

**Rule 1.0 [1-100] Purpose and Function of the Rules of Professional Conduct
(Commission's Proposed Rule Adopted on June 2 – 3, 2016 – Clean Version)**

(a) Purpose.

The following rules are intended to regulate professional conduct of lawyers through discipline. They have been adopted by the Board of Trustees of the State Bar of California and approved by the Supreme Court of California pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 6076 and 6077 to protect the public, the courts, and the legal profession; protect the integrity of the legal system; and promote the administration of justice and confidence in the legal profession. These Rules together with any standards adopted by the Board of Trustees pursuant to these Rules shall be binding upon all lawyers.

(b) Function.

- (1) A willful violation of any of these rules is a basis for discipline.
- (2) The prohibition of certain conduct in these rules is not exclusive. Lawyers are also bound by applicable law including the State Bar Act (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6000 et seq.) and opinions of California courts.
- (3) A violation of a rule does not itself give rise to a cause of action for damages caused by failure to comply with the rule. Nothing in these Rules or the Comments to the Rules is intended to enlarge or to restrict the law regarding the liability of lawyers to others.

(c) Purpose of Comments.

The comments are not a basis for imposing discipline but are intended only to provide guidance for interpreting and practicing in compliance with the Rules.

(d) These Rules may be cited and referred to as the “California Rules of Professional Conduct.”

Comment

[1] The Rules of Professional Conduct are intended to establish the standards for lawyers for purposes of discipline. See *Ames v. State Bar* (1973) 8 Cal.3d 910, 917 [106 Cal.Rptr. 489]. Therefore, failure to comply with an obligation or prohibition imposed by a rule is a basis for invoking the disciplinary process. Because the Rules are not designed to be a basis for civil liability, a violation of a rule does not itself give rise to a cause of action for enforcement of a rule or for damages caused by failure to comply with the rule. *Stanley v. Richmond* (1995) 35 Cal.App.4th 1070, 1097 [41 Cal.Rptr.2d 768]. Nevertheless, a lawyer's violation of a rule may be evidence of breach of a lawyer's fiduciary or other substantive legal duty in a non-disciplinary context. *Id.*; *Mirabito v. Liccardo* (1992) 4 Cal.App.4th 41, 44 [5 Cal.Rptr.2d 571]. A violation of a rule may have other non-disciplinary consequences. See e.g., *Fletcher v. Davis* (2004) 33

Cal.4th 61, 71-72 [14 Cal.Rptr.3d 58] (enforcement of attorney's lien); *Chambers v. Kay* (2002) 29 Cal.4th 142, 161 [126 Cal.Rptr.2d 536] (enforcement of fee sharing agreement).

[2] While the rules are intended to regulate professional conduct of lawyers, a violation of a rule can occur when a lawyer is not practicing law or acting in a professional capacity.

[3] A willful violation of a rule does not require that the lawyer intend to violate the rule. *Phillips v. State Bar* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 944, 952 [264 Cal.Rptr. 346]; and see Business and Professions Code § 6077.

[4] In addition to the sources of guidance identified in paragraph (b)(2), opinions of ethics committees in California, although not binding, should be consulted for guidance on proper professional conduct. Ethics opinions and rules and standards promulgated by other jurisdictions and bar associations may also be considered.

[5] The disciplinary standards created by these Rules are not intended to address all aspects of a lawyer's professional obligations. A lawyer, as a member of the legal profession, is a representative and advisor of clients, an officer of the legal system and a public citizen having special responsibilities for the quality of justice. A lawyer should be aware of deficiencies in the administration of justice and of the fact that the poor, and sometimes persons* who are not poor, cannot afford adequate legal assistance. Therefore, all lawyers are encouraged to devote professional time and resources and use civic influence to ensure equal access to the system of justice for those who because of economic or social barriers cannot afford or secure adequate legal counsel. In meeting this responsibility, every lawyer should aspire to render at least fifty hours of pro bono publico legal services per year. In fulfilling this responsibility, the lawyer should provide a substantial* majority of such hours to indigent individuals or to nonprofit organizations with a primary purpose of providing services to the poor or on behalf of the poor or disadvantaged. See Business and Professions Code § 6073 (financial support for programs providing pro bono legal services).

Proposed Rule 1.0 [1-100] Purpose and Function of the Rules of Professional Conduct
Synopsis of Public Comments

TOTAL = XX **A = X**
 D = X
 M = X
 NI = X

No.	Commenter/Signatory	Comment on Behalf of Group?	A/D/M/NI ¹	Rule Section or Cmt.	Comment	RRC Response
2016-1	Barnes, Scott	No	D		The Bar has failed the people of California by making rules and not having the integrity to enforce them. Making rules with no accountability or enforcement is worthless...	Enforcement practices and policies are beyond the scope of the Commission's project to revise the rules. It should be noted, however, that pursuant to its Charter, the Commission is proposing new and amended rules that continue the function of the rules as disciplinary standards. The Commission has further made a deliberate effort to address ambiguities in rule language and to reconcile rules with developments in professional responsibility that have occurred since the rules were last revised. The Commission believes this approach will contribute to the effective enforcement of the rules by the State Bar.
X-2016-43b	Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct (COPRAC)	Y	M	Comment	COPRAC opposes moving the reference to ethics opinions from the main body of the rule to a comment. This provision has been part of the main body of Rule 1-100 for over 25 years. Including reference to ethics opinions in the main body of the rule informs lawyers that they have an obligation to understand their ethical duties and not merely	

¹ A = AGREE with proposed Rule

D = DISAGREE with proposed Rule

M = AGREE ONLY IF MODIFIED

NI = NOT INDICATED

**Proposed Rule 1.0 [1-100] Purpose and Function of the Rules of Professional Conduct
Synopsis of Public Comments**

TOTAL = XX **A = X**
D = X
M = X
NI = X

No.	Commenter/Signatory	Comment on Behalf of Group?	A/D/M/NI ¹	Rule Section or Cmt.	Comment	RRC Response
					avoid violating the narrow letter of the rule. We believe removal from the main body of the rule sends a signal to lawyers that ethics opinions are less important under the new rules.	
X-2016-46	Maxine Johnson	No	M		I have a lawyer as a neighbor and he and his wife have gone throughout the neighborhood suing other neighbors. A lawyer should never have the ability to sue on behalf of a person he or she is either married to or having sex with prior to the lawsuit and benefitting from using the spouse or girlfriends name.	The substance of the comment pertains to proposed Rule 1.8.10. Please refer to the public commenter table for Rule 1.8.10 for the RRC response.
X-2016-37	Margena Wade	No	A		No lawyer should have sexual relations or a personal relationship with a client, unless that relationship is well established before or well after the case. Otherwise, there is too much gray area to allow this.	The substance of the comment pertains to proposed Rule 1.8.10. Please refer to the public commenter table for Rule 1.8.10 for the RRC response.