~~

~~jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice. The lawyer, however, must obtain admission pro hac vice in the case of a court-annexed arbitration or mediation or otherwise if court rules or law so require.~~

~~[13] Paragraph (c)(4) permits a lawyer admitted in another jurisdiction to provide certain legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction that arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted but are not within paragraphs (c)(2) or (c)(3). These services include both legal services and services that nonlawyers may perform but that are considered the practice of law when performed by lawyers.~~

~~[14] Paragraphs (c)(3) and (c)(4) require that the services arise out of or be reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. A variety of factors evidence such a relationship. The lawyer's client may be resident in or have substantial contacts with the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. The matter, although involving other jurisdictions, may have a significant connection with that jurisdiction. The necessary relationship might arise when the client's activities or the legal issues involve multiple jurisdictions, such as when the officers of a multinational corporation survey potential business sites and seek the services of their lawyer in assessing the relative merits of each. Lawyers desiring to provide pro bono legal services on a temporary basis in a jurisdiction that has been affected by a major disaster, but in which they are not otherwise authorized to practice law, as well as lawyers from the affected jurisdiction who seek to practice law temporarily in another jurisdiction, but in which they are not otherwise authorized to practice law, should consult Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 47.~~

~~[15] Paragraph (d) identifies two circumstances in which a lawyer who is admitted to practice in another United States jurisdiction, and is not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law as well as provide legal services on a temporary basis. Except as provided in paragraphs (d)(1) and (d)(2), a lawyer who is admitted to practice law in another jurisdiction and who establishes an office or other systematic or continuous presence in this jurisdiction must become admitted to practice law generally in this jurisdiction.~~

~~[16] Paragraph (d)(1) applies to a lawyer who is employed by a client to provide legal services to the client or its organizational affiliates, i.e., entities~~

~~that control, are controlled by, or are under common control with the employer. This paragraph does not authorize the provision of personal legal services to the employer's officers or employees. The paragraph applies to in-house corporate lawyers, government lawyers and others who are employed to render legal services to the employer. The lawyer's ability to represent the employer outside the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed generally serves the interests of the employer and does not create an unreasonable risk to the client and others because the employer is well situated to assess the lawyer's qualifications and the quality of the lawyer's work.~~

~~[18] Paragraph (d)(2) recognizes that a lawyer may provide legal services in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed when authorized to do so by federal or other law, which includes statute, court rule, executive regulation or judicial precedent. See, e.g., Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 7, § 5.01(g) (Practice Pending Admission by Applicant Licensed in Another Jurisdiction).~~

~~[19]~~ [14] A lawyer who practices law in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraphs (b), ~~(c) or (d)~~ or (e) or otherwise is subject to the disciplinary authority of this jurisdiction. See RPC 8.5(a). Additionally, under paragraph (f) ~~(g)~~, a lawyer providing legal services in Tennessee pursuant to paragraphs (b), ~~(c) or (d)~~ or (e) shall be deemed to have submitted himself or herself to personal jurisdiction in Tennessee for claims arising out of the lawyer's actions in providing such services in this state.

~~[20] Paragraph (f) requires a lawyer who practices law in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraphs (c) or (d) to inform the client that the lawyer is not licensed to practice law in this jurisdiction. See also RPC 1.4(b).~~

~~[21] Paragraphs (c) and (d) do not authorize communications advertising legal services in this jurisdiction by lawyers who are admitted to practice in other jurisdictions. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services in this jurisdiction is governed by RPCs 7.1 to 7.5.~~

~~[22]~~ [15] Paragraph (g) ~~(h)~~ provides that a lawyer or law firm may not employ or continue the employment of a disbarred or suspended lawyer as an attorney, legal consultant, law clerk, paralegal or in any other position of a quasi-legal nature. That paragraph is consistent with existing Tennessee law. See Formal Ethics Opinion 83-F-50; Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 9, § 28.8 (providing, "[b]y no later than twenty days after the effective date of the order [imposing disbarment, suspension or transfer to disability inactive status], the

respondent attorney shall cease to maintain a presence or occupy an office where the practice of law is conducted, except as provided in Section 12.3(c)”).

DEFINITIONAL CROSS-REFERENCES

“Informed consent” See RPC 1.0(e)
“Reasonably” See RPC 1.0(h)
“Tribunal” See RPC 1.0(m)

EXHIBIT B

CURRENT TENNESSEE SUPREME COURT RULE 8, RPC 5.5

Rule 5.5. Unauthorized Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice of Law

(a) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction, or assist another in doing so.

(b) A lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction shall not:

(1) except as authorized by these Rules or other law, establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law; or

(2) hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.

(c) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction that:

(1) are undertaken in association with a lawyer who is admitted to practice in this jurisdiction and who actively participates in the matter;

(2) are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential proceeding before a tribunal in this or another jurisdiction, if the lawyer, or a person the lawyer is assisting, is authorized by law or order to appear in such proceeding or reasonably expects to be so authorized;

(3) are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential arbitration, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution proceeding in this or another jurisdiction, if the services arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice and are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; or

(4) are not within paragraphs (c)(2) or (c)(3) and arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice.

(d) A lawyer admitted in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services through an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction that:

(1) are provided to the lawyer's employer or its organizational affiliates and are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; or

(2) are services that the lawyer is authorized to provide by federal law or other law or rule of this jurisdiction.

(3) A lawyer providing legal services pursuant to paragraph (d)(1) is subject to registration pursuant to Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 7, § 10.01, and may be subject to other requirements, including assessments for client protection funds and mandatory continuing legal education. Failure to register in a timely manner may preclude the lawyer from later seeking admission in this jurisdiction.

(e) A lawyer authorized to provide legal services in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraph (d)(1) of this Rule may also provide pro bono legal services in this jurisdiction, provided that these services are offered through an established not-for-profit bar association, pro bono program or legal services program or through such organization(s) specifically authorized in this jurisdiction and provided that these are services for which the forum does not require pro hac vice admission.

(f) A lawyer providing legal services in Tennessee pursuant to paragraph (c) or (d) shall advise the lawyer's client that the lawyer is not admitted to practice in Tennessee and shall obtain the client's informed consent to such representation.

(g) A lawyer providing legal services in Tennessee pursuant to paragraph (c) or (d) shall be deemed to have submitted himself or herself to personal jurisdiction in Tennessee for claims arising out of the lawyer's actions in providing such services in this state.

(h) A lawyer or law firm shall not employ or continue the employment of a disbarred or suspended lawyer as an attorney, legal consultant, law clerk, paralegal or in any other position of a quasi-legal nature.

COMMENT

[1] A lawyer may practice law only in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice. A lawyer may be admitted to practice law in a jurisdiction on a regular basis or may be authorized by court rule or order or by law to practice for a limited purpose or on a restricted basis. Paragraph (a) applies to unauthorized practice of law by a lawyer, whether through the lawyer's direct action or by the lawyer assisting another person. For example, a lawyer may not assist a person in practicing law in violation of the rules governing professional conduct in that person's jurisdiction.

[2] The definition of the practice of law is established by law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to members of the bar protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified persons. This Rule does not prohibit a lawyer from employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. See RPC 5.3.

[3] A lawyer may provide professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of the law, for example, claims adjusters, employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants and persons employed in government agencies. Lawyers also may assist independent nonlawyers, such as paraprofessionals, who are authorized by the law of a jurisdiction to provide particular law-related services. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed pro se.

[4] Other than as authorized by law or this Rule, a lawyer who is not admitted to practice generally in this jurisdiction violates paragraph (b)(1) if the lawyer establishes an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law. Presence may be systematic and continuous even if the lawyer is not physically present here. Such a lawyer must not hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction. See also RPCs 7.1(a).

[5] There are occasions in which a lawyer admitted to practice in another United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction under circumstances that do not create an unreasonable risk to the interests of their clients, the public or the courts. Paragraph (c) identifies four such circumstances. The fact that conduct is not so identified does not imply that the conduct is or is not authorized. With the exception of paragraphs (d)(1) and (d)(2), this Rule does not authorize a lawyer to establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction without being admitted to practice generally here.

[6] There is no single test to determine whether a lawyer's services are provided on a "temporary basis" in this jurisdiction, and may therefore be permissible under paragraph (c). Services may be "temporary" even though the lawyer provides services in this jurisdiction on a recurring basis, or for an extended period of time, as when the lawyer is representing a client in a single lengthy negotiation or litigation.

[7] Paragraphs (c) and (d) apply to lawyers who are admitted to practice law in any United States jurisdiction, which includes the District of Columbia and any state, territory or commonwealth of the United States. The word "admitted" in paragraph (c) contemplates that the lawyer is authorized to practice in the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted and excludes a lawyer who while technically admitted is not authorized to practice, because, for example, the lawyer is on inactive status.

[8] Paragraph (c)(1) recognizes that the interests of clients and the public are protected if a lawyer admitted only in another jurisdiction associates with a lawyer licensed to practice in this jurisdiction. For this paragraph to apply, however, the lawyer admitted to practice in this jurisdiction must actively participate in and share responsibility for the representation of the client.

[9] Lawyers not admitted to practice generally in a jurisdiction may be authorized by law or order of a tribunal or an administrative agency to appear before the tribunal or agency. This authority may be granted pursuant to formal rules governing admission pro hac vice or pursuant to informal practice of the tribunal or agency. Under paragraph (c)(2), a lawyer does not violate this Rule when the lawyer appears before a tribunal or agency pursuant to such authority. To the extent that a court rule or other law of this jurisdiction requires a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in

this jurisdiction to obtain admission pro hac vice before appearing before a tribunal or administrative agency, this Rule requires the lawyer to obtain that authority.

[10] Paragraph (c)(2) also provides that a lawyer rendering services in this jurisdiction on a temporary basis does not violate this Rule when the lawyer engages in conduct in anticipation of a proceeding or hearing in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice law or in which the lawyer reasonably expects to be admitted pro hac vice. Examples of such conduct include meetings with the client, interviews of potential witnesses, and the review of documents. Similarly, a lawyer admitted only in another jurisdiction may engage in conduct temporarily in this jurisdiction in connection with pending litigation in another jurisdiction in which the lawyer is or reasonably expects to be authorized to appear, including taking depositions in this jurisdiction.

[11] When a lawyer has been or reasonably expects to be admitted to appear before a court or administrative agency, paragraph (c)(2) also permits conduct by lawyers who are associated with that lawyer in the matter, but who do not expect to appear before the court or administrative agency. For example, subordinate lawyers may conduct research, review documents, and attend meetings with witnesses in support of the lawyer responsible for the litigation.

[12] Paragraph (c)(3) permits a lawyer admitted to practice law in another jurisdiction to perform services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction if those services are in or reasonably related to a pending or potential arbitration, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution proceeding in this or another jurisdiction, if the services arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice. The lawyer, however, must obtain admission pro hac vice in the case of a court-annexed arbitration or mediation or otherwise if court rules or law so require.

[13] Paragraph (c)(4) permits a lawyer admitted in another jurisdiction to provide certain legal services on a temporary basis in this jurisdiction that arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted but are not within paragraphs (c)(2) or (c)(3). These services include both legal services and services that nonlawyers may perform but that are considered the practice of law when performed by lawyers.

[14] Paragraphs (c)(3) and (c)(4) require that the services arise out of or be reasonably related to the lawyer's representation of an existing client in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. A variety of factors evidence such a relationship. The lawyer's client may be resident in or have substantial contacts with the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted. The matter, although involving other jurisdictions, may have a significant connection with that jurisdiction. The necessary relationship might arise when the client's activities or the legal issues involve multiple jurisdictions, such as when the officers of a multinational corporation survey potential business sites and seek the services of their lawyer in assessing the relative merits of each. Lawyers desiring to provide pro bono legal services on a temporary basis in a jurisdiction that has been affected by a major disaster, but in which they are not otherwise authorized to practice law, as well as lawyers from the affected jurisdiction who seek to practice law temporarily in another jurisdiction, but in which they are not otherwise authorized to practice law, should consult Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 47.

[15] Paragraph (d) identifies two circumstances in which a lawyer who is admitted to practice in another United States jurisdiction, and is not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may establish an office or other systematic and continuous presence in this jurisdiction for the practice of law as well as provide legal services on a temporary basis. Except as provided in paragraphs (d)(1) and (d)(2), a lawyer who is admitted to practice law in another jurisdiction and who establishes an office or other systematic or continuous presence in this jurisdiction must become admitted to practice law generally in this jurisdiction.

[16] Paragraph (d)(1) applies to a lawyer who is employed by a client to provide legal services to the client or its organizational affiliates, i.e., entities that control, are controlled by, or are under common control with the employer. This paragraph does not authorize the provision of personal legal services to the employer's officers or employees. The paragraph applies to in-house corporate lawyers, government lawyers and others who are employed to render legal services to the employer. The lawyer's ability to represent the employer outside the jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed generally serves the interests of the employer and does not create an unreasonable risk to the client and others because the employer is well situated to assess the lawyer's qualifications and the quality of the lawyer's work.

[18] Paragraph (d)(2) recognizes that a lawyer may provide legal services in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is not licensed when authorized to do so by federal or other law, which includes statute, court rule, executive regulation or judicial precedent. See, e.g., Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 7, § 5.01(g) (Practice Pending Admission by Applicant Licensed in Another Jurisdiction).

[19] A lawyer who practices law in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraphs (c) or (d) or otherwise is subject to the disciplinary authority of this jurisdiction. See RPC 8.5(a). Additionally, under paragraph (g), a lawyer providing legal services in Tennessee pursuant to paragraphs (c) or (d) shall be deemed to have submitted himself or herself to personal jurisdiction in Tennessee for claims arising out of the lawyer's actions in providing such services in this state.

[20] Paragraph (f) requires a lawyer who practices law in this jurisdiction pursuant to paragraphs (c) or (d) to inform the client that the lawyer is not licensed to practice law in this jurisdiction. See also RPC 1.4(b).

[21] Paragraphs (c) and (d) do not authorize communications advertising legal services in this jurisdiction by lawyers who are admitted to practice in other jurisdictions. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services in this jurisdiction is governed by RPCs 7.1 to 7.5.

[22] Paragraph (h) provides that a lawyer or law firm may not employ or continue the employment of a disbarred or suspended lawyer as an attorney, legal consultant, law clerk, paralegal or in any other position of a quasi-legal nature. That paragraph is consistent with existing Tennessee law. See Formal Ethics Opinion 83-F-50; Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 9, § 28.8 (providing, "[b]y no later than twenty days after the effective date of the order [imposing disbarment, suspension or transfer to disability inactive status], the respondent attorney shall cease to maintain a presence or occupy an office where the practice of law is conducted, except as provided in Section 12.3(c)").

DEFINITIONAL CROSS-REFERENCES

"Informed consent" See RPC 1.0(e)
"Reasonably" See RPC 1.0(h)
"Tribunal" See RPC 1.0(m)

<u>EXHIBIT C</u>

Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers Proposed Rule

APRL MODEL RULE 5.5

RULE 5.5: Multijurisdictional Practice of Law

(a) A lawyer admitted and authorized to practice law in any United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction, subject to the other provisions of this rule.

(b) Only a lawyer who is admitted to practice in this jurisdiction may hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.

(c) A lawyer who provides legal services in this jurisdiction shall:

(1) Disclose where the lawyer is admitted to practice law;

(2) Comply with this jurisdiction's rules of professional conduct, including but not limited to Rule 1.1 (Competence), and with the admission requirements of courts of this jurisdiction;

(3) Be subject to Rule 8.5 regarding the disciplinary authority and choice of law rules of this jurisdiction; and

(4) Not assist another person in the unauthorized practice of law in this, or any other, jurisdiction.

(d) A lawyer admitted and authorized to practice law in a foreign jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction or the equivalent thereof, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction that:

(1) are provided to the lawyer's employer or its organizational affiliates;

(2) are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; and

(3) do not arise under the law of any U.S. jurisdiction, unless the services are provided after consultation with a lawyer authorized to practice law in this jurisdiction.

New Comments

1. This rule acknowledges that the practice of law now routinely transcends geographic jurisdictional boundaries. The question of what it means for a lawyer to practice law "in" a jurisdiction has been clouded by advances in technology that facilitate lawyers' ability to communicate, work, and appear in other jurisdictions. For example, historically a lawyer's physical presence in a jurisdiction was the predominate factor in determining where the lawyer practiced law. In modern law practices, lawyers routinely send e-mails, place phone calls, and participate in video calls with clients and other parties in other jurisdictions, rendering the lawyer's physical location irrelevant to the lawyer's capacity to provide legal services. Similarly, the advent of on-line research, including access to local rules and ordinances, has enhanced lawyers' ability to master competency without regard to artificial geographic limitations. Hence, this rule recognizes the realities of current law practice and expanding access to lawyers while still being mindful of the need for public protection.

2. The definition of the practice of law may be established by statute or common law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to individuals admitted and authorized to practice law in at least one United States jurisdiction, protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified and unaccountable persons. Under the circumstances specified in section 5.5(d) of this rule, lawyers licensed in a foreign jurisdiction may also practice law without undue risk of harm to the public.

3. A lawyer is "admitted" in a jurisdiction when they have been formally licensed to appear in the courts of that jurisdiction without limitation. A lawyer may be "authorized" to practice in a jurisdiction if they are admitted to practice in any U.S. jurisdiction or, where court rules so require, the lawyer has been admitted to appear by a pro hac vice procedure, or other similar mechanism. A lawyer may be admitted to practice but not authorized to do so, because, for example, the lawyer is on inactive status. Under this rule, a lawyer must be both admitted and authorized to practice in at least one United States jurisdiction.

4. The distinction of being admitted in a particular jurisdiction relates to the privilege of regularly appearing in the courts of this jurisdiction and communicating that privilege to the public. Thus, while lawyers admitted in other jurisdictions may practice in this jurisdiction as provided in this rule, only lawyers admitted in this jurisdiction may

represent that they are fully authorized to appear regularly in the courts of this jurisdiction.

5. Paragraph (c)(1) requires that all lawyers, including lawyers admitted in this jurisdiction, disclose the jurisdiction(s) in which they are admitted. Such disclosure is necessary to inform consumers of legal services and other parties where the lawyer's license originates and to facilitate disciplinary enforcement. This Rule anticipates that the primary form of disclosure will be in written communications, such as lawyers' signature blocks on correspondence and in lawyer advertising, including websites. A lawyer who communicates orally with another person and knows, or reasonably should know, that the other person has a misunderstanding about the lawyer's licensure, has an affirmative duty to correct the person's impression. *See* Rule 4.3.

6. A lawyer may establish an office for the practice of law in this jurisdiction with proper disclosure of the jurisdiction(s) in which the lawyer is admitted.

7. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services in this jurisdiction is governed by Rules 7.1 – 7.3.

8. All lawyers are required to be competent in the practice of law. *See* Rule 1.1. The lawyer's duty of competence applies regardless of practice area or the jurisdiction in which a matter is located.

9. All lawyers are subject to the disciplinary authority of the jurisdictions in which they practice. *See* Rule 8.5(a). The frequency with which disciplinary authorities have exercised their authority to prosecute and discipline lawyers not licensed in their jurisdiction has increased in the past decade, suggesting that geographic boundaries are not an impediment to holding lawyers accountable for ethical misconduct. Hence, allowing lawyers to practice in multiple jurisdictions does not undermine public protection.

10. A lawyer does not engage in the unauthorized practice of law by employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. *See* Rule 5.3. A lawyer may provide professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of the law; for example, claims adjusters,

employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants, and persons employed in government agencies. Lawyers also may assist independent nonlawyers, such as paraprofessionals, who are authorized by the law of a jurisdiction to provide particular law-related services. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed pro se.

11. To the extent that a court rule or other law of this jurisdiction requires a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction to obtain admission pro hac vice before appearing before a tribunal or administrative agency, this Rule requires the lawyer to obtain that authority. In the absence of such requirements, this Rule permits lawyers to appear before administrative agencies in jurisdictions in which they are not admitted, subject to the other provisions of this Rule.

12. In situations in which pro hac vice admission is required, this Rule permits a lawyer to engage in conduct in anticipation of a proceeding or hearing in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice law under this rule but for which pro hac vice admission has not yet been obtained. Examples of such conduct include meetings with the client, interviews of potential witnesses, and the review of documents.

13. Paragraph (d) applies to a foreign lawyer who is employed by a client to provide legal services to the client or its organizational affiliates, i.e., entities that control, are controlled by, or are under common control with the employer. This paragraph does not authorize the foreign lawyer to provide personal legal services to the employer's officers or employees or legal services to the general public. The paragraph applies to in-house corporate lawyers, government lawyers and others who are employed to render legal services to the employer. The lawyer's ability to represent the employer outside the foreign jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed generally serves the interests of the employer and does not create an unreasonable risk to the client and others because the employer is well situated to assess the lawyer's qualifications and the quality of the lawyer's work. To further decrease any risk to the client, when advising on the domestic law of a United States jurisdiction or on the law of the United States, the foreign lawyer authorized to practice under this Rule needs to first consult with a lawyer admitted and authorized to practice in at least one U.S. jurisdiction.

EXHIBIT D

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TENNESSEE PRO HAC VICE RULE

Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 19

(proposed additions; ~~proposed deletions~~)

Rule 19. Appearance Pro Hac Vice in Proceedings Before Tennessee Agencies and Courts by Lawyers Not Licensed to Practice Law in Tennessee

(a) A lawyer not licensed to practice law in Tennessee ~~and who either resides outside Tennessee or resides in Tennessee and has~~ but who has either been permitted to practice in this State pursuant to Rule 7, section 10.07 of these Rules, or who is operating in compliance with Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 8, RPC 5.5(b), is eligible for admission pro hac vice in a particular proceeding pending before a court or agency of the State of Tennessee:

(1) if, in the case of a lawyer who resides outside Tennessee, the lawyer is licensed, in good standing, and admitted to practice before the court of last resort in another state or territory of the United States or the District of Columbia in which the lawyer maintains a residence or an office for the practice of law; or, in the case of a lawyer who resides in Tennessee and has been permitted to practice in this State pursuant to Rule 7, section 10.07 of these Rules, or who is operating in compliance with Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 8, RPC 5.5(b), the lawyer is licensed, in good standing, and admitted to practice before the court of last resort in another state or territory of the United States or the District of Columbia in which the lawyer maintained a residence or an office for the practice of law; and

(2) if the lawyer is in good standing in all other jurisdictions in which the lawyer is licensed to practice law; and

(3) if the lawyer has been retained by a client to appear in the proceeding pending before that court or agency….

Exhibit E

ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY LAWYERS

600 W. Van Buren Street
Suite 700
Chicago, IL 60607
www.aprl.net

Phone: (312) 782-4396
Fax (312) 782-4725

President
Brian Faughnan
Lewis Thomason
Memphis, TN

President-Elect
Trisha Rich
Holland & Knight, LLP
Chicago, IL

Secretary
Tyler Maulsby
Frankfurt, Kurnit, Klein & Selz, P.C.
New York, NY

Treasurer
Kendra L. Basner
O'Rielly & Roche, LLP
San Francisco, CA

2020-2022 Directors
Frank R. Maher
Legal Risk, LLP
Liverpool, Merseyside

Sari W. Montgomery
Robinson, Stewart, Montgomery & Doppke, LLC
Chicago, IL

David M. Majchrzak
Klinedinst P.C..
San Diego, CA

2021-2023 Directors
Emil Ali
McCabe & Ali, LLP
Encino, CA

Stacie H. Rosenzweig
Halling & Cayo, S.C..
Milwaukee, WI

Allison Wood
Legal Ethics Consulting, P.C.
Chicago, IL

Immediate Past President
Shannon Nordstrom
Nordstrom Law Office
Las Vegas, NV

Executive Director
Karolyn Kiburz
Scottsdale, AZ

April 18, 2022

By email: rturner@clarkhill.com
Reginald M. Turner, Esq.
President, American Bar Association

Re: APRL's Proposal for a Revised Model Rule 5.5

Dear President Turner:

On behalf of APRL, an association of over 400 lawyers and law professors advising and representing lawyers in ethics matters, I enclose APRL's proposal for a replacement Model Rule 5.5 to better reflect the way lawyers practice in the 21st Century. Our proposal advocates that a lawyer admitted in any United States jurisdiction should be able to practice law and represent willing clients without regard to the geographic location of the lawyer or the client, without regard to the forum where the services are to be provided, and without regard to which jurisdiction's rules apply at a given moment in time. At the same time, our new Model Rule 5.5 would still preserve judicial authority in each state to regulate who appears in state courts, emphasizes that lawyers must be competent under Rule 1.1 no matter where they are practicing or what kind of legal services they are providing, and ensures that lawyers will be subject to the disciplinary jurisdiction of not only their state of licensure but wherever they practice.

Several years ago, one of my predecessors as President of APRL, George Clark, established a committee focused on the Future of Lawyering. The Future of Lawyering Committee is chaired by two other past presidents of our organization, Jan Jacobowitz and Art Lachman. After several years of hard work and discussions, the first action item from that group is a proposal to replace current ABA Model Rule 5.5 with a new version. That group has also created a very detailed report that discusses the history of the existing rule, how it is rooted in troubling presumptions, and how it is anachronistic in relation to the modern practice of law. In addition to the revised proposed rule itself, I also enclose a copy of that Report of the Future of Lawyering Subcommittee of the Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers.

In March, APRL's Board voted to adopt the proposed revised rule as APRL's own proposal and authorized the report prepared by a Subcommittee of our Future of Lawyering Committee to be publicly disseminated. We hope to garner support not only within the ABA for this proposal, but also in any states independently willing to consider changes to their own versions of RPC 5.5. I would ask that you help disseminate these materials to the appropriate channels within the ABA.

I thank you for your time, your consideration, and your service to our profession.

Very truly yours,

Brian S. Faughnan
APRL 2021-2022 President
Lewis Thomason, P.C.

APRL MODEL RULE 5.5

RULE 5.5: Multijurisdictional Practice of Law

(a) A lawyer admitted and authorized to practice law in any United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction, subject to the other provisions of this rule.

(b) Only a lawyer who is admitted to practice in this jurisdiction may hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.

(c) A lawyer who provides legal services in this jurisdiction shall:

(1) Disclose where the lawyer is admitted to practice law;

(2) Comply with this jurisdiction's rules of professional conduct, including but not limited to Rule 1.1 (Competence), and with the admission requirements of courts of this jurisdiction;

(3) Be subject to Rule 8.5 regarding the disciplinary authority and choice of law rules of this jurisdiction; and

(4) Not assist another person in the unauthorized practice of law in this, or any other, jurisdiction.

(d) A lawyer admitted and authorized to practice law in a foreign jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction or the equivalent thereof, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction that:

(1) are provided to the lawyer's employer or its organizational affiliates;

(2) are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; and

(3) do not arise under the law of any U.S. jurisdiction, unless the services are provided after consultation with a lawyer authorized to practice law in this jurisdiction.

New Comments

1. This rule acknowledges that the practice of law now routinely transcends geographic jurisdictional boundaries. The question of what it means for a lawyer to practice law "in" a jurisdiction has been clouded by advances in technology that facilitate lawyers' ability to communicate, work, and appear in other jurisdictions. For example, historically a lawyer's physical presence in a jurisdiction was the predominate factor in determining where the lawyer practiced law. In modern law practices, lawyers routinely send e-mails, place phone calls, and participate in video calls with clients and other parties in other jurisdictions, rendering the lawyer's physical location irrelevant to the lawyer's capacity to provide legal

services. Similarly, the advent of on-line research, including access to local rules and ordinances, has enhanced lawyers' ability to master competency without regard to artificial geographic limitations. Hence, this rule recognizes the realities of current law practice and expanding access to lawyers while still being mindful of the need for public protection.

2. The definition of the practice of law may be established by statute or common law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to individuals admitted and authorized to practice law in at least one United States jurisdiction, protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified and unaccountable persons. Under the circumstances specified in section 5.5(d) of this rule, lawyers licensed in a foreign jurisdiction may also practice law without undue risk of harm to the public.

3. A lawyer is "admitted" in a jurisdiction when they have been formally licensed to appear in the courts of that jurisdiction without limitation. A lawyer may be "authorized" to practice in a jurisdiction if they are admitted to practice in any U.S. jurisdiction or, where court rules so require, the lawyer has been admitted to appear by a pro hac vice procedure, or other similar mechanism. A lawyer may be admitted to practice but not authorized to do so, because, for example, the lawyer is on inactive status. Under this rule, a lawyer must be both admitted and authorized to practice in at least one United States jurisdiction.

4. The distinction of being admitted in a particular jurisdiction relates to the privilege of regularly appearing in the courts of this jurisdiction and communicating that privilege to the public. Thus, while lawyers admitted in other jurisdictions may practice in this jurisdiction as provided in this rule, only lawyers admitted in this jurisdiction may represent that they are fully authorized to appear regularly in the courts of this jurisdiction.

5. Paragraph (c)(1) requires that all lawyers, including lawyers admitted in this jurisdiction, disclose the jurisdiction(s) in which they are admitted. Such disclosure is necessary to inform consumers of legal services and other parties where the lawyer's license originates and to facilitate disciplinary enforcement. This Rule anticipates that the primary form of disclosure will be in written communications, such as lawyers' signature blocks on correspondence and in lawyer advertising, including websites. A lawyer who communicates orally with another person and knows, or reasonably should know, that the other person has a misunderstanding about the lawyer's licensure, has an affirmative duty to correct the person's impression. *See* Rule 4.3.

6. A lawyer may establish an office for the practice of law in this jurisdiction with proper disclosure of the jurisdiction(s) in which the lawyer is admitted.

7. Whether and how lawyers may communicate the availability of their services in this jurisdiction is governed by Rules 7.1 – 7.3.

8. All lawyers are required to be competent in the practice of law. *See* Rule 1.1. The lawyer's duty of competence applies regardless of practice area or the jurisdiction in which a matter is located.

9. All lawyers are subject to the disciplinary authority of the jurisdictions in which they practice. *See* Rule 8.5(a). The frequency with which disciplinary authorities have exercised their authority to prosecute and discipline lawyers not licensed in their jurisdiction has increased in the past decade, suggesting that geographic boundaries are not an impediment to holding lawyers accountable for ethical misconduct. Hence, allowing lawyers to practice in multiple jurisdictions does not undermine public protection.

10. A lawyer does not engage in the unauthorized practice of law by employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. *See* Rule 5.3. A lawyer may provide professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of the law; for example, claims adjusters, employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants, and persons employed in government agencies. Lawyers also may assist independent nonlawyers, such as paraprofessionals, who are authorized by the law of a jurisdiction to provide particular law-related services. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed pro se.

11. To the extent that a court rule or other law of this jurisdiction requires a lawyer who is not admitted to practice in this jurisdiction to obtain admission pro hac vice before appearing before a tribunal or administrative agency, this Rule requires the lawyer to obtain that authority. In the absence of such requirements, this Rule permits lawyers to appear before administrative agencies in jurisdictions in which they are not admitted, subject to the other provisions of this Rule.

12. In situations in which pro hac vice admission is required, this Rule permits a lawyer to engage in conduct in anticipation of a proceeding or hearing in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is authorized to practice law under this rule but for which pro hac vice admission has not yet been obtained. Examples of such conduct include meetings with the client, interviews of potential witnesses, and the review of documents.

13. Paragraph (d) applies to a foreign lawyer who is employed by a client to provide legal services to the client or its organizational affiliates, i.e., entities that control, are controlled by, or are under common control with the employer. This paragraph does not authorize the foreign lawyer to provide personal legal services to the employer's officers or employees or legal services to the general public. The paragraph applies to in-house corporate lawyers, government lawyers and others who are employed to render legal services to the employer. The lawyer's ability to represent the employer outside the foreign jurisdiction in which the lawyer is licensed generally serves the interests of the employer and does not create an unreasonable risk to the client and others because the employer is well situated to assess the lawyer's qualifications and the quality of the lawyer's work. To further decrease any risk to the client, when advising on the domestic law of a United States jurisdiction or on the law of the United States, the foreign lawyer authorized to practice under this Rule needs to first consult with a lawyer admitted and authorized to practice in at least one U.S. jurisdiction.

REPORT OF THE FUTURE OF LAWYERING SUBCOMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY LAWYERS REGARDING PROPOSED REVISED MODEL RULE 5.5[1]

Introduction

The Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers Committee on the Future of Lawyering proposes a revised Model Rule 5.5 that offers a 21st century approach to the practice of law. Since the adoption of the current Model Rule 5.5 in 2002, lawyers in the United States have continued to expand their practices beyond state and national borders. The existing rule no longer adequately addresses the day-to-day questions lawyers have about multi-jurisdictional practice and it preserves outdated notions of how lawyers serve their clients. APRL believes that a broader rule is critical to the future of the profession.

APRL's proposed revision of Model Rule 5.5 reflects the concept that a lawyer admitted in any U.S. jurisdiction should be able to engage in the practice of law and represent willing clients without regard to the geographic location of the lawyer or the client, the forum the services are provided in, or which jurisdiction's rules apply at a given moment in time. The proposed revision recognizes that ethics rules will continue to govern the conduct of lawyers and require competence in the delivery of legal services provided; acknowledges that courts and other tribunals have the inherent power to control who appears before them; and embraces the fact that technology has fundamentally changed the ease with which clients and lawyers work together over vast distances.

The proposed revised Model Rule 5.5 offers up a regulatory model that would be similar, though not identical to the way that driver's licensing works in our nation. Although each jurisdiction implements its own scheme for granting drivers' licenses, those licenses are, of necessity, recognized in every U.S. jurisdiction. Drivers are expected to inform themselves of the laws in jurisdictions to which they travel.

APRL's proposal does not ignore state licensure. To the contrary, APRL's proposal would enhance public protection by requiring that all lawyers, in every jurisdiction,

[1] The members of the subcommittee involved in the drafting of the proposed rule and of this report are: Kendra Basner (San Francisco, CA), Eric Cooperstein (Minneapolis, MN), Craig Dobson (New York, NY), Brian S. Faughnan (Memphis, TN), Jan Jacobowitz (Miami, FL), Arthur Lachman (Lake Forest Park, WA), David Majchrzak (San Diego, CA), Sari Montgomery (Chicago, IL), Lynda Shely (Scottsdale, AZ), and Hope Todd (Washington, D.C.).

disclose the jurisdictions in which they are licensed. APRL's proposal preserves the authority of judicial branches to regulate who appears before them, reminds lawyers of their ethical obligation under Rule 1.1 to be competent in all the services they provide, and ensures that lawyers will be held responsible for any misdeed committee in the relevant jurisdictions.

The proposal which APRL now urges acknowledges that clients must continue to be protected from the incompetent practice of law. However, the proposal also elevates the client's right to choose counsel to a co-equal status in the context of the regulation of multijurisdictional practice and acknowledges that protecting clients from incompetent lawyering does not require artificial boundaries that prevent clients from choosing competent counsel of their choice even if the lawyer they choose is licensed elsewhere.

The report provides APRL's reasoning and support for its proposal, including some significant historical context for Rule 5.5. The report addresses the realities of today's practice to highlight the unnecessary restriction on the ability of lawyers to practice in multiple jurisdictions and considers the recent experience of lawyers and their clients during the global pandemic.

The report also expands the principles that APRL believes should be at the heart of a regulatory structure that addresses multijurisdictional practice in a manner that benefits both clients and their lawyers. The report also discusses why certain existing "solutions" to these problems are insufficient, unjust, or both. Finally, the report includes historical context and insight into the origin of today's approach and the systemic problems that are exacerbated by its continuing existence.

Technology and the Evolution of the Practice of Law

If it was not already clear before the onset and consequences of the Covid-19 Global Pandemic ("2020 Pandemic") that technology has changed the modern practice of law, the conclusion is now undeniable. In the face of stay-at-home and other quarantine orders, technology has allowed lawyers to remotely meet with clients, negotiate deals, mediate, and appear in court via Zoom and other video conferencing technology.[2] Today's

[2]Jan L. Jacobowitz, Chaos or Continuity? The Legal Profession: From Antiquity to the Digital Age, the Pandemic, and Beyond, 23 Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law 279 (2021);

technology readily allows a lawyer to practice law from almost anywhere assuming available access to a wireless network. However, Model Rule 5.5 and its various state iterations prohibit the unauthorized practice of law—even with the use of remarkable technology during a global Pandemic. As discussed below, both the historical underpinnings of Rule 5.5 and the contemporary practice of law compel a review and revision to what should be considered the unauthorized practice of law and the rules that prohibit it.

It is important to note that not only is there a lack of evidence that lawyers are harming the public by working across state lines (assuming that they are licensed and in good standing in at least one state), but also that there is no evidence clients prioritize the location of their lawyer when deciding who to retain. In fact, Clio's 2020 Legal Trends Report indicates that:

- …Many consumers (37%) prefer to meet virtually with a lawyer for a consultation or first meeting, and 50% would rather conduct follow-up meetings through video conference. 56% of consumers would prefer videoconferencing over a phone call.
- …The majority of consumers (65%) prefer to pay using electronic forms of payment, such as credit cards, debit cards, or online payment systems such as Clio Payments, PayPal, or Apple Pay over cash or check.
- …The majority of consumers (69%) prefer working with a lawyer who can share documents electronically through a web page, app, or online portal. [3]

Thus, not only can lawyers and clients conduct the business of law remotely, regardless of physical location, but many even find it preferable. Just as the rules have evolved regarding competence, confidentiality, and technology so too should Rule 5.5 be revised to permit lawyers and clients to work together remotely without fear of

https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/pandemic-pressures-restriction-on-where-lawyers-can-practice.

[3] 2020 Legal Trends Report (Clio) available at https://www.clio.com/resources/legal-trends/2020-report/.

disciplinary or statutory action against the lawyer for violations of Rule 5.5 or UPL regulations.

Geographical Limitation and The Public's Access to Legal Services

There is no legitimate dispute that there is an access to justice crisis in the United States. This access to justice crisis – in all U.S. jurisdictions - exists under the current regulatory framework restricting the unauthorized practice of law. The "access to justice" gap includes many under-served clients who are willing to pay legal fees for a lawyer's representation, but do not ever hire a lawyer. Admittedly, there are multiple reasons why clients with some means to pay may not hire a lawyer. One of those reasons is an actual physical access problem -- the unavailability of lawyers in the clients' geographic area. Legal services "deserts" exist in many states where there are too few lawyers, or none at all, in a geographic area. Rural consumers have less access to lawyers than urban and suburban consumers.[4] Geographic restrictions on admission further compound the problem.

In some rural areas lawyers are retiring, but new lawyers are not moving to those areas to replace them. Other locations do not have locally admitted lawyers, thus causing consumers in these legal services deserts to have to travel long distances to meet with a lawyer.

The lack of truly local lawyers can be remedied to some degree by harnessing technology to make representation by lawyers from other parts of the same state easier, but it is only the profession's current ethical rules that make using lawyers geographically nearby but, in another state or jurisdiction as a broader remedy untenable.

Unfortunately, even in jurisdictions that have written their UPL rules and laws to be in line with ABA Model Rule 5.5, lawyers in another state or jurisdiction cannot provide legal services on a regular basis in a jurisdiction where they are not admitted. The current state regulatory restrictions on practicing law reinforce some of the reasons these geographic legal deserts continue to exist.

---

[4] *See* Conference of State Court Administrators, *Courts Need to Enhance Access to Justice in Rural America*, p. 1-3 (2018).

Lawyers who may be only a few miles away from clients in need cannot provide the services if the lawyers are not admitted to practice law where the clients live. Those same available lawyers may be under-employed or unemployed, yet an arbitrary state boundary prohibits them from providing services.

Additionally, those unemployed and under-employed lawyers may not be able to afford to pay a second state's admission fees, repeatedly satisfy CLE requirements, and so forth. Yet those lawyers may be competent and would otherwise be available at a reasonable fee but for current ethical and regulatory restrictions. Forcing unemployed lawyers who are competent and licensed in at least one state to take an additional bar examination, pay additional bar dues, and be challenged again about their character and fitness for the ability to serve underserved legal communities in another jurisdiction is illogical.

An unyielding, purely geographic, border inhibits the ability for competent and willing lawyers to provide legal services to consumers who need access to those services. The current state admission framework inhibits clients' ability to receive legal services and further inhibits clients' choice of counsel. If there were more flexibility for "border" lawyers to provide legal services for clients who are geographically close, whatever the applicable state law may be, the cost of legal services would be reduced, availability and access would be increased, and lawyers could be more gainfully employed.

U.S. jurisdictions continue to struggle to bridge the access to justice gap by failing to adequately amend rules concerning the "practice of law" and who may provide legal services because much of the focus is on including more and more categories of nonlawyers.[5] This is not the only solution, and it blatantly ignores an obvious path forward.

Jurisdictions continue to have lawyers who are unemployed and under-employed[6] all while legal services "deserts" exist in places where paying clients would be willing to

---

[5] *See, e.g., Washington LLLTs and legal navigators, AZ CLDPs and LPS, California Document Preparers, Minnesota Nonlawyers, NM nonlawyers, NY advocates, Utah Sandbox Participants.* National Center for State Courts, Non-Lawyer Legal Assistant Roles Efficacy, Design, and Implementation (2015) at 2 (A study by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in 2013, "Estimating the Cost of Civil Litigation" reports that the average cost for typical civil court case types puts the courts beyond the financial means of many litigants).

[6] 2020 Legal Trends Report (Clio), *supra*.

hire a lawyer who is presently unavailable to them. The current outdated state regulatory framework further reinforces the access to legal services problem in the U.S and it does so despite a wealth of experience demonstrating that modern technology can allow lawyers to provide many legal services seamlessly and competently to clients from just about any location.

Competency and the Paradox of the Licensed Lawyer

The seemingly arbitrary nature of the geographical limitations imposed by the current regulatory structure is heightened by an understanding of the paradox associated with how few restrictions exist on a lawyer's ability to practice by subject matter. Once admitted in a U.S. jurisdiction, a lawyer is permitted to practice in any area of law of the lawyer's choosing or in multiple areas of law.

Indeed, historically, lawyers might take any case that crossed their office threshold, be it a family law matter one day, a criminal matter the next, or HIPAA compliance for a third-party provider of information systems the day after that. Over the past several decades, the profession has observed a trend away from the concept of lawyers as generalists and toward lawyers narrowing their practice to only one or two areas, in which they develop deep expertise. But that outcome has arisen because of the marketplace, not any ethical restrictions on practice.

A lawyer's voluntary devotion to one area of practice, however, in no way restricts the scope of the lawyer's license in their state. An attorney with 20 years of experience, but only involving family law, who learns of a neighbor's, relative's, or former client's severe car accident may agree to represent that person. Similarly, a lawyer who, following admission to the bar, works in a non-legal setting for twenty years, faces no licensing restrictions in taking on that same personal injury case as long as they have an active law license. Moreover, a newly minted lawyer immediately after passing the bar could take on a family law case, a car-accident lawsuit, and a contract negotiation with a hospital for a physician. The lawyers in these scenarios might not be the best lawyers for the job, but the Rules of Professional Conduct assume that the lawyers can educate themselves about the subject matter and competently handle the case. *See* Rule 1.1, cmt. [2].

The "Competency Fallacy of Rule 5.5," however, dictates that a lawyer licensed in "State A", who has devoted their entire career to personal injury work for example, would not be competent to represent the car-accident victim described above (without the association of local counsel)[7] because the lawyer is presumed to be incapable of knowing or coming to understand "the law of State B." Instead, if that State A-licensed lawyer wanted to be able to regularly represent clients with personal injury cases in State B, the lawyer would have to obtain a second license to practice law, a license issued by State B. Those who accept the current systemic issues often rely upon arguments that lawyers who wish to be able to practice across state lines more freely can simply obtain such additional licenses through reciprocity. This option to pursue additional licenses through reciprocity is not an adequate solution, and for many jurisdictions, is simply not true.

Those who tout the virtues of reciprocity not only ignore that 11 states do not offer reciprocity or provisional/reduced admission requirements at all, but they usually gloss over the burdens that this default imposes upon lawyers in the jurisdictions where it is a possibility. First, many jurisdictions impose a "time in practice" requirement such that a lawyer seeking to become licensed in a new jurisdiction without having to sit for the bar examination must have either practiced law for a set number of years, often five or more, or must have been engaged in active law practice for some percentage (often 60% or more) of the most recent time-period or both.

For example, to seek admission by reciprocity in Tennessee, a lawyer must have been licensed in another jurisdiction for at least 5 years and must have been engaged in the active practice of law for 5 of the 7 years preceding the date of the application. See Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 7, § 5.01(a)(3). On the other hand, there are some jurisdictions that allow reciprocity if the lawyer received a minimum passing score on the Multistate Bar Examination so long as the lawyer applies within a certain amount of time after passing that test.

Second, for those jurisdictions that conditionally allow reciprocity, the application and admissions process for reciprocity has built in expenses – both upfront and recurring

[7] Of course, even with local counsel, the lawyer will likely also have to seek pro hac vice admission to appear in the State B court in connection with the litigation. Furthering the paradox, most rules for pro hac vice admission do not include anything that would require the lawyer seeking admission to demonstrate substantive competence with respect to the issues being litigated or even as to litigation generally.

-- in the form of application fees, the fee charged by the National Conference of Bar Examiners for conducting a background investigation (discussed below), additional annual registration or bar fees, and, in some jurisdictions, additional imposed taxes in the form of professional privilege taxes and the like.

Third, the addition of another state of licensure can also lead to the imposition of even more required hours of continuing legal education if both the lawyer's original jurisdiction and the new jurisdiction impose mandatory hours requirements and if the states' approaches to calculating hours or certifying courses are not identical.

Fourth, even for lawyers that have practiced for long enough to be eligible for admission by reciprocity, the process can take an excessive time, especially when considering that the person awaiting a ruling on their application is someone who has most likely already passed a bar examination (unless they are among the small minority of lawyers (pre-pandemic) to have obtained licensure in a diploma-privilege state) and also has already been vetted through a state's character and fitness evaluation process.

The process can take months and may even last for a year or longer. The timing of the process is prolonged because it is not one of a rubber stamping of decisions made in the home licensing jurisdiction; nor is it one in which the exploration into the applicant's background is reasonably limited to life events occurring after the issuance of the original law license.

Instead, an applicant must authorize a brand-new background investigation by either the National Conference of Bar Examiners or other state authorized investigatory body. The state entity from which reciprocity is sought then waits for the results of that new investigation and has the power to dig into any aspects of the applicant's background that it feels raises substantial questions about the applicant's character and fitness.

Thus, someone who is already a licensed lawyer in one state can find themself facing opposition to their admission in another jurisdiction on character and fitness grounds involving past conduct that did not prevent their admission to their home jurisdiction. These situations seem discordant enough when the grounds being examined truly involve only "conduct." But the unfairness is made even starker when situations arise involving concerns about physical or mental health conditions rather than actual incidents of past misconduct. Such a situation, indirectly presented in subsequent federal court litigation, resulted in one federal district judge (now a member of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals),

authoring a scathing opinion taking Kentucky's regulatory process to task. *See Jane Doe v. Supreme Court of Ky.,* No. 03:19-cv-00236-JRW, (W.D. Ky. Aug. 28, 2020).

The collective burdens this general approach imposes have been the subject of scrutiny with application to military spouse attorneys, a very small subset of the population with very successful lobbying efforts at seeking regulatory reforms. Roughly 30 states have enacted rule revisions or other accommodations in response to such efforts. You can find an up-to-date listing of such revisions at https://www.msjdn.org/rule-change/.

While much of the focus of lobbying efforts made on behalf of military spouse attorneys focused on the sympathetic nature of their circumstances and the practical realities associated with being required to move frequently – sometimes even faster than the wheels of the regulatory system can turn to fully process a reciprocity application – there is fundamentally little reason to believe that a lawyer falling within this small subset is more ethical or more competent than another lawyer simply because they are married to someone in active military service.

Returning to Tennessee as an example, after lobbying efforts and a rules revision petition filed by a prominent military spouse attorneys' group, an exception was adopted in Tennessee that permits someone who is not licensed in Tennessee, but who is married to an active member of the U.S. armed forces, to obtain a temporary license in Tennessee without having to submit to a new NCBE character and fitness investigation as long as they are "the spouse of an active duty servicemember of the United States Uniformed Services," are "physically residing in Tennessee or Fort Campbell, Kentucky due to the servicemember's military orders," and can demonstrate several other basic requirements. *See* Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 7, § 10.06(a).

Although the overall sample size is small when compared to the bar as a whole, the apparent dearth of any known cases of discipline for incompetent handling of matters by military spouse attorneys in the 30 jurisdictions where barriers to licensure have been dropped cannot be overlooked as an indicator that the "Competency Fallacy of Rule 5.5" cries out for re-evaluation. While allowing these lawyers more freedom to represent clients has not resulted in any noticeable increase in discipline, state bars have been actively imposing discipline against lawyers solely for engaging in "unauthorized practice

of law" in circumstances where the existence of any harm to consumers of legal services is questionable.

Client Trust and Choice of Counsel

APRL's proposed revisions to Model Rule 5.5 do not reject the need for client protection but elevates the client's right to choose counsel to a co-equal status in the context of the regulation of multijurisdictional practice. Providing client protection does not require artificial boundaries that prevent clients from choosing competent counsel of their choice even if the lawyer they choose is licensed elsewhere.

A client's right to choose, discharge, or replace their lawyer is a core ethical principal that permeates the Rules of Professional Conduct and is underscored in case law throughout the country. The law of law firm breakups and lawyer departures clarifies that neither a law firm nor any of its lawyers have a possessory interest in clients. The Supreme Court of Indiana has articulated in concise fashion the broadly recognized concept that clients are not "chattel" but independent actors with agency: "Although the firm may refer to clients of the firm as 'the firm's clients,' clients are not the 'possession' of anyone, but, to the contrary, control who will represent them." *Kelly v. Smith*, 611 N.E.2d 118, 122 (Ind. 1993).

The concept that an individual has a right to legal counsel is traditionally centered around the concept that "choice" necessarily suggests alternatives from which to choose. When the client is prepared to pay for legal representation, it would make sense that the client should be empowered to choose whoever the client wishes. This largely unchallenged freedom of choice continues past the initial selection of a lawyer. "[T]he right to change attorneys, with or without cause, has been characterized as 'universal.'" *Echlin v. Super. Ct. of San Mateo County*, 90 P.2d 63, 65 (Cal. 1939).

One scenario that highlights this issue is when a lawyer who has been working on a matter departs the firm where they have been employed. In such instances, the client has three choices, to remain a client with the firm, to remain a client with the departing lawyer, or whether to select new counsel altogether. *See, e.g.*, ABA Formal Ethics Op. 489; Rules Regulating the Florida Bar, rule 4-5.8; Virginia State Bar Professional Guidelines, rule 5.8 (both requiring that clients be notified of these three options).

It is because of a client's choice of counsel that restrictive covenants precluding lawyers who depart a firm from competing in the same marketplace have generally been found to be unenforceable outside of conditions on retirements, such as permitted by Model Code of Professional Responsibility DR 2-108(A) and Model Rule 5.6. Such restrictions not only discourage mobility within the marketplace but also deny clients the ability to choose between the firm and the withdrawing lawyer who previously represented them.

Under common law, the client's right to choose who should serve as their lawyer has been regarded as necessary to ensure that the proper dynamics exist for this unique fiduciary relationship. More than 90 years ago, the City Court of New York remarked, "It is unquestioned that a client has the right to terminate the relationship of attorney and client at any time, with or without cause. That right is afforded him by the law because of the peculiar nature and character of the relationship, which in its very essence is one of trust and confidence. It is a right for the benefit of the client and is intended to save him from representation by an attorney whose services he no longer desires." *Gordon v. Mankoff*, 261 N.Y.S. 888, 889-90 (1931).

Further, under the Sixth Amendment, there is a presumption that a criminal defendant may retain counsel of choice. For example, the Supreme Court concluded that the denial of a defendant's request for a continuance to consult with a lawyer violated due process rights. "Regardless of whether petitioner would have been entitled to the appointment of counsel, his right to be heard through his own counsel was unqualified. ...A necessary corollary is that a defendant must be given a reasonable opportunity to employ and consult with counsel; otherwise, the right to be heard by counsel would be of little worth." *Chandler v. Fretag*, 348 U.S. 3, 9, 10 (1954). This is consistent with the Supreme Court's earlier statement that "it is hardly necessary to say that, the right to counsel being conceded, a defendant should be afforded a fair opportunity to secure counsel of his own choice." *Powell v. Alabama,* 287 U.S. 45, 53 (1932).

A client's preference for counsel is even honored when looking at the termination of the relationship between a lawyer and a client. Clients may end a lawyer's representation at any time and for any reason. Conversely, lawyers may terminate the relationship only based on one or more of the enumerated situations set forth in Model

Rule 1.16(a) and (b)—and may only do so upon following the procedures set forth in (c) and (d).

Indeed, it is not unheard of for a court to deny a lawyer's application to withdraw from representing a client, even when the appropriate conditions are present. This issue is often litigated when a client terminates a lawyer's engagement before the occurrence of an event that a fee is contingent upon. The terminated lawyer often argues that the client's decision is unfair, particularly if the lawyer believes there was no just cause for the termination. But fairness to lawyers is subordinate to clients' right to choose and change their legal representatives. *See*, *e.g.*, *Fracasse v. Brent*, 494 P.2d 9, 13 (Cal.1972). The Supreme Court of California has remarked:

> The interest of the client in the successful prosecution or defense of the action is superior to that of the attorney, and he has the right to employ such attorney as will in his opinion best subserve his interest. The relation between them is such that the client is justified in seeking to dissolve that relation whenever he ceases to have absolute confidence in either the integrity or the judgment or the capacity of the attorney. . . . The fact that the attorney has rendered valuable services under his employment, or that the client is indebted to him therefor, or for moneys advanced in the prosecution or defense of the action, does not deprive the client of this right. (*Id*..)

Even where a client's right to choose is not absolute, for example, where a lawyer has a conflict of interest that cannot be waived, courts still articulate that the right to choose counsel should be of paramount importance. Particularly when addressing challenges by third parties—often in the context of asserted conflicts—courts have consistently concluded that a client's choice of counsel should be infringed upon only in cases where injustice will result. [8]

---

[8] *See*, *e.g.*, *Blumenfeld v. Borenstein*, 247 Ga. 406, 408 (1981) (reversing disqualification based solely on marital status, holding, "The mere fact that the public may perceive some conduct as improper is, without some actual impropriety, insufficient justification for interference with a client's right to counsel of choice."); *United States v. Urbana*, 770 F. Supp. 1552, 1556 (S.D.Fla. 1991) (courts disqualify an accused's lawyer of choice only as a measure of last resort). *Macheca Transport Co. v. Philadelphia Indem. Co.*, 463 F.3d 827, 833 (8th Cir. 2006) (the extreme measure of disqualifying counsel of choice should be used only when absolutely necessary); *In re BellSouth Corp.*, 334 F.3d 941, 961 (11th Cir. 2003) (the right to counsel of choice may only be overridden for compelling reasons); *Optyl Eyewear Fashion Intern. Corp. v. Style Companies, Ltd.*, 760 F.2d 1045, 1050 (9th Cir. 1985) (because of potential for abuse, disqualification motions should be subject to particularly strict judicial scrutiny); *Evans v. Artek Sys. Corp.*, 715 F.2d 788, 794 (2d Cir. 1983) (movant must meet a heavy burden to remove opposing counsel).

Yet when it comes to the multi-jurisdictional practice of law, the principal of client choice of counsel is strikingly absent. No matter that the prospective client has known the lawyer personally for many years, is related to the lawyer, has a prior professional relationship with the lawyer, is familiar with the lawyer's expertise in a narrow area of the law, or was referred to the lawyer by a trusted associate. If the lawyer is not licensed in the state in which the client resides or where a matter occurs, the client's choice receives no deference under Rule 5.5. Client choice of a lawyer is paramount, except when it contravenes an outdated regulatory scheme based on state boundaries

The Long and Problematic History of Placing Geographic Restrictions on the Right to Practice Law

Historical context proves useful when attempting to understand the current framework and to justify amending it to reflect the contemporary practice of law. In fact, "[t]he state-based licensing process originated more than two centuries ago when the need for legal services was locally based and often involved the need for representation in court."[9] It is worthwhile to journey back to this time to understand both the historical reasoning and its inapplicability to today's legal profession.

The authority to admit lawyers to practice in a jurisdiction derives from the role of the judiciary in the American legal system:

> From the colonial period until today, American courts have claimed the English common law tradition of inherent power—a power not derived from statute—to regulate the lawyers practicing before them, especially with respect to admission to practice. Thus, the courts must license lawyers before lawyers will be given audience, courts set the terms upon which legal practice is pursued, and courts enforce the rules they have themselves established.[10]

From Colonial Times to 1921

[9] Report of the ABA Commission on Multijurisdictional Practice, at 7 (August 2002) ("2002 MJP Report")."

[10] 1 Geoffrey Hazard, Jr., William Hodes & Peter Jarvis, THE LAW OF LAWYERING §1.07, at 1-26 (4th ed. 2021).

In colonial America, local judges generally determined admission in colonial courts, usually based on service in an apprenticeship for a number of years. An alternative approach was to permit lawyers admitted to the English bar to practice anywhere in the colonies.[11] After the American Revolution, states imposed varying admission requirements, with bar examinations, where they existed, generally a mere formality that could be bypassed by choosing a different area of study, such as clerking under a practitioner or judge.[12]

"[C]ontrol of the American legal profession remained highly localized and dispersed through the first hundred years or so following the Revolution."[13] Thus, "during the Jacksonian era, Bar admission requirements became increasingly less strict because of the perceived elitism of admission practices as contrary to democratic ideals."[14] As a result, almost any *man* who desired to practice law could gain admittance.[15] Where examinations were required, they were often oral and minimal, and have been characterized as "laughable" and almost a "farce" or a "joke."[16] "By 1860, of the thirty-nine states, only nine had any specific requirements for admission to their Bar."[17]

---

[11] Daniel Hansen, *Do We Need the Bar Examination? A Critical Evaluation of the Justifications for the Bar Examination and Proposed Alternatives,* 45 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 1191, 1193-94 (1995).

[12] *Id.* at 1194-95.

[13] James Jones, Anthony Davis, Simon Chester & Caroline Hart, *Reforming Lawyer Mobility—Protecting Turf or Serving Clients?,* 30 GEORGETOWN J. LEGAL ETHICS 125, 129 (2017).

[14] Hansen, *supra,* at 1195; Carol Langford, *Barbarians at the Bar: Regulation of the Legal Profession Through the Admissions Process,* 36 HOFSTRA L. REV. 1193, 1199 (2008). *See also* Jones, et al., *supra,* at 129 ("early efforts by the old established bars of the original colonies to keep the legal profession small and elite through rigorous admissions standards following the American Revolution largely collapsed, in no small part because of the diverse legal needs of a vast and rapidly expanding country of individual entrepreneurs"), citing Lawrence Friedman, A HISTORY OF AMERICAN LAW 315–18 (2d ed. 1985).

[15] Hansen, *supra,* at 1195-96; Langford, *supra,* at 1199. *See also* Matthew Ritter, *The Ethics of Moral Character Determination: An Indeterminate Ethical Reflection upon Bar Admissions*, 39 CAL W. L. REV. 1, 7 (2002) ("Although good moral character remained requisite for admission to the practice of law in many states, Bar membership was effectively open at the end of the Civil War to any and all male citizens who could produce a personal reference.").

[16] Hansen, *supra,* at 1196, 1200; Lawrence Friedman, A HISTORY OF AMERICAN LAW 317, 652 (2d ed. 1985). An often-told anecdote from the pre-Civil War period is of Abraham Lincoln examining an Illinois bar applicant while the future president was taking a bath. Hansen, *supra,* at 1196 (quoting Joel Seligman, *Why the Bar Exam Should be Abolished,* JURIS DR., at 48 (Aug.-Sept. 1978).

[17] Ritter, *supra*, at 7.

"The radical democratization of Bar admissions prompted widespread calls for its reform in the later nineteenth century."[18] The post-Civil War years saw the beginning of the standardized law school curriculum in this country, as Christopher Columbus Langdell's theory of legal education, based on the case method of Socratic instruction and focused on increased standards and more uniformity (which would effectively limit competition in the profession), became accepted.[19]

In addition, "[e]xpanding post-war industrialization increased concern over the character certification and competency of lawyers to deal with the extensive legalization of the social economy."[20] "The ancestor to the modern written bar examination developed between 1870 and 1890 and gained substantial ground and acceptance in the 1890s… [B]y the 1920s, there was a written bar examination in most states."[21] Further, "[b]etween 1880 and 1920, states adopted additional entry procedures, such as publication of applicants' names, probationary admissions, recommendations by the local Bar, court-directed inquiries, and investigation by character committees."[22]

1921 ABA Root Report

What has become the traditional route to bar admission now includes "graduating from an accredited law school, passing the admitting state's bar examination, and satisfying the state's bar examiners that the applicant possesses the requisite character to

[18] Deborah Rhode, *Moral Character as a Professional Credential,* 94 YALE L.J. 491, 498 (1985)

[19] Hansen, *supra,* at 1198-99.

[20] Langford, *supra,* at 1204.

[21] Hansen, *supra,* at 1200 (noting that "the written bar exam principally developed as a replacement for oral bar exams, and not as a check on law schools," and citing George Stevens, *Diploma Privilege, Bar Examination or Open Admission,* 46 B. EXAMINER 15, 25-26 (1977), for the proposition that "the bar exam was intended to standardize admissions requirements and was considered egalitarian in the sense that its mission was to equalize the disparate admissions requirements in various regions around the country").

[22] Rhode, *supra,* at 499.

practice law."[23] This uniform route to lawyer admission in virtually every state has its roots in the ABA Root Committee Report, issued 100 years ago, in 1921.[24]

The Root Report established the ABA's position that three years of law school education should be required for licensed lawyers (with two years of college as a prerequisite for law school entry), but that such a requirement alone was not sufficient. "[G]raduation from a law school should not confer the right of admission to the bar, and that every candidate should be subjected to an examination by public authority to determine his fitness."[25] The diploma privilege was eventually eliminated and replaced by required exams by all of the states with the exception of Wisconsin as of 2020.[26]

The Root Report urged states to impose these legal education and bar examination requirements based on two primary considerations: "efficiency" and "character." "The part played by lawyers in the formulation of law and in the establishment and maintenance of personal and property rights requires a high degree of efficiency for the proper service of the public."[27]

As to "character" considerations specifically, the Report noted that "it is plain that the private and public responsibilities of the profession demand a high standard of morality and implicit obedience to correct standards of professional ethics."[28] Thus, "character screening effectively arrived in the early twentieth century."[29] By 1927, a large

---

[23] 2002 MJP Report, at 7.

[24] Elihu Root, et al., *Report of the Special Committee to the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association,* 44 REP. ANNUAL MTG. A.B.A. 679 (1921) ("Root Report").

[25] *Id.* at 687-88

[26] *See* Hansen, *supra,* at 1192 & n.7. Objections to the diploma privilege in the 20th Century included "(1) a fear that law school education lacked uniformity in the length of time given over to study; (2) a belief that the diploma privilege was anti-democratic because it tended to favor state law schools over private schools, which were often not granted the privilege; (3) a belief that the diploma privilege discriminated against state residents who studied at out-of-state institutions; (4) a belief that the bar examination produced a higher standard of practice; and (5) a fear that the diploma privilege allowed law schools to circumvent the state's control of the bar." Beverly Moran, *The Wisconsin Diploma Privilege: Try It, You'll Like It,* 2000 WISC. L. REV. 645, 647. The third and fifth of these objections implicate federalism concerns that form the basis of current UPL regulation in state statutes and the ethics rules.

[27] *Id.* at 680.

[28] *Id.*

[29] Keith Swisher, *The Troubling Rise of the Legal Profession's Good Moral Character,* 82 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 1037, 1041 (2008). Other articles exploring the history of character and fitness requirements in detail

majority of the states had "strengthen[ed] character inquiries through mandatory interviews, character questionnaires, committee oversight, or related measures."[30]

The Report urged immediate action by the organized bar, the ABA, and state and local bar associations "to prevent the admission of the unfit and to eject the unworthy," and to "purify the stream at its source by causing a proper system of training to be established and to be required."[31] It is probably an understatement to say that when enforcement of character requirements began in earnest in the middle part of the 20th Century, "both its motivations and outcomes were extremely problematic."[32] In 1971 and again in 1991, the ABA and the National Conference of Bar Examiners reaffirmed the basic conclusions and recommendations of the Root Report.[33]

Statutory Developments and Enshrinement of UPL Restrictions in the Ethics Rules

Although the original 1908 ABA Canons on Professional Ethics did not contain a provision regarding the Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL), professional bar associations began to organize against UPL about a decade before the issuance of the Root Report. In 1914, "the New York County Lawyers Association launched the first unauthorized practice campaign by forming an unauthorized practice committee to curtail competition from title and trust companies," and the ABA followed suit by forming

---

include Deborah Rhode, *Moral Character as a Professional Credential,* 94 YALE L.J. 491, 498-503 (1985); Roger Roots, *When Lawyers Were Serial Killers: Nineteenth Century Visions of Good Moral Character,* 22 N. ILL. U. L. REV. 19 (2001); Matthew A. Ritter, *The Ethics of Moral Character Determination: An Indeterminate Ethical Reflection upon Bar Admissions,* 39 CAL. W. L. REV. 1, 4-13 (2002); and Carol Langford, *Barbarians at the Bar: Regulation of the Legal Profession Through the Admissions Process,* 36 HOFSTRA L. REV. 1193, 1196-1208 (2008).

[30] Swisher, *supra,* at 1041 (quoting Rhode, *supra,* 94 YALE L.J. at 499).

[31] Root Report, at 681.

[32] Swisher, *supra,* at 1040. As well documented in Professor Rhode's seminal 1995 article and expanded upon by Professor Swisher in his 2008 piece, scrutiny based on "character" excluded from admission "unworthy groups" based on gender and ethnicity considerations, as well as other perceived "problem" applicants. *Id.* at 1041-42. By the late 1950s, the U.S. Supreme Court had imposed constitutional constraints on these standards, requiring a rational connection to fitness to practice. *Id.* at 1042 (citing cases).

[33] Hansen, *supra,* at 1201 & nn.62, 63 (citing the 2nd and 3rd editions of the NCBE's Bar Examiner's Handbook).

its own committee on unauthorized practice by 1930.[34] "Beginning in the 1920s, bar associations attempted to gain greater control over the practice of law by spearheading efforts to 'integrate' the bar through court rules (pursuant to inherent powers) or statutes that required every lawyer to belong to the state bar."[35] And beginning in the 1930s, most state legislatures adopted statutes outlawing (and sometimes criminalizing) UPL,[36] with state supreme courts asserting their authority (often stated as "exclusive" authority vis-à-vis the legislature) to define and regulate UPL and the practice of law.[37]

UPL was first mentioned in an ABA ethics code in a September 30, 1937, amendment to the ABA Canons. New Canon 47, titled "Aiding the Unauthorized Practice of Law," provided that "No lawyer shall permit his professional services, or his name, to be used in aid of, or to make possible, the unauthorized practice of law by any lay agency, personal or corporate."

Three decades later, the restriction on assisting UPL was enshrined in the ABA Model Code of Professional Responsibility but also paired with a new prohibition. Canon 3 of the 1969 ABA Model Code of Professional Responsibility was titled "A Lawyer Should Assist In Preventing the Unauthorized Practice of Law." DR 3-101 of the Model Code,

---

[34] Derek Denckla, *Nonlawyers & the Unauthorized Practice of Law: An Overview of the Legal & Ethical Parameters,* 67 FORDHAM L. REV. 2581, 2583-84 (1999).

[35] *Id.* at 2582. "Invoking 'inherent powers,' the highest state courts have claimed the jurisdiction—sometimes exclusive—to regulate every aspect of the practice of law, through such activities as specifying conditions for admission, disciplining or disbarring those lawyers who fail to exercise good conduct, and promulgating lawyers' codes of conduct." *Id.; see also* RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS §1, cmt. *c* (2000) ("The highest courts in most states have ruled as a matter of state constitutional law that their power to regulate lawyers is inherent in the judicial function. Thus, the grant of judicial power in a state constitution devolves upon the courts the concomitant regulatory power."). The historical development of, and the role of the organized bar in, the "inherent power" doctrine in the context of state UPL regulation is extensively discussed in Laurel Rigertas, *Lobbying & Litigating Against "Legal Bootleggers"—The Role of the Organized Bar in the Expansion of the Courts' Inherent Powers in the Early Twentieth Century,* 46 CAL. W. L. REV. 65 (2009); and in Laurel Rigertas, *The Birth of the Movement to Prohibit the Unauthorized Practice of Law,* 37 QUINNIPIAC L. REV. 97 (2018).

[36] The language of these statutes appears to focus on the unauthorized practice of law by nonlawyers, but "most jurisdictions regarded even out-of-state *lawyers* as engaged in UPL, unless they had met local licensing requirements. Thus, lawyers were prohibited from practicing law in violation of local regulations, which meant that in courtroom litigation, at least, and perhaps in arbitration as well, out-of-state lawyers were required to seek admission *pro hac vice*. . . . Furthermore, whether out-of-state lawyers could participate in interstate transactional work in the 'wrong' jurisdiction, or even advise clients about the situation was uncertain, and many lawyers were willing to test the limits of a state's tolerance." 2 Hazard, Hodes & Jarvis, *supra,* §49.02, at 49-5.

[37] *See* Denckla, *supra,* at 2585.

titled "Aiding Unauthorized Practice of Law," provided that "(A) A lawyer shall not aid a non-lawyer in the unauthorized practice of law" and "(B) A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction where to do so would be in violation of regulations of the profession in that jurisdiction." The focus of the Ethical Considerations in Canon 3 was on practice by so-called non-lawyer "layman," but EC 3-9 explained the restriction on multijurisdictional practice:

> Regulation of the practice of law is accomplished principally by the respective states. Authority to engage in the practice of law conferred in any jurisdiction is not per se a grant of the right to practice elsewhere, and it is improper for a lawyer to engage in practice where he is not permitted by law or by court order to do so. However, the demands of business and the mobility of our society pose distinct problems in the regulation of the practice of law by the states. In furtherance of the public interest, the legal profession should discourage regulation that unreasonably imposes territorial limitations upon the right of a lawyer to handle the legal affairs of his client or upon the opportunity of a client to obtain the services of a lawyer of his choice in all matters including the presentation of a contested matter in a tribunal before which the lawyer is not permanently admitted to practice.

In a footnote supporting the first proposition in this EC (that regulation of the practice of law is accomplished principally by the respective states), the ABA Code cited the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *United Mine Workers v. Illinois State Bar Ass'n,* 389 U.S. 217, 222 (1967): "That the States have broad power to regulate the practice of law is, of course, beyond question." Quoting ABA Ethics Op. 316 (1967), the footnote also noted that "It is a matter of law, not of ethics, as to where an individual may practice law. Each state has its own rules." In recognizing the potential practical difficulties with imposing these restrictions, another footnote also quoted ABA Ethics Op. 316 for the proposition that

> Much of clients' business crosses state lines. People are mobile, moving from state to state. Many metropolitan areas cross state lines. It is common today to have a single economic and social community involving more than

> one state. The business of a single client may involve legal problems in several states."[38]

The Ethical Consideration noted these practical difficulties without providing guidance on how to resolve them.

This uncertainty continued with the enactment of the Model Rules. "When Model Rule 5.5 was originally promulgated in 1983, . . . it carried forward from the Model Code of Professional Responsibility, without elaboration, both aspects of the traditional prohibition on the unauthorized practice of law."[39] The rule simply provided that "A lawyer shall not (a) practice law in a jurisdiction where doing so violates the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction; or (b) assist a person who is not a member of the bar in the performance of activity that constitutes the unauthorized practice of law." There was a single comment:

> The definition of the practice of law is established by law and varies from one jurisdiction to another. Whatever the definition, limiting the practice of law to members of the bar protects the public against rendition of legal services by unqualified persons. Paragraph (b) does not prohibit a lawyer from employing the services of paraprofessionals and delegating functions to them, so long as the lawyer supervises the delegated work and retains responsibility for their work. See Rule 5.3. Likewise, it does not prohibit lawyers from providing professional advice and instruction to nonlawyers whose employment requires knowledge of law; for example, claims adjusters, employees of financial or commercial institutions, social workers, accountants and persons employed in government agencies. In addition, a lawyer may counsel nonlawyers who wish to proceed pro se.

As of the adoption of the Model Rules in the early 1980s, the state-based framework for regulation of lawyer admission and practice by the 50 individual states and

---

[38] An additional footnote quoted from a New Jersey Supreme Court case, *In re Estate of Waring,* 47 N.J. 367, 376, 221 A.2d 193, 197 (1966): "[W]e reaffirmed the general principle that legal services to New Jersey residents with respect to New Jersey matters may ordinarily be furnished only by New Jersey counsel; but we pointed out that there may be multistate transactions where strict adherence to this thesis would not be in the public interest and that, under the circumstances, it would have been not only more costly to the client but also 'grossly impractical and inefficient' to have had the settlement negotiations conducted by separate lawyers from different states."

[39] 2 Hazard, Hodes & Jarvis, *supra,* §49.02, at 49-4.

the District of Columbia was a *fait accompli,* altogether consistent with traditional and historical federalism principles, and seemingly immutable.[40] Any and all constitutional and other challenges to the individual states' authority to regulate the practice of law within their borders, as well as federal courts' authority to condition admission based on admission in the state in which they sit, have been decisively and universally rejected by the courts.[41]

Birbrower: **The California Supreme Court Grabs Lawyers' Attention**

Despite the long history of the restrictions set forth above, the application of UPL restrictions to licensed lawyers who practice law across state lines where they are not licensed, referred to as interstate UPL, did not receive much attention in the profession until 1998 when the Supreme Court of California issued its landmark decision in the case *Birbrower, Montalbano, Condo & Frank v. Superior Court of Santa Clara County*.[42] In sum, the Court held that New York-licensed lawyers from the New York law firm of Birbrower, Montalbano, Condo & Frank had engaged in UPL because the firm's lawyers

---

[40] For example, the 2002 MJP Report, at page 7, noted: "Lawyers in the United States are not licensed to practice law on a national basis, but are licensed by a state judiciary to practice law within the particular state. In general, state admissions processes are intended to protect the public by ensuring that those who are licensed to practice law in the state have the requisite knowledge of that state's laws and the general fitness and character to practice law." And §3 of the Restatement of the Law Governing Lawyers, adopted in 2000, accepts as essentially unchangeable based on historical experience the concept of judicial authority of each state to regulate law practice within state boundaries. *See* RESTATEMENT, *supra,* §3 & cmt. *b* ("[J]urisdictional limitations on practice applicable to lawyers are primarily a function of state lines. . . . Occasionally, proposals are put forward for removal of state-line limitations on practice, as by means of a national bar-admission process. However, local interest in maintaining regulatory control of lawyers practicing locally is strong and historically has prevented adoption of such proposals.").

[41] *E.g., Schoenefeld v. Schneiderman,* 821 F.3d 273 (2d Cir. 2016) (upholding against constitutional challenge under the Privilege and Immunities Clause a state requirement for nonresident bar members to maintain a physical office in the state), *cert. denied,* 137 S. Ct. 1580 (2017); *National Association for the Advancement of Multijurisdictional Practice (NAAMJP) v. Howell,* 851 F.3d 12 (D.C. Cir.) (joining "the chorus of judicial opinions" rejecting constitutional challenges of the NAAMJP and lawyer Joseph Giannini to local rules of practice limiting who may appear in particular state and federal courts), *cert. denied,* 138 S. Ct. 420 (2017); *NAAMJP v. Lynch,* 826 F.3d 191 (4th Cir.) (rejecting NAAMJP's constitutional challenge to conditions placed on admission to the Maryland federal district court bar), *cert. denied,* 137 S. Ct. 459 (2016); *Giannini v. Real,* 911 F.2d 354 (9th Cir.) (upholding constitutionality of California bar examination and local federal rules conditioning admission), *cert. denied,* 498 U.S. 1012 (1990); *Lawyers United Inc. v. U.S.,* 2020 WL 3498693 (D.D.C. June 29, 2020) (rejecting constitutional challenges to federal bar admission rules in D.C., California, and Florida), *aff'd,* 839 Fed. Appx. 570 (March 15, 2021).

[42] 949 P.2d 1 (1998), *cert. denied,* 525 U.S. 920 ("*Birbrower*")

handled a matter in California for a California client in preparation for a California arbitration based on a contract governed by California law. The Court further held that because the firm violated California's UPL statute it could not enforce its fee agreement and collect the substantial fees it had earned for the California legal services it had provided.[43]

Birbrower generated a great deal of controversy and concern among lawyers and law firms throughout the country. It particularly created uncertainty for lawyers who regularly practiced across state lines as to what amount of legal work and activity would constitute the unlawful practice of law. (Those interested in a more thorough discussion of *Birbrower* can find a deeper dive into its facts and ramifications at Appendix A.)

Although the California Court of Appeal case that quickly followed on the heels of *Birbrower*, *Estate of Condon v. McHenry* 65 Cal.App.4th 1138, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922 (1998) ("*Condon*"), attempted to clarify some of these concerns by emphasizing that purpose of the UPL rules to protect the state's people and entities should be paramount in any analysis, the holding in Condon that a Colorado lawyer did not commit UPL by representing a Colorado client concerning a California matter was not widely noticed.

While there are courts that have deviated from *Birbrower*, *Birbrower's* influence continues to impact interstate UPL. For example, in the 2016 case *In re Charges of Unprofessional Conduct in Panel File No. 39302*, 884 N.W.2d 661 (Minn. 2016), a Colorado-admitted lawyer agreed to represent his in-laws in a post-judgment debt collection matter in Minnesota. The Colorado lawyer was not licensed in Minnesota and never set foot in the state, but he unsuccessfully tried to negotiate a settlement of the Minnesota matter by telephone and email.

In defending himself against disciplinary charges, the Colorado lawyer argued that a lawyer practices law *in* a jurisdiction in one of three ways: (1) by being physically present in the jurisdiction; (2) by establishing an office or other systematic and continuous presence in the jurisdiction; or (3) by entering an appearance in a matter through the filing of documents with a tribunal. *Id.* at 665. Citing *Birbrower*, the court determined that physical presence in the state was not the only way to practice law in Minnesota and that through multiple e-mails sent over several months, the lawyer advised Minnesota

[43] *Id.* at 11.

clients on Minnesota law in connection with a Minnesota legal dispute and attempted to negotiate a resolution of that dispute with a Minnesota attorney demonstrating an ongoing attorney-client relationship with his Minnesota clients and that his contacts with Minnesota were not fortuitous or attenuated. *Id.* at 666. Thus, the court held that the out-of-state lawyer committed the unauthorized practice of law in Minnesota by violating Minn. R. Prof. Conduct 5.5(a) resulting in the lawyer being disciplined.

In response to *Birbrower* and after issuance of the 2002 MJP Report, the ABA eventually adopted a revision to the Model Rules to authorize temporary practice in jurisdictions other than a lawyer's licensed jurisdiction.

The 2002 MJP Report and the Most Recent Revisions to ABA Model Rule 5.5

The 2002 MJP report, which preceded and largely served as an advocacy piece for changes to ABA Model Rule 5.5 adopted by the House of Delegates the same year, summarized the purported policy basis for multijurisdictional UPL restrictions in state statutes and the lawyer ethics rules:

> In general, a lawyer may not represent clients before a state tribunal or otherwise practice law within a particular state unless the lawyer is licensed by the state or is otherwise authorized to do so. Jurisdictional restrictions promote a variety of state regulatory interests. Most obviously, by limiting law practice in the state to those whom the state judiciary, through its admissions process, has deemed to be qualified to practice law in the state, they promote the state interest in ensuring that those who represent clients in the state are competent to do so. Jurisdictional restrictions also promote the state interest in ensuring that lawyers practicing law within the state do so ethically and professionally. Lawyers licensed by the state are thought to be more conversant than out-of-state lawyers with state disciplinary provisions as well as with unwritten but understood expectations about how members of the local bar should behave, and lawyers in the state may be disciplined more easily and effectively than out-of-state lawyers when they engage in professional improprieties. By strengthening lawyers' ties to the particular communities in which they maintain their offices, jurisdictional restrictions may also help maintain an active and vibrant local bar, which in many communities serves a crucial public role, because lawyers serve voluntarily on court committees, in public office, and on boards of not-for-profit institutions in the community. 2002 MJP Report, at 9.

The 2002 MJP Report noted that "no state categorically excludes out-of-state lawyers and there is general agreement that, as a practical matter, lawyers cannot serve clients effectively unless accommodations are made for multijurisdictional law practice, at least on a temporary or occasional basis." *Id.* at 10. For litigation matters, the Report noted that *pro hac vice* admission rules existed in every state but was not available for some aspects of litigation matters, such as pre-litigation work and ADR. *Id.* at 10, 12. Transactional lawyers "also commonly provide services in states in which they are not licensed," and on behalf of clients in their state of admission, often "travel outside the state in order to conduct negotiations, gather information, provide advice, or perform other tasks relating to the representation." *Id.* at 12. Thus, the Report noted that lawyers, as of the end of the 20th Century,

> have general understandings about how jurisdictional restrictions apply to their work in states where they are not licensed. These understandings are shaped less by the wording of the UPL provisions or by decisional law, which is sparse, than by conventional wisdom or by what the U.S. Supreme Court has called "the lore of the profession." On one hand, lawyers understand that they may not open a permanent office in a state where they are not licensed and also that they may not appear in the court of a state where they are not licensed without judicial authorization. On the other hand, lawyers recognize that they may give advice in their own states concerning the law of other jurisdictions, that they may represent out-of-state clients in connection with transactions and litigation that take place where the lawyer is licensed, and that they may travel to other jurisdictions in connection with legal work on behalf of clients who reside in and have matters in the state where the lawyer is licensed.

Id. at 13. And these understandings were "to some extent, reinforced by the sporadic enforcement of state UPL laws," with regulatory actions "rarely brought against lawyers who assist clients on a temporary basis in connection with multi-state or interstate matters." *Id.*

Consistent with the recommendations of the 2002 MJP Report, the ABA adopted temporary practice rules contained in Model Rule 5.5(c). It permits four exceptions to UPL that allow lawyers to "provide legal services on a temporary basis" in a jurisdiction where they are not admitted: (1) when they associate with local counsel who actively

participates in the matter; (2) when they are assisting or participating in an actual or potential proceeding before a tribunal, generally by obtaining pro hac vice admission; (3) when they are participating in an arbitration, mediation or other alternative resolution; and (4) where the legal services in the second state "arise out of or are reasonably related to the lawyer's practice in a jurisdiction in which the lawyer is admitted to practice." Model Rule 5.5(c) (1-4).

Model Rule 5.5(d) further allows lawyers admitted in another US jurisdiction or in a foreign jurisdiction, or a person lawfully practicing as in-house counsel under the laws of a foreign jurisdiction to provide legal services through an office or other systematic or continuous presence in a jurisdiction where the lawyer is not licensed if certain criteria are met. Model Rule 5.5(d-e). Model rule 5.5(a-b), however, essentially continued, other than otherwise as excepted under the above sub-sections, to prohibit interstate multijurisdictional practice.

These revisions to the ABA Model Rules met widespread approval in terms of being adopted by a majority of U.S. jurisdictions, but not all jurisdictions have done so, and issues persist. Some of those issues revolve around lawyers' need to evaluate the approaches of jurisdictions that have not embraced the Model Rule approach to temporary practice, while other issues stem from problems involving the lack of "fit" between modern law practice and either regulating activity based only on geographic boundaries or based upon notions that any lawyer practices "the law of a jurisdiction."

Competence as an Ongoing Regulatory Justification

Defenders of the current version of Rule 5.5 often assert that restrictions on multi-jurisdictional practice are necessary to ensure the competence of lawyers who represent clients in their jurisdiction. In addition to the previously discussed competence paradox involved in the privileges of licensed lawyers under the current regulatory structure, the modern landscape of how lawyers become licensed to practice law across the United States undermines this rationale.

As discussed above, jurisdiction to regulate the practice of law has been largely a matter of geographic boundaries up to this point,[44] with some exceptions.[45] Notably, authorization to practice law within the state of licensure is comprehensive; the license does not limit a lawyer to work involving the law of the licensing jurisdiction. Although jurisdictional licensing based exclusively on a lawyer's location has provided the benefit of clarity both in terms of the authorization and freedom to practice regardless of what laws or jurisdictions the lawyer's work might touch; lawyers can now effectively practice nationwide in many respects without ever leaving their licensing jurisdictions. Moreover, the jurisdictional regulatory scheme limits lawyers' ability to physically relocate while serving clients only in those jurisdictions in which the lawyers are admitted to practice.

Licensing Lawyers in 2021

Admission by Bar Examination

As discussed above, the competency argument for multi-jurisdictional practice restrictions assumes that admission to practice in one jurisdiction does not establish competence to practice in any other jurisdiction. The underlying premise in that proposition is that some special training or testing is required to demonstrate competence in a particular jurisdiction.

Presently, 41 U.S. jurisdictions have adopted the Uniform Bar Examination (including Michigan, which announced in October 2021 that it would adopt the UBE, to be administered starting in 2023). The candidates for admission in those jurisdictions take identical bar examinations, although the minimum threshold for passing scores varies among jurisdictions:[46]

---

[44] RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS §3(1) (2000), "A lawyer currently admitted to practice in a jurisdiction may provide legal services to a client…at any place within the admitting jurisdiction." *Id.* COMMENT (e): "Admission in a state permits a lawyer to maintain an office and otherwise practice law anywhere within its borders."

[45] Federally authorized practice, for example, allows one to practice law nationwide. See *Sperry v. Florida*, 373 U.S. 379 (1963). Federal law sets the maximum qualifications required to practice before all but one federal agency at being a member of the bar of a state. See 5 USC §500(b). Some federal courts also allow for application to admission based upon a bar license in any jurisdiction along with admission to a federal court in that jurisdiction. See, e.g., L.R.Civ.P. 83.1 (WDNY).

[46] *See* https://www.ncbex.org/exams/ube/score-portability/minimum-scores/ (last visited Jan. 8, 2022).

260	Alabama, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, North Dakota
264	Indiana, Oklahoma
266	Connecticut, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Montana, New Jersey, New York, South Carolina, Virgin Islands
270	Arkansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming
272	Idaho, Pennsylvania
273	Arizona
276	Colorado
280	Alaska

Twenty-four of the UBE jurisdictions have no additional or substitute exam component tailored to that particular jurisdiction.[47] Of the 16 jurisdictions that have a state-specific component, nine require attending a course or tutorial in the jurisdiction's law (all the courses but one, New Mexico's, are online, and only New York requires both an online course and an online test). When an applicant from another jurisdiction transfers in a passing UBE score, such applicants may also be required by these nine states to complete the state-focused course or tutorial. Seven jurisdictions (including New York) require an applicant to complete an online multiple-choice test. All seven states require anyone seeking admission, either by bar exam or transfer of score from another jurisdiction, to complete the test.

[47] https://reports.ncbex.org/comp-guide/charts/chart-5/#1610472174303-4aeee78b-6a74 (last visited Jan. 8, 2022).

Admission on Motion

Virtually all of the jurisdictions permitting admission by motion impose the same jurisdiction-specific exam and course requirements for those applicants. Otherwise, the states permitting admission by motion treat the lawyer's experience in their home jurisdiction as sufficient to demonstrate competence to be licensed in the new jurisdiction.

Conclusion

Geographic limitations on a lawyer's provision of services long accepted by the legal profession in the name of client protection often deprive clients of ever having an opportunity to exercise a truly full and free "choice" of counsel. These geographic restrictions exist even if lawyer and client are both willing to enter into the engagement, oftentimes already having an existing professional relationship. Geographic limitations also make no accommodation for the idea that the relationship may benefit from both the level of trust that the client has in the lawyer as the "first choice" as well as any existing knowledge the lawyer has about the client, including relevant goals, priorities, tendencies, and communication style.

Instead of such a rigid approach, APRL's proposed Model Rule 5.5 allows clients to consciously choose the lawyer they want to represent them as long as the lawyer has disclosed to the client the facts as to where they are licensed. It does not abandon client protection in empowering client choice. It also ensures that lawyers who ultimately do provide incompetent legal services, or who otherwise run afoul of their ethical obligations, will be capable of being held responsible for their misconduct or shortcomings in any (or all) of the relevant jurisdictions.

APRL's proposal to revise Model Rule 5.5 is also consistent with the trend that has come from several jurisdictions who have issued guidance during the 2020 Pandemic to lawyers who found themselves practicing across state lines less by choice and more by necessity.[48] Not all of the guidance issued in these jurisdictions has been focused entirely

[48] D.C. Opinion 24-20: Teleworking from Home and the COVID-19 Pandemic (March 23, 2020) (interpreting the "incidental and temporary practice" exception of DC's Rule 49(c)(13)); *see also* N.J. Committee on the Unauthorized Practice of Law Op. 59, Advisory Committee on Prof. Ethics Op. 742 (Oct. 6, 2021); Pennsylvania State Bar Op. 300 (April 2020); Utah State Bar Ethics Advisory Committee Opinion

upon, or limited to situations where, lawyers were forced for public health reasons to live somewhere other than where they were licensed, but, if history is a guide, absent further improvements in the rule itself, then the progress that has been made will likely not come to fruition. APRL's proposed Model Rule 5.5 embeds the concepts of client choice, transparency, and accountability in a way that we believe will long outlive those who currently practice law under the existing regulatory system.

No. 19-03 (May 14, 2019); The Fla. Bar re: Advisory Opinion – Out-of-State Attorney Working Remotely From Florida Home, SC20-1220 (Fla. May 20, 2021).

Exhibit F

The World Needs More Lawyers

By Shoshana Weissmann, Daniel Greenberg, Luke Wake,
Braden Boucek and Jonathan Riches

“If there's one thing this world needs, it's more lawyers.
Could you imagine a world without lawyers?”

-Lionel Hutz, The Simpsons

The Federalist Society and Regulatory Transparency Project take no position on particular legal or public policy matters. This paper was the work of multiple authors, and no assumption should be made that any or all of the views expressed are held by any individual author except where stated. The views expressed are those of the authors in their personal capacities and not in their official or professional capacities.

To cite this paper: S. Weissmann et al., “The World Needs More Lawyers,” released by the Regulatory Transparency Project of the Federalist Society, September 28, 2023 (https://rtp.fedsoc.org/paper/the-world-needs-more-lawyers/)

28 September 2023

Executive Summary

The American legal profession, as well as those it serves, would benefit from lowering the barriers to entry to the practice of law. Several licensing barriers unnecessarily contribute to the high cost of legal services, which inhibit access to justice for ordinary Americans. In some respects, legal licensure is categorically distinct from the licensure of other highly regulated professions. This suggests that a particular focus on legal licensure may be appropriate. We therefore explore the implications of modest reforms that would advance the public interest, with an eye to the encouragement of competitive markets in legal services, and the protection and preservation of the fiduciary nature of legal services.

I. Introduction

Everyone knows lawyers are expensive. The hard truth is that individuals of modest means often cannot afford counsel. Even small businesses may be hard-pressed to seek out counsel when needed.

Of course, there are good reasons why legal counsel is costly. Practicing law is difficult. Representation in any given matter may require an extraordinary expenditure of time and energy. Yet if we believe that it is important to provide ordinary individuals access to the justice system, it is worth asking whether there are ways we could encourage more competitive legal markets that might lower costs to consumers.

One answer may be to pursue modest reforms of existing legal licensure regimes that operate as barriers to entry into the profession. As detailed in Occupational Licensing Run Wild, there is now broad cross-ideological consensus that occupational licensing barriers generally raise costs for consumers with only marginal benefits to the public. Often the perceived benefits of licensing can be achieved through more tailored regulatory measures that would ultimately benefit consumers. Those lessons may be applied even to the legal profession.

We do not propose the elimination of legal licensure requirements. But consumers would benefit if we could eliminate duplicative or unnecessary restrictions on the practice of law. Accordingly, this paper examines the nature of existing licensing requirements and considers the relative merits of several potential reforms—while emphasizing that the practice of law requires particularized standards that will safeguard the interests of clients.

On their face, licensing requirements exist to protect the vulnerable. That remains an important goal. But it is essential that all licensing requirements have appropriate effect and are supported by evidence. As we shall see, some licensure restrictions impose burdens without commensurate benefits to society.

II. The Value of Reconsidering Existing Legal Licensure Requirements and Their Potential Tradeoffs

Today, there is a wide cross-ideological consensus in favor of occupational licensing reform.[1] Over-extensive occupational licensing blocks providers from entering labor markets, thereby reducing supply of their services and pushing prices higher for consumers. And the alleged benefits of stricter licensing requirements are often oversold or illusory.[2]

There is growing support for occupational licensing reform for historically low-paid professions like florists, health care paraprofessionals, childcare workers, and tradesmen. But occupational licensing is especially entrenched for higher-status professionals. That is especially true for the inherently conservative legal profession.[3]

Even if we accept licensure as a permanent fixture of the legal profession, there are opportunities to improve the system. For example, one could conceivably allow competent individuals to practice law on specific matters for which they have been well trained. This is starkly different from the universal scope of practice that is contemplated by our existing legal licensure regime. But the idea of allowing varying levels of legal licenses is not without precedent.

Consider the medical field. A doctor with a medical license is granted a universal scope of practice to provide any medical care that may be needed. But other medical professionals are only authorized to provide a narrow band of services. For example, nurses can diagnose and treat certain conditions and ailments; order, perform, and interpret diagnostic tests; and (in some cases) prescribe medications and certain treatments. These regimes ensure adequate care, partly because a licensed nurse must typically work under the supervision of a fully licensed doctor. And a nurse's license demonstrates only that its holder has been deemed competent to provide a limited set of medical services.

Of course, there are tradeoffs. The benefit of allowing nurses to provide more medical services is that they can provide needed services more rapidly, and at lower costs, than if those services were performed exclusively by licensed doctors. The potential cost is that services provided by nurses

---

[1] Notably, every recent presidential administration has encouraged occupational licensing reform. The Obama Administration issued a report arguing that the growing costs of occupational licensing rules functioned as a tax on consumers. The Trump Administration devoted resources to helping state governments design and implement occupational licensing reforms. And on July 9, 2021, the Biden Administration, through executive order, encouraged "the FTC to ban unnecessary occupational licensing restrictions that impede economic mobility."

[2] Licensing regimes are often predicated on an assumption that excluding relatively weak or low-quality providers will benefit consumers. But as detailed in Occupational Licensing Run Wild, there are usually regulatory alternatives that facilitate more competitive markets, decrease costs for consumers, and safeguard the public interest more effectively.

[3] *See, e.g.,* https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/california-bar-swamped-by-comments-opposing-ethics-rule-changes

might not always provide the same quality of care that a doctor would.[4] In many cases, policymakers have dealt with these tradeoffs by deciding that the pressing need for providing health care calls for a more flexible system.

Likewise, one must question whether the tradeoffs are worth accepting as we contemplate reforms to existing legal licensure regimes. Legal licensure reform is complicated because any reforms must ensure that the providers maintain fiduciary responsibilities and a high level of care to safeguard client interests. However, the state can often address those compelling concerns by enforcing codes of professional conduct as opposed to denying licensure.

These potential tradeoffs inform our analysis of limited scope of practice licensure and other liberalizing reforms. At the root of each of the following proposals is the idea that there is value in lowering the barriers to entry into the legal profession, so long as we ensure an adequate level of protection for consumers of legal services. The overarching question is: what system would most benefit those in need of legal services, especially those whom are currently priced out of the market?

III. Avenues for Legal Licensure Reform

A. Interstate Recognition and Remote Work

The legal profession has been fundamentally and irrevocably changed by the revolution in remote work. Lawyering is uniquely suited to remote work, given how much of the job involves quiet moments of research and writing that can take place from any location.

Lawyers already drafted documents on the computer, rather than by hand. They already researched online—not in libraries. In the digital era, lawyers can interview clients and witnesses virtually—and with lower cost and more convenience.[5] So now more than ever, lawyers can work from wherever, whenever—and they are just as effective as ever. Moreover, remote work arrangements can also benefit law firms by reducing overhead expenses, which could help lower the costs of legal services.

Yet unfortunately, remote practice of law is sometimes unlawful. One might reasonably think that a lawyer licensed in a specific state should be free to move and work wherever as long as the lawyer limits his or her work to matters pertaining to the state where he or she is licensed. And that is true in some states.[6] Some states expressly require attorneys to be licensed wherever they physically

---

[4] In any event, empirical evidence shows nurse practitioners provide care equal to that of physicians.

[5] According to Clio's 2020 Legal Trends report, 56% of consumers would prefer videoconferencing over a phone call and 69% prefer working with a lawyer who can share documents electronically through a web page, app, or online portal. 2020 Legal Trends Report (Clio), available at https://www.clio.com/resources/legal-trends/2020- report/.

[6] For example, in 2022, the Virginia Supreme Court clarified that: "[A] foreign lawyer may work remotely in Virginia (from home or otherwise), for any length of time, with or without an emergency justification to do so, as long as the work done involves the practice of the law of the foreign lawyer's licensing jurisdiction or exclusively federal law that does not require Virginia licensure."

perform legal work—regardless of what state their clients are in or what matters they are working on.[7] And the issue is unsettled or unclear in other states—which means lawyers must seek admittance to avoid risk of sanction.[8]

Meanwhile, a related issue has long plagued attorneys seeking to practice law across different jurisdictions. Generally, if an attorney seeks to handle legal matters pertaining to different states he or she must be licensed within each jurisdiction. This means that to avoid professional and criminal sanction, an attorney must seek admittance to multiple state bars—with all the attendant costs, administrative burdens and energy that entails. For one, no attorney relishes having to take the bar exam—even if they have already passed their own state's bar with flying colors (perhaps decades ago).

All of this means that attorneys are discouraged from expanding services to clients who might benefit from their assistance. In so limiting the availability of competent attorneys, these licensing regimes, in turn, drive up costs for legal services. And so one must question whether the benefits of requiring an attorney to go through these hoops is really worth it.

Consider the case of Violaine Panasci.[9] She graduated law school from the University of Ottawa in Canada, and received her LLM from Pace University in New York where she graduated *summa cum laude*. She scored in the 90th percentile o n the Uniform Bar Exam (UBE) and passed the New York Bar Exam—which is notoriously one of the toughest in the country. But after being admitted to the New York Bar she relocated to Nashville during the pandemic.

Unsurprisingly, she had no trouble getting hired in Tennessee. Her trouble came from the state of Tennessee, which denied her application to practice law because the State Bar concluded her "academic path [was] not equivalent to that of a traditional U.S. graduate."

That was surprising. Given that Tennessee uses the same UBE as New York, and the fact that she remained in good standing in New York, there should be no doubt as to her professional competence. And given the need for good, affordable lawyers, in a rural state like Tennessee, one would think her admission would serve the public interest.[10]

Why wasn't it good enough that Violaine was admitted in another state? Why doesn't Tennessee want as many competent lawyers as it can find to drive down the cost of legal services that many find prohibitively high? Why did Violaine have to apply in the first place, only to be rejected?

The bottom line is that restrictive Tennessee practices appear to dampen competition in the market for legal services by benefiting incumbents at the expense of new market entrants and consumers.

---

[7] For example, Missouri Bar Advisory Opinion No. 970098 provides: "It would constitute the unauthorized practice of law for an Attorney to provide legal advice or counseling on any area of law from an office which is located physically within the state of Missouri."

[8] *See E.g.*, Tex. Rules Disc. Prof'l. Cond. Rule 5.05; Ala. Rules of Prof'l. Cond. Rule 5.5(d); Colo. of Prof'l. Cond. Rule R.5.5; Nev. Rules of Prof'l. Cond. Rule 5.5.

[9] Available at https://www.tennessean.com/story/opinion/2022/08/22/tennessee-board-of-law-examiners-denied-application-supreme-court-challenge/7867974001/.

[10] *See* Conference of State Court Administrators, *Courts Need to Enhance Access to Justice in Rural America*, pp. 1-3 (2018).

But if the only justification is to protect already licensed attorneys from competition, it really is time for policymakers to consider reform. Thankfully, on September 16, 2022, the Supreme Court of Tennessee issued a per curiam order that recognized that Violaine's legal education "should not preclude" her from being admitted to practice law in Tennessee.[11]

The good news is that there is a model rule that would both clarify that remote work is lawful and enable competent attorneys to engage in multijurisdictional practice without seeking admittance to numerous state bars. The Association of Professional Responsibility Lawyers has presented a Proposed Rule revising the American Bar Association Model Rule 5.5 governing multi-jurisdictional practice of law. Regardless of whether the ABA endorses the rule, state policy makers should consider adopting the following:

RULE 5.5: Multijurisdictional Practice of Law

(a) A lawyer admitted and authorized to practice law in any United States jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction, subject to the other provisions of this rule.

(b) Only a lawyer who is admitted to practice in this jurisdiction may hold out to the public or otherwise represent that the lawyer is admitted to practice law in this jurisdiction.

(c) A lawyer who provides legal services in this jurisdiction shall:

(1) Disclose where the lawyer is admitted to practice law;

(2) Comply with this jurisdiction's rules of professional conduct, including but not limited to Rule 1.1 (Competence), and with the admission requirements of courts of this jurisdiction;

(3) Be subject to Rule 8.5 regarding the disciplinary authority and choice of law rules of this jurisdiction; and

(4) Not assist another person in the unauthorized practice of law in this, or any other, jurisdiction.

(d) A lawyer admitted and authorized to practice law in a foreign jurisdiction, and not disbarred or suspended from practice in any jurisdiction or the equivalent thereof, may provide legal services in this jurisdiction that:

(1) are provided to the lawyer's employer or its organizational affiliates;

(2) are not services for which the forum requires pro hac vice admission; and

(3) do not arise under the law of any U.S. jurisdiction, unless the services are provided after consultation with a lawyer authorized to practice law in this jurisdiction.

B. Enabling Trained Professionals to Do More Without a Law License

One way to reduce legal costs for ordinary individuals is to give them more options for pursuing legal services. Currently, consumers are limited to working with fully-licensed lawyers if they want any sort of legal representation. Even something as simple as filling out a form that will be filed in court may constitute the practice of law, which usually precludes non-lawyers from giving assistance.

[11] https://www.goldwaterinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Violaine-Panasci-Supreme-Court-of-Tennessee.pdf

But some states have begun experimenting with reforms that enable paralegals (or other trained professionals) to handle basic issues.

For example, in 2020, the Utah Supreme Court voted unanimously to establish a "pathbreaking" pilot program that allows qualified non-lawyers to provide services that were previously permitted only for Utah-licensed attorneys. The so-called "Regulatory Sandbox Program" may serve as an innovative model for other states to emulate. As the Supreme Court explained, the program would "explore creative ways to safely allow lawyers and non-lawyers to practice law and to reduce constraints on how lawyers market and promote their services."

Businesses had to apply to participate in the Regulatory Sandbox Program. There were restrictions: for example, the Sandbox would not allow for out-of-state attorneys to circumvent Utah's licensure requirements, or for disbarred attorneys to control a business providing legal services. There were disclosure requirements. Participants also had to affirm their compliance with Utah's Rules of Professional Conduct. Any request for waiver of those rules had to be clearly stated in the application, and it had to explain why waiver would not cause consumer harm.

Once approved, participating entities could engage in activities otherwise restricted to licensed Utah lawyers. This was not a universal license to practice law. But the Regulatory Sandbox Program allowed limited legal services in certain approved areas. And this opened up opportunities both for business innovation and for expanded services in the non-profit sector.

For example, Holy Cross Ministries joined the sandbox to train "two community health workers to serve as bilingual medical-debt legal advocates" so they could provide limited legal advice about medical debt and related problems. In the first nine months, the Regulatory Sandbox enabled non-lawyers to assist more than 2,500 individuals with "housing, immigration, healthcare, discrimination, employment, and a gamut of other issues." Program participants have also assisted victims of domestic violence and stalking with limited legal issues, while providing emotional support that they would not otherwise receive.

Although many low-income individuals may be priced out of the legal market altogether, there is reason to believe that limited authorized legal services from non-lawyers could reduce costs and expand access to justice. For example, some firms use both artificial intelligence software and nonlawyer providers to aid in the process of record expungement for Utahns. And the cost of such services is generally significantly cheaper than that charged by a traditional lawyer.

Some members of the established legal community are likely to resist such reforms. For example, "access to justice" advocates encountered fierce opposition in California when proposing reforms that would authorize non-lawyers to provide limited services. Some argued that these reforms would "completely destroy the practice of law as we know it," and argued that allowing non-lawyers to offer limited services would "erode the quality of legal services."

To be sure, the State has a legitimate interest in ensuring that those who provide legal services are appropriately regulated to safeguard the public. But as noted above, the medical field already has embraced the idea of allowing qualified individuals to provide limited medical services—while limiting the universal practice of medicine only to licensed doctors. Of course, those in need of legal help are in a vulnerable position and need assurance that those authorized to provide legal services

are competent. But the stakes are even higher in the field of medicine, where the quality of the service literally could be the difference between life and death.

In the medical field, policymakers have judged that the value of enabling greater access to health care is worth the risk of allowing trained individuals to provide limited medical care—even if they haven't gone to medical school. So it is not unreasonable to think that the legal profession could allow for limited licensure for trained individuals. When weighing the respective costs and benefits of the status quo, one must consider the likelihood that some people will go without legal help altogether if limited to working with more costly fully-licensed attorneys, in just the same way we know that staggering costs discourage some people from seeking health care.

While mindful of the risks, a growing number of states are experimenting with these sort of reforms—especially for paralegals who already have requisite training to help with limited matters in "[c]ases involving temporary separation, divorce, parentage, cohabitant abuse, civil stalking, custody and support, and name change," "forcible entry and detainer," and smaller debt collection issues. For example, licensed paralegals can now fill out forms that, previously, only lawyers were authorized to execute.

Likewise, Arizona, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Oregon have experimented with similar reforms. And other jurisdictions—like New York, Maryland, District of Columbia, and New Mexico—have experimented with "court navigators" who can assist people going through the court system with knowing what the processes look like, which office to contact next, what the necessary forms are, etc.

Ultimately, states contemplating reform should look to data from states that have pioneered regulatory innovation in this arena. If the data shows that that there are no greater complaints from individuals assisted with these sort of limited legal services, it would make sense for other states to follow suit. And at least so far, the initial results from Utah are positive.

C. Allowing Non-Lawyers to Invest in Legal Service Companies

The American Bar Association's Model Rule 5.4 provides that lawyers are generally prohibited from sharing legal fees with non-lawyers; furthermore, the Rule flatly prohibits lawyers from forming partnerships with non-lawyers.[12] Today, almost every state has adopted this rule in some form. Such restrictions are meant to protect legal consumers. The assumption that drives the rule is that, without it, non-lawyers may pursue profit at the expense of client interests. But is this assumption correct?

One state is now experimenting with an alternative model that sheds light on this question by encouraging innovation in the legal services market. In 2020, the Arizona Supreme Court eliminated

---

12 https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_5_4_professional_independence_of_a_lawyer/.

its non-lawyer ownership prohibition.[13] The rule change allows non-lawyers to own, manage, and profit from law firms.[14]

Since Arizona adopted this measure, several firms have participated in this new business model, known as an Alternative Business Structure ("ABS"). The results have been promising. In addition to price and technological innovations in the practice of law,[15] ABS has proven to be convenient for clients looking for one-stop shops for legal and business needs.

For example, the ABS model allows attorneys to couple their services with those of other advisors in such fields as tax planning, real estate, and business formation, among others. According to Andy Kvesic, the CEO and Managing Partner of ABS firm Radix Law, many firms in Arizona have been providing these comprehensive services to clients: "Estate planning attorneys have combined with wealth planners under one roof. Tax attorneys are now working side by side with accountants…Personal injury firms are teaming up with litigation finance companies to tap a new source of capital."[16]

Simply put, legal consumers now have more options. And if this sort of innovation is serving client interests and potentially lowering the costs for consumers, then Arizona's approach should be heralded as a model for the rest of the country. But what about the objection that non-lawyers' investment may create profit-motive incentives that are adverse to client interests?

Only time will tell whether there is merit to these sort of concerns. But Arizona now provides a helpful case study. So far, there is no evidence to suggest that ABS firms are less protective of client interests than traditional attorney-only firms. Notably, there were no recorded complaints for ABS firms in the first 22 months of the program. If over time it remains true that there is no higher number of complaints for ABS firms, that might justify liberalization in other states.[17]

In any event, concerns about non-attorneys pursuing profit motives over client interests can hardly be confined to these new business models: after all, attorney-owned firms are not without profit

---

[13] Joel Truett, "Goodbye Rule 5.4: Legal Ethics Change in Arizona," *Arizona State Law Journal*, available at https://arizonastatelawjournal.org/2021/04/19/goodbye-rule-5-4-legal-ethics-change-in-arizona/.

[14] Utah also adopted a "regulatory sandbox" pilot program in 2020 that loosened non-lawyer ownership prohibitions in that state. *See* Ricca & Ambrose, note 8, at 1.

[15] Lucy Ricca & Graham Ambrose, "The high highs and low lows of legal regulatory reform," Legal Evolution, Oct. 16, 2020, available at https://us01.l.antigena.com/l/GyaaAbimrrpUadkPPnye0KxF47rl6e3gjrfVXCO~qumIGHih50DgIeDu~lO5cFBBRhJ1P_q6SSWvbgCKHYpbnsC_JQgVEHhR-SRQzhIiFl_R9cRfzYGe19UbJEnGguTwClOAOOe8K72GFm6eR8ZtfoeeIhwgi9VYdCCDaH_YOfw7s7YbXXbieFE4Kjur4s1FBrOC2JicXQ2kdYtglVwtau6mZm, note 8 at 4 ("[M]ost entities across Utah and Arizona are implementing both technological and other innovations – including price innovations – to deliver legal services in new ways.").

[16] Andy Kvesic, "Firm Ownership Now Open to Non-Lawyers," *In Business Magazine, Greater Phoenix* (May 2022), available at https://inbusinessphx.com/legal-regulations/firm-ownership-now-open-to-non-lawyers#.Y_U7ruzMIfg.

[17] Ricca & Ambrose, note 8 at 5.

motives. That will always be true. Such concerns are currently addressed by existing rules of professional responsibility. If those rules are deemed adequate to regulate lawyers in traditional firms, presumably they should have similar effects for these new business models.

The best case for mixed-function firms rests on a model in which every function is governed by fiduciary duty—just as with traditional law firms. That could be easily addressed through legislation, or by requiring non-lawyers to consent to be bound by rules similar to the professional responsibility standards governing licensed attorneys. For example, a certified public accountant at a one-stop-shop firm would still have to act as a fiduciary and abide by all the same rules as would an attorney.

D. Revisiting Character and Fitness Requirements

In most states, those who hope to become licensed lawyers must pass a "character and fitness" evaluation. The requirements vary by state. Typically, the applicant must disclose previous addresses, civil and criminal violations, academic history, employment history, mental health and substance abuse issues, court judgments and orders.

In principle, this kind of review makes sense, given the fiduciary nature of the attorney-client relationship. Those offering legal services should have upright moral character. But it may be possible to improve the system of character and fitness evaluations.

First, inquiries about mental health and substance abuse issues may be counterproductive. Survey data suggests that these sort of disclosure requirements may discourage law students from seeking needed counseling—which might actually exacerbate mental health and substance abuse issues in the legal profession.[18] Accordingly, some have proposed that the focus of character and fitness evaluation should be confined to recent conduct and behavior, rather than over-inclusive inquiries about mental health or inquiries into long-forgotten episodes of the applicant's youth.

Second, it would make sense to modify the character and fitness process so that aspiring lawyers might have reasonable assurance that their personal history is uncontroversial before they invest three years, and incur many thousands of dollars of debt, to attend law school. The system currently requires aspiring lawyers to endure a character and fitness evaluation late in law school or after completing it. In principle, there is no reason why an applicant could not obtain pre-clearance for their character and fitness before enrolling in law school. Under this reform, bar applicants would still have to account for their conduct through law school; however, this sort of reform would avoid cruel surprises.

E. Apprenticeship as a Path to Licensure

A few states allow individuals to sit for the bar exam without first graduating from law school. This may be an unconventional path to licensure. But many who have studied under the auspices of a practicing attorney have learned the knowledge and skills necessary to practice law. And if the bar is worth its salt as a measure of one's competence to practice law, one might ask: Is graduation from a three-year ABA accredited law school truly essential?

---

[18] *See* "Suffering in Silence: The Survey of Law Student Well-Being and the Reluctance of Law Students to Seek Help for Substance Use and Mental Health Concerns," vol. 66, *J. Legal Education*, no. 1 (2016).

Law school is the preferred route for most aspiring lawyers. But it is probably wrong to assume that an individual who has studied under a dedicated legal mentor for years is unfit to handle legal work of the sort that has been performed under supervision throughout their apprenticeship. If an enterprising apprentice can demonstrate competence by passing a difficult bar exam—that many law school graduates fail—he or she is presumably just as capable as a recent law school graduate.

As such, state bars should consider apprenticeship as an alternative route to licensure that may enable more socially disadvantaged individuals to break into the legal profession—while furthering the goal of expanding access to justice for all. As ever, the bar must ensure that those licensed to practice law are competent and that they will adequately safeguard client interests. At a minimum, it is worth studying how non-traditional attorneys (i.e., those who did not graduate from law school) perform as compared to law school graduates.[19]

F. Reducing or Eliminating CLE Requirements

Finally, it may be time to rethink existing Continuing Legal Education (CLE) requirements. At present, all but five states require some amount of CLE. But survey data suggests that many lawyers find CLE requirements burdensome in terms of time, energy, and cost. More importantly, there is reason to believe that CLE requirements will not necessarily make for better lawyers.

The theory behind the CLE requirement is that lawyers should continually learn about developments in the law. That makes sense. But any competent lawyer will keep abreast of significant developments affecting his or her practice area—with or without CLE requirements. Those who fail to do so will suffer consequences—including the potential for negligence lawsuits or reprimand by the State Bar.

CLE requirements mandate that an attorney must devote a specified number of hours toward CLE classes; however, there is not usually any requirement that those CLE credits must be relevant to the attorney's work. Attorneys in relatively niche practice areas may find it difficult to discover relevant CLE classes—which means that they are forced to spend time and money on courses that may be wholly irrelevant to their needs and their clients' interests. This is undoubtedly a source of frustration for many in the legal profession.

While the idea of continual learning makes sense, the existing CLE system does not (and probably cannot) measure the time attorneys spend learning about issues that are relevant to their practice outside the traditional CLE class. Some jurisdictions appropriately award CLE credit for time spent writing law review articles or teaching CLE courses; however, there is generally no accounting for the time attorneys spend outside of CLE courses. For example, there is no accounting for time spent reading articles (or the Federal Register) to keep abreast of regulatory developments. Nor is there

[19] It may also be time to consider other reforms. For example, states might consider allowing law school graduates to practice law without taking the bar. Currently only Wisconsin allows for "diploma privilege." So it would be worth studying Wisconsin to see if there is any measurable difference between Wisconsin licensed lawyers who took the bar and those who did not.

any accounting of time spent reading the latest judicial opinions, or for time spent attending think tank events, Supreme Court term review discussions, or other such continual learning methods.

As such, it might make sense to eliminate existing CLE requirements in favor of a relatively simple requirement: namely, an attorney must attest that he or she is staying on top of relevant developments that may affect their practice. But in so far as we keep existing CLE requirements, we should consider opportunities for improvement. One option might be to reduce the number of CLE hours required, with the expectation that attorneys will focus more on courses relevant to their daily practice. Another might be to loosen CLE requirements to allow attorneys to count time spent learning through novel methods—like presentations from other attorneys or scholars, regardless of whether they are hosted by an "approved" CLE provider.

In any event, there is a dearth of empirical research on the effectiveness of existing CLE requirements.[20] Although CLE requirements are less of a concern than the barriers to entry into the legal profession discussed above, they still deserve research. Indeed, we should ultimately require empirical evidence before we support any regulation that imposes societal burdens.

IV. Conclusion

Occupational licensure limits opportunities for individuals. Licensure requirements may inhibit individuals from pursuing professions for which they might be well-suited or from pursuing options that might provide for a better life. For example, licensure restrictions impede mobility for individuals who may hesitate to move across state lines simply because they don't want to deal with the burden of seeking licensure in a second state.

For all these reasons, policymakers are rethinking occupational licensing restrictions for various trades and professions. Lawmakers are entertaining licensing reform for florists, interior decorators, tour guides, estheticians, and beauticians. And reform should be on the table—even for the venerable legal profession.

As detailed above, reform doesn't have to mean eliminating licensure. There are many modest reform options that would reduce unnecessary barriers to entry into the profession while advancing the interests of consumers who need affordable access to legal services. Given the compelling need to ensure opportunities for access to justice for all, policymakers would be wise—at a minimum—to question whether the status quo is serving the public good.

[20] Georgetown University Law Professor Rima Sirota writes in a paper that "no evidence-based reason has emerged to support the conclusion that CLE bears any relationship—much less a causal one—to better lawyering."