

CLEAN

DRAFT #10, Submitted for January 11, 2019, meeting

Bomse
*Bundy
Dilworth
Carr

**THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONDUCT
DRAFT FORMAL OPINION INTERIM NO. 16-0003
ANCILLARY BUSINESS ISSUES**

ISSUES: Under what circumstances does a lawyer's conduct in connection with a non-law business render that business potentially subject to regulation under the California Rules of Professional Conduct and, what steps, if any, can a lawyer take to ensure that a non-legal business is not subject to those Rules? How do rules governing partnership with non-lawyers, sharing of legal fees, solicitation, conflicts of interest and lawyer-client business transactions apply to a lawyer's dealings with a non-law business in which the lawyer is involved?

DIGEST: Although non-legal services are, by definition, not the practice of law, they can become subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct if they are conducted in a manner that is not distinct from activities constituting the practice of law or if they are sufficiently law-related to give rise to a reasonable risk that the customer may understand that legal services are being provided or that a lawyer-client relationship has been formed. Where appropriate steps have been taken to distinguish non-legal from legal services and to clarify that no legal services are being provided and that no lawyer-client relationship has been formed, the Rules of Professional Conduct will not apply to the services provided. The Rules governing the lawyer's separate practice of law, including rules pertaining to solicitation, conflicts of interest, and business transactions will, however, remain applicable to the lawyer's dealings with the non-legal entity in the course of the lawyer's practice.

AUTHORITIES

INTERPRETED: Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §6106; California Rules of Professional Conduct 1.7; 1.8.1; 5.4 (a)-(b); 7.2 (b); 7.3; 8.4

CLEAN

INTRODUCTION

In today's economic environment, many lawyers and law firms are interested in pursuing business opportunities that do not involve the provision of legal services. Those activities may draw on the lawyer or law firm's own non-legal background and skills or they may involve investing in or partnering with non-lawyers. This opinion addresses the circumstances under which the Rules of Professional Conduct may apply to a non-law business conducted or controlled by a lawyer.¹ It also addresses ethical issues that may arise for a lawyer in her own practice arising from her relationship with a separate non-law business.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

A law firm is considering seeking to capitalize on capacities developed over time by marketing those capacities through businesses that do not involve the direct representation of clients in legal matters. The firm is considering a variety of options.

In Scenario 1, the firm would provide services as a professional fiduciary through a separate entity. Services at the professional fiduciary firm would be provided by lawyers from the firm and by some non-lawyers trained as professional fiduciaries and the entity would be jointly owned by the law firm and the non-lawyer fiduciaries working there.

In Scenario 2, the firm would provide e-discovery support services. The firm is considering whether the services should be provided through a distinct e-discovery support department of the firm or through a separate entity.

With respect to each of the proposed options, the firm would like to know first, whether, and under what circumstances, the provision of the services would be subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct. In addition, the firm wants to know: (a) how the rules barring partnerships or fee-splitting with non-lawyers might apply to such arrangements and (b) how the rules regarding solicitation, conflict of interest and lawyer-client business transactions might apply to the relations between the law firm and the separate entity that provides non-legal services.

BACKGROUND

The Definition of Non-Legal Services. Under California law, non-legal services are defined as "services that are not performed as part of the practice of law and which may be performed by non-lawyers without constituting the practice of law." Formal Opinion 1995-141.² It is well-

¹ This Opinion supplements and updates important earlier opinions on this topic, including Formal Opinions 1982-69, 1995-141, and 1999-154.

² Consistent with the Committee's longstanding practice, this opinion is not intended to address or opine upon the issue of the unauthorized practice of law. Regarding activities undertaken by an individual

settled that a lawyer or law firm has the right to provide non-legal services. A lawyer or law firm may engage in the provision of non-legal services either directly from the lawyer or the firm's own offices,³ or through a separate entity in which the lawyer or law firm has an ownership interest. Services may be delivered by lawyers or by non-lawyers.

The fact that a lawyer is providing services that are not part of the practice of law and that could lawfully be provided by a layperson does not mean that professional discipline and professional rules have no role to play.⁴ Even when a lawyer's sole business is the provision of non-legal services, she is subject to professional discipline for "the commission of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption." Business & Professions Code § 6106; State Bar of California, Formal Opinion No. 1995-141 at 2. In addition, Rule 8.4 applies by its own terms even "when a lawyer is ... not practicing law or acting in a professional capacity." Rule 8.4, Comment [1].

In addition, under certain circumstances lawyer or law firm involvement in a business providing non-legal services can trigger the application of other Rules of Professional Conduct.⁵ A Comment to the Rules notes that "a violation of a rule can occur when a lawyer is not practicing law or acting in a professional capacity." RPC 1.0, Comment 2. But with the exception of Rule 8.4, the Rules do not themselves specify when they apply to non-legal services, leaving that question to be resolved under other California authorities, including case law and ethics opinions.⁶

who is not an active member of the California State Bar, members should consider California Business and Professions Code sections 6125 to 6127. Regarding what constitutes the practice of law in California, members should consider the following cases: *Birbrower, Montalbano, Condon & Frank v. Superior Court* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 119 [70 Cal.Rptr.2d 858]; *Farnham v. State Bar* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 605 [131 Cal.Rptr. 661]; *Bluestein v. State Bar* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 162 [118 Cal.Rptr. 175]; *Baron v. City of Los Angeles* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 535 [86 Cal.Rptr. 673]; *Crawford v. State Bar* (1960) 54 Cal.2d 659 [7 Cal.Rptr. 746]; *People v. Merchants Protective Corp.* (1922) 189 Cal. 531, 535 [209 P. 363]; *Estate of Condon* (1998) 65 Cal.App.4th 1138 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 922]; *People v. Landlords Professional Services* (1989) 215 Cal.App.3d 1599 [264 Cal.Rptr. 548]; and *People v. Sipper* (1943) 61 Cal.App.2d Supp. 844 [142 P.2d 960].

³ The former rule forbidding the provision of legal and non-legal services from the same office has long since been disapproved. See LACBA Opinion 384, LACBA Opinion 413.

⁴ The question of whether a lawyer's performance of non-legal services is subject to professional discipline or to the Rules of Professional Conduct is related to, but distinct from, the question whether those services are "professional services" for purposes of the application of the malpractice statute of limitations in Code of Civil Procedure §340.6. See *Lee v. Hanley* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 1226 [191 Cal.Rptr.3d 536]. We express no opinion on that issue of statutory construction here.

⁵ Several independent statutory provisions govern lawyer's provision of certain products and services ancillary to the practice of law. *E.g.*, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6009.3 (tax preparation); 6009 (lobbyists); 6175 (financial products); 18895 (athlete agents). All are beyond the scope of this opinion.

⁶ Many American jurisdictions have addressed the issue of the application of professional rules to non-legal businesses by adopting a version of American Bar Association Model Rule 5.7. A drafting team of the Commission for the Revision of the Rules of Professional Conduct recommended against adoption of

99

Non-Legal Services Provided in Circumstances Not Distinct from the Practice of Law. One way that services not constituting the practice of law can become subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct is when they are rendered in circumstances that are not sufficiently distinct from the provision of legal services. The authorities all involve situations where a sole practitioner offered to provide both legal and non-legal services in the same matter, from the same office, without any efforts to distinguish the two services. *Layton v. State Bar*, 50 Cal. 3d 888, 904 (1990) (serving as lawyer for the estate and executor in the same matter), State Bar Formal Opinion 1982-69 (serving as lawyer and broker with respect to the same real estate transaction); *Libarian v. State Bar*, 21 Cal. 2d 862 (1943) (lawyer and notary). This principle may apply even if the non-legal services are provided through a separate entity devoted primarily to the provision of such services. For example, a lawyer who establishes a separate entity through which she primarily intends to provide investment advice (a non-legal service) is nevertheless subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct if she also provides legal advice to her investment advisees as part of the separate business. State Bar Formal Opinion 1999-154.

Non-Legal Services “Related to the Practice of Law.” Even where the lawyer or law firm is providing non-legal services that are distinct from the lawyer’s practice of law, the Rules of Professional Conduct can still apply if the non-legal services are sufficiently related to the practice of law that the lawyer’s involvement in them could “reasonably lead prospective clients to misperceive the nature of the services being offered.” State Bar Formal Opinion 1999-154. Thus, we have previously opined that an advertisement for an attorney’s separate investment advisory business that lists the attorney’s professional credentials as a lawyer is a “communication with respect to professional employment” within the meaning of former rule 1-400, because investment advising is an activity related to the practice of law and the use of the lawyer’s legal credentials to advertise that service could therefore lead the client to misperceive the nature of the service being provided. *Id.*; compare *Kelly v. State Bar*, 53 Cal. 3d 509, 517 (1991) (lawyer acting as client’s agent for sale of client’s airplane); *Priamos v. State Bar*, 3 St. Bar. Ct. Rptr. 824 (lawyer acting as investment advisor).

At the same time, there are some forms of non-legal services that are so clearly unrelated to the practice of law that there is no risk of customer confusion between the lawyer’s legal and non-legal activities. Thus, it is well-settled that lawyer-owned retail service businesses like a restaurant or dry cleaner that are distinct from the lawyer’s practice are so clearly non-related to the practice of law that the Rules of Professional Conduct do not apply to relations with their customers. Formal Opinion 1995-141.

Types of Law Related Services Potentially Subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct. The California authorities do not provide a comprehensive listing of “law-related” non-legal activities that are potentially subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct. It is clear that acting as a fiduciary or investment advisor is such an activity. See Formal Opinion 1995-141 (fiduciary);

Rule 5.7 in California “because appropriate guidance is currently provided by other California authorities.” Memorandum from Rule 5.7 Drafting Team to Members, Commission for the Revisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct, May 16, 2016 at 4-5. The full Commission voted to accept that recommendation.

Kelly (agent); Formal Opinion 199-154 (investment advisor); *Priamos* (same). Beyond that, however, there is little relevant authority. Given the limited California authority defining law-related activities, it is both permissible and helpful to look for guidance in national sources of authority, such as the Model Rules of Professional Conduct. Formal Opinion 2010-180 n.7; *State Compensation Ins. Fund v. WPS, Inc.* (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 642, 655-56 [82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 799]. American Bar Association Model Rule 5.7 defines “law-related services” subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct as those “that might reasonably be performed in connection with legal services and in substance are related to the provision of legal services.” This definition reflects the same concern as California law: the risk of client confusion concerning the nature of the services being provided.

The Comments to the Model Rules suggest a further non-exhaustive list of “law-related” activities that are potentially subject to professional rules, including “providing title insurance, financial planning, accounting, trust services, real estate counseling, legislative lobbying, economic analysis, social work, psychological counseling, tax preparation, and patent, medical or environmental consulting.” *Id.* Comment [8]. Some of these activities overlap with those already recognized under California law as potentially subject to regulation under the Rules of Professional Conduct. To the extent that the list extends beyond those activities, the Committee does not opine here on whether a lawyer’s provision of any of the listed services, in circumstances distinct from her practice, would be subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct. Specific circumstances may matter greatly in assessing the risk of client misunderstanding. In addition, the relationship of the non-legal business activity to activities defined as the practice of law is context-dependent and could change over time as the latter definition changes. The Committee believes, however, that this broader list may provide useful guidance to lawyers seeking to determine whether a non-law business is potentially subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Affirmative Steps May Avoid the Application of the Rules of Professional Conduct. The question remains whether the application of the Professional Rules to “law-related” non-legal services is automatic and inescapable, or instead can be avoided through appropriate clarifying measures. No California authority directly addresses this question. It is settled, however, that a lawyer providing non-legal services has a duty to clarify whether and to what extent a lawyer-client relationship exists, particularly when a lawyer knows or reasonably should know that the customer believes that such a relationship exists. Formal Opinion 1995-141. It is also settled (1) that a lawyer can avoid the formation of an implied lawyer-client relationship through words or actions making it unreasonable for the putative client to infer that such a relationship exists and (2) that the sophistication of the client is relevant in assessing the reasonableness of the client’s belief. *Sky Valley Ltd. Partnership v. ATX Sky Valley, Ltd.*, 150 F.R.D. 648, 651-52 (N.D. Cal. 1993) (applying California law). These principles suggest that appropriate efforts to distinguish legal and non-legal services, coupled with appropriate warnings that no attorney-client relationship exists and that no legal services are being provided, can be effective to take law-related non-legal services outside the coverage of the Rules of Professional Conduct.⁷

⁷ A leading California ethics authority appears to assume, at least implicitly, that such clarifying measures are not available or effective. M. Tuft & E. Peck, California Practice Guide, Professional Responsibility [1:324], stating that a lawyer or law firm that directly or indirectly provides law related services, whether

182
 183 Allowing lawyers and law firms providing non-legal services that take appropriate clarifying
 184 measures to avoid the application of the Rules of Professional Conduct also represents sound
 185 policy, for at least three reasons. First, the primary reasons for applying the Rules of
 186 Professional Conduct to non-legal services are the risk of overlap with legal services and the risk
 187 of client confusion concerning whether the protections of the lawyer-client relationship exist.
 188 When those risks are dispelled, the reasons for applying the Professional Rules are no longer
 189 present. Second, there are often substantial benefits for customers in permitting such clarifying
 190 measures to be effective. Where the provision of a non-legal service is subject to its own
 191 regulatory or contractual scheme, the lawyer provider and the customer may have multiple
 192 shared reasons, including clarity, consistency and efficiency, for having the services regulated
 193 under that scheme alone. Third, where California policy permits, it is desirable to align
 194 California’s approach with that taken in other jurisdictions. The approach outlined here, which
 195 treats the application of the Rules of Professional Conduct to law-related services as presumptive
 196 only, advances national uniformity because it aligns with the approach taken in Model Rule 5.7,
 197 which states that professional rules do not apply to law-related services if the lawyer has
 198 established that those services are distinct from legal services and that reasonable measures have
 199 been taken to ensure that the customer understands both that the services are not legal services
 200 and that the protections of the lawyer client relationship do not exist. Model Rule 5.7,
 201 Comments [6] - [8]. In an era when many lawyers and law firms practice (and potentially offer
 202 non-legal services) in multiple jurisdictions, having a standard that simultaneously reflects
 203 California policy and advances national uniformity is a substantial advantage.

204
 205 The effectiveness of measures taken to distinguish non-legal services from legal services and to
 206 clarify the nature of the services provided and the absence of a lawyer-client relationship will
 207 depend on the circumstances, including the clarity of the measures taken, the sophistication of
 208 the customer, whether the services are being provided in the same matter, and whether the
 209 customer has engaged separate legal counsel in the matter. *Id.* Ordinarily the lawyer should
 210 explain that the protections associated with forming an attorney-client relationship, including the
 211 attorney-client privilege and the duty of confidentiality, will not apply. In some situations,
 212 particularly those involving the provision of legal and non-legal services in the same matter or to
 213 unsophisticated customers, the legal and non-legal services may be “so closely entwined” that
 214 even a very clear disclaimer may not be effective. See Model Rule 5.7, Comment [8]. But
 215 where non-legal services are clearly distinguished as such, and the lawyer has taken reasonable
 216 clarifying measures, there is no reason why the business cannot be conducted under the baseline
 217 legal rules governing non-lawyers who engage in it.

to clients or non-clients, “must comply” with the Rules of Professional Conduct and the State Bar Act in
 the provision of those non-legal services. The authors do not, however, consider the possibility of
 effective clarifying measures or the authorities or reasons of policy cited in text that support their
 recognition.

DISCUSSION

1. Applicability of the Rules of Professional Conduct

For purposes of discussion, we assume, without deciding, that the businesses contemplated in Scenarios 1 and 2, if conducted by non-lawyers, would not constitute the unauthorized practice of law.⁸ If conducted by a lawyer or law firm, however, both would be sufficiently law-related to be presumptively subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct. In the case of fiduciary services provided by a lawyer, the latter conclusion is compelled by the case law and our prior opinions. See Formal Opinion 1995-141. In the case of e-discovery services, the same result follows because e-discovery support services are frequently provided in connection with, and are substantively related to, the practice of law. In both Scenarios 1 and 2, then, there is a significant risk that the client could misunderstand the nature of the services being provided.

Because the proposed activities are law related, they will be subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct unless they are distinct from the firm's provision of legal services and the firm has taken reasonable steps to ensure that the customer for the services understands that the firm's involvement in providing them does not mean that the services involve the practice of law and is not intended to give rise to an attorney-client relationship.

To avoid the application of the Rules of Professional Conduct to law-related services the provision of those services must be distinct from the law firm's practice of law. If a single lawyer is offering both legal and non-legal services in the same matter, from the same office, the activities ordinarily will not be distinct and the Rules of Professional Conduct will apply. Conversely, if the services are being offered in different matters and by separate entities, they will normally be distinct. In between these extremes, the answer will depend on circumstances. For example, there may be circumstances where distinctness may be achieved even if the services are provided through the same entity—for example if the law firm provides legal and non-legal services through separate units of the firm that are organizationally and functionally distinct. See Model Rule 5.7 (suggesting that distinctness may be shown by using different support staff for legal and non-legal services). Similarly, there may also be occasions where even though services are being provided in the same matter, for example, by the law firm and a separate entity controlled by the law firm, the relationship between the two types of services, in terms of organizational structure, designated responsibilities, personnel, compensation and related issues, could still permit a finding that the services are distinct.

2. Effectiveness of Clarifying Measures

Assuming the provision of non-legal services is distinct from the provision of legal services, the question remains whether the law firm can avoid the application of the Rules of Professional Conduct by making clear that it is not providing legal services and that no lawyer-client relationship exists. Scenario 1 involves the provision of professional fiduciary services. Formal Opinion 1995-141 states without apparent qualification that, "when rendering professional services that involve a fiduciary relationship, a member of the State Bar must conform to the

⁸ See the discussion *supra* at note 2.

professional standards of a lawyer.” This language could be read as suggesting that a lawyer operated or controlled non-legal business may not ever avoid the application of the Rules of Professional Conduct if the business in question involves the assumption of any fiduciary duties. We do not, however, read the Opinion so broadly. To begin with, neither that Opinion nor the authorities it relied upon involved a lawyer conducting a distinct non-legal business who made affirmative efforts to explain that he or she was not providing legal services or forming an attorney-client relationship. To the contrary, those cases all involved individual lawyers providing non-legal services that overlapped both physically and functionally with the provision of legal services, see, e.g., *Libarian v. State Bar*, 21 Cal. 2d 862 (1943); State Bar Formal Opinion 1982-69, or the lawyer’s affirmative use of his professional status to invite the injured person’s trust and confidence. *Beery v. State Bar*, 43 Cal 3d. 802 (1987); *Sodikoff v. State Bar*, 14 Cal. 3d. 422 (1975); *Jacobs v. State Bar*, 219 Cal. 59 (1933); see also *Alkow v. State Bar*, 38 Cal. 2d 257 (1952). Because none of those cases involved appropriate clarifying measures, none can be read as holding that such efforts are invariably ineffective. Moreover, we have found no other case so holding. Finally, for the reasons discussed above, we believe that California law does and should give effect to such disclaimers for all types of non-legal businesses. Put simply, once appropriate measures have been taken to avoid consumer confusion, there does not appear to be any good reason why a lawyer who has a separate non-legal business as, for example, a professional fiduciary or a real estate broker, should be required to comply with rules that are unique to the legal profession.

Accordingly, we believe that in both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 a lawyer who is providing non-legal services that are distinct from his or her law practice can avoid the application of the Rules of Professional Conduct to those services if she provides the customer with reasonable notice that no legal advice or services are being provided, that no attorney-client relationship has been formed, and that the protections associated with the attorney-client relationship, including the privilege and the duty of confidentiality, will not be available. Such clarifying measures are more likely to be effective if the notice is in writing and if prospective customers of the law firm are themselves law firms or represented by counsel. This will very likely be the case for a separate entity providing e-discovery services; perhaps less so for a firm serving as a professional fiduciary. Where the customer is not sophisticated, it may be relevant whether the customer had, or was advised to retain, separate legal counsel in the matter.

In Scenario 1, the law firm has expressed an interest in having one or more of its lawyers take an active role in directing, performing, or delivering the services in question, as opposed to simply being a passive investor in the entity. Lawyers may be fully as capable of providing non-legal services as their non-lawyer counterparts. The direct involvement of lawyers in providing such services may, however, increase the risk that the customer may believe the services entail the formation of a lawyer-client relationship. Still, where the non-legal services are clearly distinct from any legal services provided by the lawyer, the relevant disclaimers are clear, and the client is sophisticated, there is no categorical reason why the lawyer’s involvement should give rise to a risk of misunderstanding sufficient to require the application of the Rules.

A similar point applies to the degree of lawyer control of the non-legal business. For purposes of determining whether the professional rules apply to the non-legal business, the degree to which the lawyer or law firm controls the business is important principally insofar as it may indicate to

customers of the business that the services being provided are legal in nature. Accordingly, if the degree of lawyer control is not apparent to the customer, it is unlikely to support a finding that the professional rules apply to the non-legal business. And even if that degree of control is apparent, it is unlikely, standing alone, to lead to a finding that the Rules of Professional Conduct apply if the non-legal business has properly disclaimed the provision of legal services and the formation of a lawyer client relationship.

3. Partnership and Sharing of Income with Non-Lawyer Partners or Investors

In this section and the following section, we assume, unless otherwise stated, that the lawyer or law firm is subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct, but that the non-legal service provider has taken sufficient steps to ensure that it is not.

A lawyer or law firm may well want to share income from a non-legal business with non-lawyer partners, employees, or investors. Under the Rules of Professional Conduct, a lawyer may not form a partnership or other organization with a non-lawyer if any of the activities of that partnership consist of the practice of law, RPC 5.4 (b), and, except in certain limited circumstances, may not directly or indirectly share legal fees with a non-lawyer. RPC 5.4 (a).

A separate entity providing exclusively non-legal services is, by definition, not engaged in the practice of law. Accordingly, RPC 5.4 (b) does not bar a lawyer from forming a partnership or other organization with non-lawyers to conduct such a business, or from accepting investment in such a business from non-lawyers. Moreover, fees that are derived exclusively from the provision of non-legal services are not legal fees. Thus, RPC 5.4 (a) does not bar the direct or indirect sharing of fees with non-lawyers who work or invest in a separate non-law business. *Accord*, State Bar Formal Opinion 1995-141.

4. Solicitation, Conflict of Interest and Lawyer-Client Business Transactions

A law firm that practices law and a separate lawyer-controlled firm that provides non-legal services may often want to pursue business on the other firm's behalf or refer business to the other firm. The two firms may also want to make compensation for such referrals part of the relationship between the law firm and the firm providing non-legal services, whether in the form of referral fees or otherwise. These issues have been largely covered in earlier opinions. We discuss them under the headings of solicitation, conflict of interest, and lawyer-client business transactions.

Solicitation. The law of solicitation governs oral or written targeted communications by or on behalf of a lawyer that are directed to a specific person and that offer to provide, or can reasonably be understood as offering to provide, legal services. Rule of Professional Conduct 7.3 (e). A lawyer or law firm that solicits non-client third persons for a distinct non-legal business is not covered by this Rule, because the communication cannot be understood as offering legal services. *Accord*, State Bar Formal Opinion 1995-141 (construing former Rule 1-400). For the same reasons, the solicitation rules do not apply when a lawyer-controlled entity that provides solely non-legal services is soliciting on its own behalf.

CLEAN

When the separate entity is engaged in efforts to obtain clients for the law firm, however, the solicitation rules that govern the law firm's conduct will apply to those efforts, because such communications are "on behalf of" the law firm and can be understood as offering to provide legal services. *Id.* Moreover, any compensation, gift or promise by the lawyer given in consideration of a recommendation by the non-lawyer entity would be forbidden by RPC 7.2 (b). *See* State Bar Formal Opinion 1995-141.

Conflict of Interest. A lawyer who refers an existing client to a non-legal business in which the lawyer has an economic interest, with the expectation or intention that the client will purchase non-legal services from the entity, may have a potential conflict of interest. Rule 1.7 (b) requires informed written consent of the affected client and compliance with Rule 1.7 (d), "if there is a significant risk the lawyer's representation of the client will be materially limited" by the lawyer's personal interest. Rule 1.7 (b). Whether the lawyer's referral to a business in which she has an interest will give rise to a potential conflict under Rule 1.7 (b) will depend on, among other things, the connection of the non-legal services to the representation of the client, the degree to which the choice of provider could affect the outcome or cost of the representation, and the degree to which the lawyer or law firm will benefit economically from the referral. *Compare* Formal Opinion 1995-140 (construing the requirement of written disclosure of interests under former Rule 3-310 (B)(4)). Where the non-legal services are connected to the representation and the lawyer receives compensation for his referral, compliance with Rule 1.7 is normally required, because of the risk that the lawyer's exercise of judgment in conducting the representation will be adversely affected by her economic interest. Formal Opinion 1995-140. Conversely, if the referral is for services unrelated to the representation or if the lawyer's economic benefit from the transaction is immaterial, compliance may not be required. Cf. Formal Opinion 2002-159, section III.

Lawyer-Client Business Transactions. Transactions by an existing client of a lawyer or law firm with an entity providing non-legal services may also be subject to Rule 1.8.1, governing lawyer-client business transactions.⁹ That rule applies not only to transactions between client and lawyer

⁹ Rule 1.8.1 provides that:

A member shall not enter into a business transaction with a client; or knowingly acquire an ownership, possessory, security, or other pecuniary interest adverse to a client, unless each of the following requirements has been satisfied:

(a) the transaction or acquisition and its terms are fair and reasonable to the client and the terms and the lawyer's role in the transaction or acquisition are fully disclosed and transmitted in writing to the client in a manner which should reasonably have been understood by the client;

(b) the client either is represented in the transaction or acquisition by an independent lawyer of the client's choice or the client is advised in writing to seek the advice of an independent lawyer of the client's choice and is given a reasonable opportunity to seek that advice; and

CLEAN

384 directly, but also potentially to transactions between the client and an entity in which the lawyer
385 has a controlling interest. Formal Opinion 1995-141.

386
387 The test for determining the applicability of Rule 1.8.1 to a transaction between a lawyer's client
388 and a non-legal business in which the lawyer has an interest is "whether the transaction arises out
389 of the lawyer-client relationship or the trust and confidence reposed by the client in the lawyer as
390 a result of the lawyer-client relationship." Formal Opinion 1995-141 (applying former Rule 3-
391 300); *compare Hunnicutt v. State Bar* (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 362, 370-71 (Rule applies if the client
392 placed his trust in his former attorney "because of the representation").¹⁰ When a lawyer advises
393 a client to patronize a non-legal business, and receives a referral fee for doing so, the transaction
394 clearly arises out of the lawyer-client relationship, and Rule 1.8.1 applies. Formal Opinion 1995-
395 140. The same conclusion should follow in any other case where the lawyer's referral to or
396 involvement in the non-legal business is reasonably likely to cause the client to transfer the trust
397 and confidence reposed in the lawyer to the negotiation of the client's relationship with the non-
398 legal business. *Id.*¹¹

CONCLUSION

402 A lawyer engaged in a non-law business is always subject to professional discipline for conduct
403 that violates Business & Professions Code § 6106 or Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4. A
404 lawyer's involvement in a non-law business may also trigger the application of other Rules of
405 Professional Conduct if the business is sufficiently "law-related" that the lawyer's involvement
406 might reasonably lead a customer for those services to believe that an attorney-client
407 relationship, with its attendant protections, was being formed, or that legal services were being
408 provided. Even when a non-law business is "law related" in this sense, however, the application
409 of the Rules can be avoided if the non-law business is conducted in a manner distinct from the
410 lawyer's practice of law and if reasonable measures have been taken to ensure that the customer

(c) The client thereafter consents in writing to the terms of the transaction or the terms of
the transaction or acquisition, and to the lawyer's role in it.

¹⁰ There is a suggestion in Formal Opinion 1995-141 that the applicability of Rule 1.8.1 to a transaction with a non-legal business is determined by whether the non-legal business is offering services that involve the assumption of a fiduciary duty. If so, then the Rule applies. If not, it does not. *Id.* at p.3. To the extent that Formal Opinion 1995-141 takes that view we believe it is incorrect. The question whether a given transaction arises from the attorney client relationship, so that Rule 1.8.1 applies, is largely independent of the type of non-legal service offered—it turns instead on the degree to which the trust and confidence arising from the lawyer-client relationship is likely to influence the customer's approach to the transaction with the non-legal business.

¹¹ Sometimes a transaction may involve the potential for exploitation of client trust both because of the lawyer's role in making the referral and the lawyer's role in the negotiation with the separate entity, as when a personal injury lawyer refers a client to a medical facility in which the lawyer practices as a doctor. LACBA 477.

CLEAN

411 understands that no attorney-client relationship is being formed, that no legal services are being
412 provided, and that the protections of the attorney-client relationship will not apply.
413

414 This opinion is issued by the Standing Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct of
415 the State Bar of California. It is advisory only. It is not binding upon the courts, the State Bar of
416 California, its Board of Governors, any persons, or tribunals charged with regulatory
417 responsibilities, or any member of the State Bar.
418