Rule 1.13 [3-600] Organization as Client
(Commission’s Proposed Rule Adopted on February 19 – 20, 2016 – Clean Version)

(a) A lawyer employed or retained by an organization shall conform his or her representation to the concept that the client is the organization itself, acting through its duly authorized directors, officers, employees, members, shareholders, or other constituents overseeing the particular engagement.

(b) If a lawyer representing an organization knows* that a constituent is acting, intends to act or refuses to act in a matter related to the representation in a manner that the lawyer knows* or reasonably should know* is (i) a violation of a legal obligation to the organization or a violation of law reasonably* imputable to the organization, and (ii) likely to result in substantial* injury to the organization, the lawyer shall proceed as is reasonably* necessary in the best lawful interest of the organization. Unless the lawyer reasonably believes* that it is not necessary in the best lawful interest of the organization to do so, the lawyer shall refer the matter to higher authority in the organization, including, if warranted by the circumstances, to the highest authority that can act on behalf of the organization as determined by applicable law.

(c) In taking any action pursuant to paragraph (b), the lawyer shall not violate his or her duty of protecting all information protected by Business and Professions Code § 6068(e)(1).

(d) If, despite the lawyer’s actions in accordance with paragraph (b), the highest authority that can act on behalf of the organization insists upon action, or fails to act, in a manner that is a violation of a legal obligation to the organization or a violation of law reasonably* imputable to the organization, and is likely to result in substantial* injury to the organization, the lawyer shall continue to proceed as is reasonably* necessary in the best lawful interests of the organization. The lawyer’s response may include the lawyer’s right and, where appropriate, duty to resign or withdraw in accordance with Rule 1.16.

(e) A lawyer who reasonably believes* that he or she has been discharged because of the lawyer’s actions taken pursuant to paragraph (b), or who resigns or withdraws under circumstances described in paragraph (d), shall proceed as the lawyer reasonably believes* necessary to assure that the organization’s highest authority is informed of the lawyer’s discharge or withdrawal.

(f) In dealing with an organization’s constituents, a lawyer representing the organization shall explain the identity of the lawyer’s client whenever the lawyer knows* or reasonably should know* that the organization’s interests are adverse to those of the constituent(s) with whom the lawyer is dealing.

(g) A lawyer representing an organization may also represent any of its constituents, subject to the provisions of Rules 1.7, 1.8.2, 1.8.6, and 1.8.7. If the organization’s consent to the dual representation is required by any of these Rules, the consent
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shall be given by an appropriate official or body of the organization other than the individual who is to be represented, or by the shareholders.

Comment

The Entity as the Client

[1] This Rule applies to all forms of private, public and governmental organizations. See Comment [6]. An organizational client can only act through individuals who are authorized to conduct its affairs. The identity of an organization’s constituents will depend on its form, structure, and chosen terminology. For example, in the case of a corporation, constituents include officers, directors, employees and shareholders. In the case of other organizational forms, constituents include the equivalents of officers, directors, employees, and shareholders. Any agent or fiduciary authorized to act on behalf of an organization is a constituent of the organization for purposes of the authorized matter.

[2] A lawyer ordinarily must accept decisions an organization’s constituents make on behalf of the organization, even if the lawyer questions their utility or prudence. It is not within the lawyer’s province to make decisions on behalf of the organization concerning policy and operations, including ones entailing serious risk. A lawyer, however, has a duty to inform the client of significant developments related to the representation under Rule 1.4 and Business and Professions Code § 6068(m). Even when a lawyer is not obligated to proceed in accordance with paragraph (b), the lawyer may refer to higher authority, including the organization’s highest authority, matters that the lawyer reasonably believes are sufficiently important to refer in the best interest of the organization subject to Rule 1.6 and Business and Professions Code § 6068(e).

[3] Paragraph (b) distinguishes between knowledge of the conduct and knowledge of the consequences of that conduct. When a lawyer knows* of the conduct, the lawyer’s obligations under paragraph (b) are triggered when the lawyer knows* or reasonably should know* that the conduct is (i) a violation of a legal obligation to the organization, or a violation of law reasonably* imputable to the organization, and (ii) likely to result in substantial* injury to the organization.

[4] In determining how to proceed under paragraph (b), the lawyer should consider the seriousness of the violation and its potential consequences, the responsibility in the organization and the apparent motivation of the person* involved, the policies of the organization concerning such matters, and any other relevant considerations. Ordinarily, referral to a higher authority would be necessary. In some circumstances, however, the lawyer may ask the constituent to reconsider the matter. For example, if the circumstances involve a constituent’s innocent misunderstanding of law and subsequent acceptance of the lawyer’s advice, the lawyer may reasonably* conclude that the best interest of the organization does not require that the matter be referred to higher authority. If a constituent persists in conduct contrary to the lawyer’s advice, it will be necessary for the lawyer to take steps to have the matter reviewed by a higher authority in the organization. If the matter is of sufficient seriousness and importance or urgency to the organization, referral to higher authority in the organization may be necessary even if the
lawyer has not communicated with the constituent. For the responsibility of a subordinate
lawyer in representing an organization, see Rule 5.2.

[5] This Rule does not authorize a lawyer to substitute the lawyer’s judgment for that
of the organization or to take action on behalf of the organization independently of the
direction the lawyer receives from the highest authorized constituent overseeing the
particular engagement. In determining how to proceed in the best lawful interests of the
organization, a lawyer should consider the extent to which the organization should be
informed of the circumstances, the actions taken by the organization with respect to the
matter and the direction the lawyer has received from the organizational client.

**Governmental Organizations**

[6] It is beyond the scope of this Rule to define precisely the identity of the client and
the lawyer’s obligations when representing a governmental agency. Although in some
circumstances the client may be a specific agency, it may also be a branch of
government or the government as a whole. In a matter involving the conduct of
government officials, a government lawyer may have authority under applicable law to
question such conduct more extensively than that of a lawyer for a private organization in
similar circumstances. Duties of lawyers employed by the government or lawyers in
military service may be defined by statutes and regulations. In addition, a governmenta
organization may establish internal organizational rules and procedures that identify an
official, agency, organization, or other person* to serve as the designated recipient of
whistle-blower reports from the organization’s lawyers, consistent with Rule 1.6 and
Business and Professions Code § 6068(e). This Rule is not intended to limit that
authority.
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